

Changing Patterns of Dispute Settlement in an American City

Prit Kaur*

Abstract

The objective of the sociology of law is to investigate the dialectical interaction between the formal state legal system and the social structure and culture. One specific area suited for this type of investigation is dispute settlement as undertaken by individuals in different socio-legal cultural contexts. Do people, for instance, prefer to settle disputes within or outside the state legal system, and why? The current study, based on data collected from 100 research participants, shows that 56% of disputes are settled through the state legal system, 20% of disputes are settled through socially recognized non-state methods and 24% of disputes are settled through 'extra-dispute settlement methods' recognized neither socially nor by the state. The investigation further reveals that disputants' preferences for resolution method are primarily determined by the nature and meaning of the disputes as embedded in their socio-cultural situational contexts and having established connection(s) within the formal legal system.

Keywords: Legal Pluralism, Dispute Settlement, Procedural Justice, Omni-culturalism

Introduction

American society today is more characterized by socio-cultural legal variety and diversity than ever before. A high migration and immigration rate of individuals from Latin America and Asia over the past four decades has significantly changed the demographic profile of many cities in the USA. The traditional divide between the two races of 'White and Black' has become more complicated as the proportion of Blacks in the minority population has declined from 65% to 37%, while the proportion of Hispanic and Asian Americans has increased steadily to 30%. Additionally, the presence of almost

* Dr. Prit Kaur has a PhD in Sociology of Law from Panjab University, Chandigarh, India, and a post-doctorate from California State University, Sacramento. She is working as an Assistant Professor of Criminal Justice at Auburn University at Montgomery. Her areas of research interest are immigration and migration, community-policing, and gender and juvenile justice. She can be reached at pkaur@aum.edu

two-thirds foreign-born Asians and 40% Hispanics among these populations has raised the number of foreign-born citizens to 12.9% of the entire United States population (Grieco 2010; American Immigration Council 2013). These foreign-born individuals have brought with them not only professional skills but also new sets of socio-cultural legal norms and practices. They have added many non-state, informal and non-standard legal norms, including customary laws, religious laws and traditions, to the existing sets of state laws that consist of constitutional laws required or ordained by the state.

However, this emerging legal plurality in American society is part of a larger global trend. Legal pluralism has already been accepted theoretically and practically to a certain extent in many European countries. Scholars describing the inevitable intermingling of the normative systems that emerged in the international and transnational realms have interchangeably used terms such as global legal pluralism, judicial pluralism, dichotomous systems of law and justice, transnational pluralism, normative pluralism, normative transfer, and empirical pluralism (Berman 2007; Griffiths 2015; Teubner 1996; Zumbansen 2010). Researchers have also developed parallels and analogies of the emerging pluralism of the non-colonial world to the indigenous unifying systems and the state (formal) legal systems of post-colonial societies. For instance, Tamanaha (2008) called legal pluralism a 'historic condition'. He described how the numerous pluralistic co-existing, conflicting and overlapping norms and institutions of medieval times were incorporated into state law in Western European societies, while at the same time a wave of legal pluralism was being produced elsewhere through colonization. Over the years, post-colonial societies have slowly moved toward a more unified system of law, while at the end of the 20th Century in Western societies a new wave of pluralism emerged under globalization. The mass migration of people across national borders and the creation of global societies has led to an intermingling of normative orders, consequently confusing individuals and groups that could not be certain which legal regime applied to their situation and providing opportunities for individuals and groups to strategically invoke or oppose one legal order against another. This new situation demands a review of the emerging normative orders

and their repercussions for justice delivery to different constituents in any society, including American society. Only by studying the local settings in which the norms of multiple communities become operative can scholars gain a deeper and more thorough understanding of the international and transnational legal terrain (Berman 2007). Thus, this study has sought to explore the prevalence of state and non-state legal systems and interconnections among them from a subaltern perspective by studying dispute settlement mechanisms. The specific objectives of the study are: (i) to identify peoples' problems/disputes; (ii) to understand and describe how the state and non-state legal systems are perceived and used in terms of their efficacy in resolving disputes among community members; and (iii) to examine situations or cases where disputes are resolved outside any approved settlement method and the reasons the external methods are used.

Literature Review

For this study, it was necessary to examine the studies related to (I) legal plurality; (II) dispute settlement; and (III) diversity inclusion.

(I) Legal Plurality

Like most multi-ethnic societies, American society is characterized by legal pluralism implying the co-presence of alternate systems of law and justice. For example, a state legal system exists consisting of the constitutional law and various subsets of official laws required or ordained by the state and additionally, a great variety of non-official, informal and non-standard legal systems exist including customary laws, religious laws and traditions of the different communities operating at different levels. This type of legal pluralism has presumably always existed in most multi-ethnic societies. However, according to Berman (2007), Zumbansen (2010), Perez (2011), Paul (2013), and Griffiths (2015) among others, the notion of legal pluralism has been complicated and intensified by the apparent multiplicity of legal orders, from the local to the global level. Globalization brought different nations together to be called a 'global village', it paradoxically also spawns the rise of plurality, diversity and complexity at the micro level, i.e., the towns and cities of any of the

countries. This new situation demands a review of the emerging normative orders and their repercussions for justice delivery in the society. Following the same line, this study will evaluate the following:

Assumption 1: The changing demographic profile of the city of Montgomery has impacted its normative along with its socio-cultural structure.

(II) Dispute Settlement

The primary focus of the studies of dispute settlement is the identification of reasons for selecting state or non-state methods of dispute settlement and the characteristics of the disputants making those selections. The first group of scholars consisting of Matthews (1988), and Warner et. al. (2015), believed that people attach more importance to and consider it more convenient to use non-state laws. Meanwhile, studies by Corsale (1987) and Gessner (1988) focused on the effectiveness of the formal system, and Starr (1978), and Zumbansen (2010) examined the intermingle and interrelation between formal and informal legal systems.

A second group of scholars, Xie and Goyette (2003), Bobo and Tuan (2006), Wu (2014) and Piatkowska (2015), recognized race/ethnicity, age, gender, class along connectedness and visibility of the police, as critical factors influencing public perceptions, different levels of alienation and ultimately disputants' decisions concerning whether to turn to the formal legal system for assistance.

To summarize, one can contend that in any changing society continuous micro-level analysis of the nature of disputes, disputants and dispute settlement methods is required for the efficacy of the state legal system. Thus, this study will examine:

Assumption 2: The changing demographic profile of the city of Montgomery has generated new dispute situations and provided the options of dispute settlement outside the accepted norms of the state and society by bringing disputants with diverse backgrounds and experiences together.

(III) Diversity Inclusion

Throughout American history, to integrate different cultural norms, mores, customs, heritages, and religions, two approaches-

assimilation and multiculturalism have received the most attention in the scholarly literature.

Assimilation was a melting-pot philosophy based on the assumption that immigrants and migrants must shed their dysfunctional behaviors and cultures to become part of the broader American culture (Dinnerstein and Reimers 2009). On the other, multiculturalism, which was based on the retention of strong ethnic identities and cultural concepts along with becoming a part of the melting pot and was discussed in the study of Marger (2005).

However, with the continuous growth of ethnic minorities, the third and most recent approach of omni culturalism with strong emphasis on tolerance, patience and assimilation (wherever possible) was developed by Moghaddam and Breckenridge (2010). Many criminal justice agencies of the highly diverse cities have adopted approach of omni culturalism, and added various training modules concerning diverse cultures and religions into their training curricula, recruited professional from minority communities and established connections with schools, community groups and cultural bodies of minorities and divers groups. Working on the same lines, this concept leads us to the following:

Assumption 3: The changing demographic profile of the city of Montgomery demands additional efforts and resources to effectively address increasing diversity and plurality.

In sum, in spite of a rich diversity of studies, the questions of how the state legal systems and non-state systems function in American society, how they are interrelated, and finally, how they are viewed by the people themselves is still open, unsettled and in need of more intensive systematic and subaltern investigation. This study attempts to strengthen the existing research in this area.

Methodology

The site for this study is the city of Montgomery—the capital of the State of Alabama. With a population of 205,786, Montgomery is ranked eighth among cities with the highest percentage of Blacks or African Americans. Montgomery is 56.6% Black or African American, 36.1% Caucasian American, 3.9% Hispanic, 2.2% Asian American, 1.3% persons of two or more races, 0.2% Native American and 0.1% native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander (US Census 2010: Facts about Montgomery).

Although members of all these races share a common city culture and are bound by the same state legal norms and laws, each group is also deeply rooted in its own cultural laws and ethnic and community traditions due to its unique historical relations and migration history.

The phrase ‘rule of law’ is reserved for the unified formal, state systems of law and justice, whereas the non-state, informal systems are widely varied, ethnic and customary. The state legal system has formalized procedures of dispute settlements such as police procedures, courts and other adjudicative bodies where decisions are arrived at by a third party—a judge who imposes decisions on the disputing parties according to a set of rules that are usually codified. In contrast, non-state procedures are negotiated by the disputants with the help of elders of the family, associates, friends or divine authority, and usually the disputing parties arrive at an agreement through bargaining. In the present study, efforts were made to explore the interaction between the two normative systems (i.e., state and non-state) and the popular perceptions leading to their use by people of different ethnicities. The study also identifies the circumstances under which disputes are settled outside any established method, along with studying which state laws govern disputes that by definition are not easily situated under the law and necessarily involve affiliations with multiple communities originating outside the United States.

For the present study, “dispute” refers to a situation in which one or more persons have a grievance against another party and communicate that grievance to the other. A dispute processing technique can be defined as a method or institution known to other members of the disputants’ group that is specifically resorted to or involved because of the dispute. State legal systems include the

police, courts, detectives and forums, while non-state methods include family, relatives, friends, associates, community elders, and divine authority. Extra-methods include methods used by the disputants outside the accepted methods of society and law, which may include anti-socio-legal groups or methods outside the United States.

A total of 100 respondents were selected to participate in the research by using snowball and convenient sampling with the following demographics: race (White 46%, Black 38%, Asian 10%, Hispanic 5%, and Native American 1%); gender (women 50% and men 50%); education (BHS 8%, HS 32%, BS 21%, MA 26%, PHD 8% and professional training 5%); age (21-30 22%, 31-40 15%, 41-50 22%, 51-60 24%, 61-70 8% and 71+ 9%); and class (upper 17.4%, middle 78.3% and lower 4.3).

A three-pronged interview-schedule was used to collect information from the research participants concerning: (i) the demographic profiles of the disputants and their connections with the criminal justice system, (ii) perceptions of the nature of disputes and actual involvement in the disputes, and (iii) perceptions and actual usage of the dispute settlement mechanisms.

Analysis

It was found during the study that almost all the participants in the White and Black communities had long-standing relationships with each other. Some had lived in Montgomery all their lives, while others had lived in the city for more than 20 years. It was also observed that most lived in areas that could easily be branded Black or White due to the majority of their population. Other facts that the study revealed were not only that the city was divided into four precincts for policing but also that the divisions are associated with the races and classes of the residents in the different areas.

In 1950, Alabama was ranked as having a larger immigrant population than California. However, over the years, the state has not experienced steady growth in the numbers of immigrants. However, for the past few years, the numbers of Asians and especially of Hispanics in Alabama have been increasing. In 2002, Hyundai Motor manufacturing began in Montgomery and brought a large number of Asian people to the city. Additionally, the size of the state's Hispanic population (i.e., a mixture of people from 15

different countries) more than doubled from 75,830 in 2000 to 185,602 in 2010.

The majority of the Asian and Hispanic populations are concentrated in particular cities in Alabama and in certain sub-areas within the cities. This type of settlement trend not only segregates the new migrants but also contributes to and strengthens the traditional residential segregation of the races. This, in turn, leads to a disconnect among different ethnicities and hinders understanding of each other's cultures, traditions and practices. However, the large number of Asian and Mexican restaurants, places of worship, body shops, grocery stores, markets, and presence in the work force are not only indicative of the presence of the rising numbers of members of those ethnicities in Montgomery, but it assists the migrants in connecting with others. Additionally, this city is an educational hub with large Air Force and military bases that attract a large number of international students and professionals on short- and long-term bases.

The change in Montgomery's demographic profile has subsequently led to efforts to accommodate & assimilate the recent and not-so-recent immigrants. For instance, most of the churches in the city have special services for Asians & Hispanic and have even begun dedicated ministries. The majority of the educational institutions have included Spanish and/or Chinese in their regular or summer schedules. The criminal justice agencies have created neighborhood groups and have begun hiring Asians and Hispanics to reach out to the diverse populations. As a result, the impact of the presence, rising numbers of diverse populations and efforts for diversity inclusion can be felt in the normative & socio-cultural environment of the city.

Changing Nature of Disputes

Nearly all the participants in this study considered disputes an unhealthy but permanent feature of the culture of Montgomery. Participants noted a variety of disputes, such as over matters involving property, inheritance, cultural values, teenage dating, child rearing practices, trespassing, stealing, theft, discrimination, drugs, mugging, extortion, fear of retaliation, gangs, power, honor crimes, shame, breach of trust, money laundering, malpractice, and maltreatment. Additionally, new types of crimes such as identity

theft, stalking, bomb threats, sexting, scams, online elder abuse, Facebook harassment, and Twitter threats were reported.

As shown in Table 1, below, the majority of the participants classified disputes on the basis of the settlement mechanisms used by others and themselves. A clear difference was found between the perceptions and actual nature of crime in the city. While as many as 66.6% of the participants thought most disputes in the city were of a criminal nature, in reality only 14 (27.4%) of the disputes among the research participants were of a criminal nature.

Table 1
Nature of Disputes: Perceptions and Reality

Perceptions about Disputes		Actual Disputes				Total
		Familial	Civil	Criminal	OTH	
Familial	Count	1	1	2	3	7
	% Within disputes	14.3	14.3	28.6	42.9	100
Civil	Count	2	5	1	0	8
	% Within disputes	25.0	62.5	12.5	0	100
Criminal	Count	7	13	10	4	34
	% Within disputes	20.6	38.2	29.4	11.8	100
Other	Count	1	0	1	0	2
	% Within disputes	50.0	0	50	0.0	100
Total	Count	11	19	14	7	51
	% Within disputes	21.6	37.3	27.5	13.7	100

It was found that Montgomery as a city does not have any unique disputes, but the occurrence of the disputes makes them unique. For instance, the city's west side has more violence, homicide, drug related crimes and prostitution. In this section of the city most residents do not willingly contact the formal legal system unless they are mandated to do so by the nature of the disputes and/or crimes. The majority of the research participants expressed concerns over the violence in this high-risk most disadvantaged west side of the city. However, others have not shown much interest and called it 'Black-on-Black crime'.

It is also noted that there is under-reporting of disputes and crimes in the city. Some of the participants shared the reasons they or members of their races remain hesitant to report crimes or conflicts. Participants from all four races (i.e., Caucasian, Black, Hispanic and Asian) gave fear of retaliation or further victimization

as the primary cause of non-reporting or not seeking assistance from the state legal system. Additionally, especially for Asian and Hispanic participants, alack of understanding of their culture and cultural values, conflict between their cultural values and state laws, poor language skills, non-familiarity with the system, fear of deportation, and experiences with criminal justice systems in their home countries were given as reasons for not contacting the state authorities. Participants also stated that people do not report crimes when any illegal transactions particularly related to drugs, weaponry, prostitution and money laundering have a poor result.

In nutshell, migration of Asians and Hispanic populations to the city of Montgomery has added more complexity to the historical socio-cultural normative set-up of the city. City is experiencing more variety of disputes and related challenges not only due to the fast changing technology but also socio-legal diversity.

Dispute Settlement Practices

Disputes abound in every society and a wide variety of mechanisms are in place for their settlement. Montgomery is no exception in this regard, and our data reveal the availability of a wide range of methods for dispute settlement. The legally and socially approved mechanisms range from formal state (through police, courts, organizations and/or tribunals) to relatively informal non-state (through family, friends, associates and/or divine authority) methods. Different mechanisms were used either individually or in combination, depending on the nature and situational context of the dispute and the consequent form it assumed.

The data in Table 2 revealed that 56% of the disputants presented their disputes to state systems and 20% used non-state methods. A significant portion of the disputes (24%) were settled by using non-conventional extra-mechanisms, i.e., outside the recognized and established state and non-state mechanisms.

Table 2
Dispute Settlement: Perceptions and Practices

Perceptions about methods	Actual Dispute Settlement Methods Used			Total
	State	Non-state	Extra	

State legal system (police, courts, tribunals, organizations etc.	Count	12	2	4	18
	% Within Modes	66.7	11.1	22.2	100
Non state methods (family, friends, associates, divine authority etc.)	Count	3	1	2	6
	% Within Modes	50	16.7	33.3	100
Extra-legal (outside legally and socially recognized methods)	Count	13	7	6	26
	% Within Modes	50	26.9	23.1	100
Total	Count	28	10	12	50
	% Within Modes	56	20	24	100

The data analysis showed a clear difference in the perceptions and practices related to dispute settlement in the city. Most of the research participants mentioned during data collection that non-state systems have easy access and are affordable in comparison to cumbersome, out of reach, time-consuming, and esoteric state law. Thus, they perceived that most of the disputants will prefer non-state intervention in their disputes. However, in reality, the majority of disputants (i.e., 56%) preferred formal interventions to resolve their issues. The reasons provided by disputants for their preference were authority vested in the formal legal system by law and its power to resolve disputes, legal sentences and protection from violence. The majority of the disputes concerning criminal acts (i.e., robbery and theft), employer-employee relations, non-adherence to state regulations, and property issues were usually resolved through state mechanisms. Participants also noted that they sought help from formal systems more easily if they knew someone within the criminal justice system.

In contrast, the majority of the disputes arising over domestic issues, such as the use of abusive language and misunderstandings among closely related people, were presented to non-state agencies for resolution.

Two categories of disputes were settled outside state and non-state established systems. In the first, the disputants believed that state law and local social norms have no or unclear answers to the issues involved, and the second involved illegal transactions or ego-related issues. For instance, due to conflict between cultural values and state law, the matters or disputes emerging from domestic violence, child rearing practices, teenage dating, arranged marriages, and abortions to avoid female children remain under or

unreported and are settled outside of the state or non-state methods, or even outside the country. Similarly, disputes involving trading of illegal drugs and weapons and prostitution were settled outside any state and non-state established procedures. These disputes over illegal matters are either settled through fights or by negotiation, primarily because of the fear of police.

The above analysis shows that most of the disputants preferred state interventions in their disputes. A settlement of the significant portion of the disputes outside the established state and non-state methods by using extra-mechanisms indicates rising socio-cultural diversity, plurality, divisiveness and its consequences for the city.

During the study, an effort is also made to understand the influence of demographic characteristics of the disputants on their selection of dispute resolution method. Data presented in the table 3 below.

Table 3
Dispute Settlement Method, Race, Education, Established Connection
within the State Legal System, Sex and Class of Disputants

			Dispute Settlement Method			Total
			State	Non-state	Extra	
Race	Other	Count, % Within Race	5(55.6)	2(22.2)	2(22.2)	9(100)
	White	Count, % Within Race	15(71.4)	2(9.5)	4(19)	21(100)
	Black	Count, % Within Race	8 (40)	6(30)	6(30)	20(100)
	Total	Count, % Within Race	28(56)	10(20)	12(24)	50(100)
Education	BHS/HS	Count, % Within Edu	9(50)	3(16.7)	6(33.3)	18(100)
	BA/BS	Count, % Within Edu	4(50)	1(12.5)	3(37.5)	8(100)
	MA and above	Count, % Within Edu	15(62.5)	6(25)	3(12.5)	24(100)
	Total	Count, % Within Edu	28(56)	10(20)	12(24)	50(100)
Connection within the State Legal System	Yes	Count, % Within Sys	20(71.4)	3(10.7)	5(17.9)	28(100)
	No	Count, % Within Sys	8(36.4)	7(31.8)	7(31.8)	22(100)
	Total	Count, % Within Sys	28(56)	10(20)	12(24)	50(100)
Sex	Female	Count, % Within Sex	21(51.2)	9(22)	11(26.8)	41(100)
	Male	Count, % Within Sex	7(77.8)	1(11.1)	1(11.1)	9(100)
	Total	Count, Within Sex	28(56)	10(20)	12(24)	50(100)
Class	Lower	Count, % Within Class	2(100)	0	0	2(100)
	Middle	Count, % Within Class	20(55.6)	6(16.7)	10(27.8)	36(100)
	High	Count, % Within Class	5(62.5)	2(25)	1(12.5)	8(100)
	Total	Count, % Within Class	27(58.7)	8(17.4)	11(23.9)	46(100)

As expected, analysis of the responses based on individual characteristics of the disputants show that majority of the respondents those contacted formal system are white followed by Asians and Hispanics, and then Blacks. This finding concurs with the earlier studies of Bobo & Tuan 2006), Wu (2014) and Piatkowska (2015). The most interesting revelation from the data is that disputants those have connections in the formal state system preferred formal intervention.

Discussion and Conclusion

From the above, it can be concluded that Montgomery has not remained unaffected by the diversity explosion that has transformed other cities in the USA. Globalization has penetrated deep into American society, affecting citizens' lives, and its impact can be felt everywhere. As assumed, the traditional socio-legal divide between the two main races is complicated by the multiplicity of ethnicities and consequent rise in plurality and

diversity. We find evidence that changes in the demographic profile have brought changes in the normative and socio-cultural structure of the city.

In the melting pot of diverse cultures and ethnicities, the concept of the dispute itself has become more complex and global in nature. Technologies and globalization have provided breeding grounds for new types of crimes and changed the nature of crime from localized to international and transnational by reducing the distances and bringing the people of different ethnicities and nationalities together. People make selective use of state and non-state methods of dispute resolution. The majority of the participants believe that non-state dispute resolution methods are popular, but in reality, most people prefer formal interventions to resolve their disputes. Disputant's race, connection within the state system, and education level strongly influence their choice for state intervention. However, when people did not find any concrete solutions to their problems in existing state or non-state laws, they took their problems outside the systems to obtain the best results for themselves. Rarely did they remain silent, but most problems were resolved with the assistance of extra-legal mechanisms. These results support our assumption that globalization has led to new disputes, disputing situations and settlement mechanisms.

Ultimately, to view our findings from the proper perspective, we return to Durkheim (1960), and Teubner (1996). Durkheim noted that as societies become more complex, shared norms and common purposes decline as the primary basis of law. Our findings clearly show that although participants perceive non-state systems as popular, disputing parties in reality prefer the state legal systems. It is also noted that when disputants do not find solutions to all of their problems in the local laws, they seek solutions outside the existing local laws. This finding aligns with Teubner that in the globalized world laws are weakly embedded in the local communities and transnational people make use of laws outside the state and at times the laws of their countries of origin.

This is exactly the situation that is emerging in Montgomery, a city at the threshold of globalization. With the changing demographic profile and increasing complexity and diversity, controls based on shared norms are diminished and state laws are evolving to provide answers to new sets of problems. City residents

have come to accept the authority of formal state laws without disassociation from their cultural norms. The state legal system and diverse alternatives to legal mechanisms co-exist and coalesce with each other. The following question then arises: how can a compatible relationship be developed among all these diverse legal practices and systems to bring them together under a state legal system? In a pluralistic society such as the USA, it is a daunting task. However, the first step must be to realize that national legal values can only become effective through a comprehensive understanding of the particular legal norms and community cultures and their interactions with the state legal system at local and micro levels. Thus, more in-depth studies of different communities/ethnicities to determine their motivations to contact the state legal system of justice versus what hinders people from doing so must be the focus of future research to incorporate plurality into the national legal values.

Additionally, it is equally important to understand that it is primarily the responsibility of the city's authorities to take adequate steps to handle the demographic changes and their impact on the normative order and social structure and culture of the city as a whole. The city's authorities are responsible for integration of the 'new arrivals', managing stresses on city systems and services, promoting social cohesion and maintaining law and order. Cities must become pro-active and plan ahead of time to deal with the new situations and emerging scenarios. An unsympathetic handling of the problems, not based on a comprehensive understanding of the impact of changing city profiles by the city authorities, may alienate different ethnic groups and affect the cohesiveness of the city. No society can afford to end up in such a situation. For obvious reasons, we must be more cautious in this respect.

References

- American Immigration Council., (2013). Strength in diversity: The economic and political clout of immigrants, Latinos, and Asians in the United States.
- Berman, P.S., (2009). Global legal pluralism. *Southern California Law Review*, 80, 1155-1238.

- Bobo, L. and Tuan, M., (2006). *Prejudice in Politics: Group Position, Public Opinion, and the Wisconsin Treaty Rights Dispute*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Corsale, M., (1987). *An Expert in Court: Some Considerations on an Experience in Italian Law*. Onati, Spain: Current Legal Sociology of Law.
- Dinnerstein, L. and Reimers, D. M., (2009). *Ethnic Americans: A History of Immigration*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Durkheim, É., (1960). *The Division of Labor in Society*. New York, NY: Free Press of Glencoe.
- Gessner, V., (1988). Informal justice in German legal development. *Current Legal Sociology- A Journal of the Sociology of Law*, 1 (1), 39-40.
- Grieco, E., (2010). *Race and Hispanic Origin of the Foreign-born Population in the United States: 2007*. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census.
- Griffiths, J., (2015). *Legal Pluralism. International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*. New York: Elsevier.
- Marger, M.N., (2005). *Race and Ethnic Relations: American and Global Perspectives*. Wadsworth: Cengage Learning.
- Matthews, R., (1988). *Informal Justice?* London: Saga Publications.
- Moghaddam, F. M. and Breckenridge, J., (2010). Homeland security and support for multiculturalism, assimilation, and omniculturalism policies among Americans. *Homeland Security Affairs*, 6, 1-15.
- Paul, Prit., (2013). *Sikh Diaspora: Legal Pluralism and Dispute Settlement*. New Delhi: Rawat.
- Perez, O., (2011). Legal pluralism. Available from: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1929395>.
- Piatkowska, S. J., (2015). Immigrants' confidence in police: Do country-level characteristics matter? *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice*, 39 (1), 1-30.
- Starr, June., (1978). *Disputes and Settlement in Rural Development: Turkey*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Tamanaha, B.Z., (2008). Understanding Legal Pluralism: Past to Present, Local to Global. The Social Sciences Research Network Electronic Paper Collection. Available form: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1010105>.

- Teubner, G., (1996). Global Bukowina: Legal Pluralism in the World Society. In: G. Teubner, eds. *Global Law Without a State*. Brookfield: Dartmouth, 3-28.
- US Census (2010): Facts about Montgomery.
- Warner, B. D., Swartz, K. and Hawk, S.R., (2015). Racially homophilous social ties and informal social control. *Criminology*, 53 (2), 204-230.
- Wu, Y., (2014). Race/ethnicity and perceptions of the police: A comparison of white, black, Asian and Hispanic Americans. *Policing and Society*, 24 (2), 135-157.
- Xie, Y. and Goyette, K., (2003). Social mobility and the educational choices of Asian Americans. *Social Science Research*, 32 (3), 467-498.
- Zumbansen, P., (2010). Transnational legal pluralism. *Transnational Legal Theory*, 1 (2), 141-189.