

Reflections Inspired by *Ethnic Boundary Making: Institutions, Power, Networks* by Andreas Wimmer

Michèle Lamont

Keywords:

boundary-making; classification; social process; inequality; misrecognition; evaluation

Ethnic Boundary Making: Institutions, Power, Networks has the makings of a classic. The author takes on a vast and important topic, provides a bold and ambitious theoretical agenda, and engages in theory development by convincingly confronting his hypotheses with data of various kinds. As he goes along, he explains the implications of his findings for a wide range of theories and debates in sociology and beyond and thus demonstrates the significance of these findings. The result is impressive because of Wimmer's mastery of American and European literatures from various fields, his encyclopedic knowledge about ethnic group composition and differentiation from around the globe, and his ability to use new statistical techniques to establish empirical patterns of group cohesion, differentiation, and boundary work.

One of the many theoretical contributions of the book is its presentation (in Chapter 3) of a broad typology of boundary changes, which appears to apply to all configurations possible. This is followed by another more elaborate typological analysis in Chapter 4 which discusses the conditions that help us predict boundary work (with a focus on the institutions, power, and networks singled out in the title of the book). The theoretical generativity of the analysis, and its wide applicability to fundamental sociological questions, are simply remarkable.

Wimmer's focus on the making of groupness (and more specifically, ethno-national groupness) shares much with my own work on boundaries and classification, from its insistence on not predefining the categories through which individuals self-identify. Indeed, this is precisely the inductive approach I used in *Money, Morals and Manners* (1992) and *The Dignity of Working Men* (2000), where I asked professionals and managers and workers to produce boundary-work in the context of interviews, i.e. to describe who they feel similar and different from, inferior and superior, etc., so as to tap where they draw lines and what criteria they use to draw such lines. The conclusion of *Money, Morals and Manners* opened up the question of the relationship

between symbolic and social boundaries (the former being defined as a necessary but insufficient condition for the latter). This insight was further elaborated in Lamont and Molnar (2002) where we pointed to similarities in boundary processes “across a wide range of social phenomena, institutions and locations” (169) such as social and collective identity, class, ethnic/racial and gender/sexual inequality, professions, science and knowledge and community, national identities and spatial boundaries, and called for a more general sociology of the properties and mechanisms of boundary processes, including how these are more fluid, policed, crossable, movable, etc. In the late 90’s and early 2000s, scholars interested in ethnicity, nationality, and race converged in their interests around such questions, with milestone articles such as Zolberg and Woon (1999), Brubaker and Cooper (2000), Brubaker, Loveman and Stomatov (2004), and Alba (2005) (plus, of course, Wimmer (2004), which makes up the bulk of Chapter 5 in the book). A convergence of focus on the work of Bourdieu on classification struggle and the legacy of Fredrik Barth empowered this shift. Wimmer’s book builds on this budding tradition and extends our understanding of boundary changes in significant ways. At the present juncture, I find his book particularly useful as a tool for thinking more systematically and comparatively about groupness and responses to stigmatization by Blacks and other groups in the US, Brazil and Israel, and the effects of responses on group boundaries, a topic I have been pursuing since 2006 in collaboration with a group of Brazilian, American and Israeli sociologists (see Lamont and Mizrahi 2012 for more information). Instead of nitpicking a work with which I am largely in agreement, I take this opportunity to initiate a dialogue between Wimmer’s perspective and my own recent efforts to contribute to a sociology of inequality that is focused on fundamental cultural processes grounded in classification and the production of group boundaries – processes I have been studying through my work on evaluation (Lamont 2009, 2012) and stigmatization (e.g. Lamont, Welburn and Fleming 2013).

In a paper written jointly with Stefan Beljean and Matthew Clair (Lamont, Beljean and Clair 2014), we provide a framework for understanding the ways in which specific types of fundamental processes produce social inequality. Specifically, we focus on cultural processes which have received limited attention in the literature. We argue that much of the literature on inequality has focused on the actions of dominant actors and institutions in gaining access to material and non-material resources, or on how ecological effects cause unequal access to

material resources. In contrast, we highlight identification and rationalization as fundamental types of micro cultural processes feeding into inequality and we describe four significant analytical exemplars of these two types: racialization and stigmatization (for identification) and standardization and evaluation (for rationalization). These processes all involve classification and the production of symbolic and social boundaries – the production of groupness of sort, including the types of groups that Wimmer is concerned with: ethnicity, but also racial and national groupings. While space limitation prevents a full explication of our argument, we provide a few key elements and point to convergence and divergence with Wimmer’s approach.

First, as compared to social processes that concern control over material resources, cultural processes are centrally constituted at the level of meaning-making: they take shape around the creation of shared categories or classification systems through which individuals perceive and make sense of their environment.¹ They all involve a sorting out of people, actions, or environments that requires the creation of group boundaries and the creation and relative stabilization of hierarchies, objectively and intersubjectively. These boundaries and hierarchies are typically a collective accomplishment that requires *de facto* the use of shared conventions and the coordination of action between various actors and institutions. Thus, cultural processes are not necessarily oriented toward ultimate instrumental goals such as gaining resources or exercising power. Instead, they are primarily shared frameworks that are constitutive of reality, as documented by cognitive sociology (e.g. DiMaggio 1997) and by the recent literature on semiotic practices (Sewell 2005). While our analysis emphasize the symbolic aspects of these processes, the conclusion of *Ethnic Boundary Making* reveals that Wimmer is more of a social structuralist, ultimately interested in power and *real politic*, as his analysis forefronts strategies as they are shaped by “institutional incentives, [...] positions in hierarchies of economic, political and symbolic power, and existing social networks.” (p. 208). In contrast, our approach is more inductive through and through, including concerning the variable frames that guide human actions (as elaborated in Lamont 2009).

Second, while much of the literature on inequality is concerned with the distribution of material resources (income inequality in particular), cultural process concerns the distribution of both material and non-material resources *as well as* recognition. The dual focus on the distribution of

resources and recognition is crucial as we understand inequality as operating at the level of the distribution of legitimacy as much as the distribution of material and social resources.

Recognition is central in establishing groups as worthy and valued members of the community, as individuals endowed with full cultural membership (Taylor, 1992; Honneth, 2012). This is particularly crucial in dynamic struggles around the meanings associated with individual and collective social identity (Jenkins 2008). While identity and identification figure centrally in Wimmer's argument, he does not give the quest for recognition its due as a motivation for human action or a dimension of inequality. He acknowledges that a multiplicity of motivations feed the creation of group boundaries (p. 5), but he does not delve on how group formation is dependent on the quest for cultural citizenship and dignity, especially in the face of racialization and stigmatization. This is one aspect where our approach diverges from and complements his. Considering such questions can illuminate Wimmer's analysis of the dynamics of boundary change described in his Chapter 3.

Third, in our paper, cultural processes do not solely depend on the actions of dominant actors: subordinates often participate in the elaboration of cultural processes as much as dominant agents do, and the sorting can be described as an unintended consequence of their (intentionally or not) coordinated action. Thus, the intention of the dominant is not a necessary condition for producing these outcomes as it is the case in traditional approaches to inequality that focus on the monopolization of material and non-material resources by dominant parties. One could ask Wimmer to more systematically spell out the interaction of dominant and dominated parties in the creation of group boundaries – the extent to which their coordination may or may lead to symbolic or social boundaries (tied to the distribution of resources). While one finds illustrations throughout the book, he does not explicitly theorize this question and more broadly the issue of coordination of action between groups.

Finally, our paper depicts the fundamental cultural processes that concern us operate continuously and in a routine fashion. Individuals do not aim to consciously deploy one system of symbolic boundaries over another, as they are rarely conscious that they inhabit categorization systems. Instead, they tend to use schemas that are largely taken for granted and made available by the national cultural repertoires that surround them (Lamont and Thevenot 2000). Thus, while

considering cultural processes, we move from a focus on discrete, instrumental actions aimed at monopolizing material and non-material resources to a focus on a range of ongoing, routine relationships that enable and constrain social action (Giddens, 1984; Sewell, 1992). In this way, our approach resembles the ecological effects literature, which considers processes to be durable and self-replicating. Yet, we understand these cultural processes to be the result of the actions of individual and group actors and the systems of meaning in which they operate, as opposed to the outcome of a diffuse ecological environment. In this way again, our approach is slightly at odd with Wimmer's in that we systematically consider whether and how such processes may feed into inequality, while considering this outcome as open-ended and indefinite.

To recap: We conceptualize cultural processes as ongoing actions/ practices that feed into structures (organizations, institutions) to produce various types of outcomes, including inequality, in a process akin to that described by structuration theorists (cf. Giddens 1984). These processes shape everyday interactions and result in an array of consequences that may feed into distribution and recognition. Through processes such as racialization, stigmatization, standardization, and evaluation, individuals sort and are sorted out on an ongoing basis. These processes open and close opportunities, and enable and constrain individuals' life course trajectories. The outcomes of such processes are open-ended or uncertain, as opposed to *always* resulting in exploitation, exclusion or isolation.

Such observations need to be more systematically put in relation with Wimmer's approach to the making and unmaking of group boundaries, so as to contribute to our understanding of the causes of inequality. Wimmer is deeply influenced by Bourdieu, and is concerned with the institutionalization (and non-institutionalization) of collective identity. Yet, despite his sustained interest in the study of mechanisms (he claims a filiation with analytical sociology), one is left with the impression that he has yet to fully develop an analysis of fundamental cultural processes operating at the micro level— and this, despite having his intellectual roots in the field of anthropology. This is another point of divergence. However, much more could also be said on the points of convergence between our approaches, and this would require more space than what is put our disposal here. But I can mention one such point: the role of institutions in mediating the creation of inequality. For instance, even in the 1990s, eligibility in the mortgage lending

industry depended on apparently neutral rationalized evaluative practices that led to unequal access to resources for African Americans. Similarly, there are many other institutions that allocate resources based on taken-for-granted rules that depend on the activation of “neutral” classification systems, but which systematically privilege some groups over others. It is the case for access to higher education in American colleges (Lemann, 2000; Karabel, 2005) and the determination of salaries for working mothers (see Budig and England (2001) on the motherhood penalty). Along the same line, social scientists have shown how the recent growth in wealth inequality in the United States has resulted from small, but incremental political-legal changes (Hacker and Pierson, 2010) and staggering “performance base” increases in executive compensation (DiPrete, Eirich, Pittinsky, 2010) that advantage the rich. While these studies concern *distribution* as a dimension of inequality, a parallel analysis needs to be conducted for how institutions feed *misrecognition* (through stigmatization and racialization). At a time when a growing number of social scientists aim to better understand the relationship between symbolic and social boundaries, it has become more imperative to examine such questions, so as to be able to develop an approach to such issues that matches Wimmer’s book in sophistication. Much of his work shows us the way and invites us to build on his many insights. This attempt to create a dialogue between *Ethnic Boundary Making* and Lamont, Beljean and Clair (2014) should be only one step in this direction.

Notes

1. Tilly (1998)’s *Durable Inequality* has done much to bring to light the role that categorization processes play in the production of inequality. As we have noted, categorization is central to the cultural processes that we identify as missing in the literature on inequality. While Tilly’s work explicates how exploitation and opportunity hoarding “establish systems of categorical inequality” (10) both intentionally and unintentionally (through emulation and adaptation), our approach envisions a systematic explication of the way in which group classifications are negotiated intersubjectively by dominants as well as subordinates. Moreover, we argue for an analytic approach that specifies how *specific types* of classificatory processes employ categorization at the meso-level.

References

- Alba, R. 2005. Bright vs. blurred boundaries: Second-generation assimilation and exclusion in France, Germany, and the United States. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28: 20-49.
- Brubaker, R. and F. Cooper. 2000. Beyond 'identity.' *Theory and Society* 29:1-47.
- Brubaker, R., M. Loveman, and P. Stamatov. 2004. Ethnicity as cognition. *Theory and Society* 33, no. 1: 31-64.
- Budig, M. and England, P. 2001. The wage penalty for motherhood. *American Sociological Review* 66, no. 2: 204-225.
- DiMaggio, P. and Markus, H.R. 2010. Culture and social psychology: Converging perspectives. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 73: 347-352.
- DiPrete, T., G. Eirich and M. Pittinsky. 2009. Compensation benchmarking, leapfrogs, and the surge in executive pay. *American Journal of Sociology* 16: 1671-1712.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1984. *The constitution of society, outline of the theory of structuration*. Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.
- Hacker, Jacob and Paul Pierson. 2005. *Winner-take-all politics: How Washington made the rich richer-and turned its back on the middle class*. New York City, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Honneth, Axel. 2012. *The I in we: Studies in the theory of recognition*. Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.
- Jenkins, Richard. 2008. *Social identity*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Karabel, Jerome. 2005. *The chosen: The hidden history of admission and exclusion at Harvard, Yale and Princeton*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Lamont, Michèle. 1992. *Money, morals, and manners: The culture of the French and the American upper middle class*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lamont, Michèle. 2000. *The dignity of working men: Morality and the boundaries of race, class, and immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lamont, Michèle. 2009. *How professors think: Inside the curious world of academic judgment*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lamont, M. 2012. Toward a comparative sociology of valuation and evaluation. *Annual Review of Sociology* 38: 201-221.

Lamont, M. and N. Mizrahi. 2012. Ordinary people doing extraordinary things: Responses to stigmatization in comparative perspective. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 35: 365-381.

Lamont, M. and V. Molnár. 2002. The study of boundaries across the social sciences. *Annual Review of Sociology* 28: 167-195.

Lamont, Michèle and Laurent Thévenot. 2000. *Rethinking comparative cultural sociology: repertoires of evaluation in France and the United States*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Lamont, M., S. Beljean and M. Clair. 2014. What is missing? Cultural processes and causal pathways to inequality. *Socio-Economic Review*.

Lamont, M., J. Welburn, and C. Fleming. 2013. Responses to discrimination and social resilience under neoliberalism: The United States compared in *Social Resilience in the Neoliberal Age*, ed. Peter Hall and Michèle Lamont. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lemann, Nicholas. 2000. *The big test: The secret history of the American meritocracy*. New York City, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Sewell Jr., W.H. 1992. A theory of structure: Duality, agency, and transformation. *American Journal of Sociology* 98, no. 1: 1-29.

Sewell Jr., William H. 2005. *Logics of history*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Taylor, Charles. 1992. *The ethics of authenticity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tilly, Charles. 1998. *Durable inequality*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Wimmer, A. 2004. Does ethnicity matter? Social categories and personal networks in three Swiss immigrant neighborhoods. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 27, no. 1: 1-36.

Wimmer, Andreas. 2013. *Ethnic boundary making, institutions, power, networks*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Zolberg, A. and Woon, L.L. 1999. Why Islam is like Spanish: Cultural incorporation in Europe and the United States. *Politics & Society* 27: 5-38.

MICHÈLE LAMONT is the Robert I. Goldman Professor of European Studies and Professor of Sociology and African and African American Studies at Harvard University.

ADDRESS: Harvard University, Department of Sociology 514, William James Hall, 33 Kirkland Street, Cambridge, MA, 02138. Email: mlamont@wjh.harvard.edu