4

Responses to Discrimination and Social Resilience Under Neoliberalism

The United States Compared[1]

Michèle Lamont, Jessica S. Welburn, and Crystal M. Fleming

Members of stigmatized groups often live with the expectation that they will be overscrutinized, overlooked, underappreciated, misunderstood, and disrespected in the course of their daily lives. How do they interpret and respond to this lived reality? What resources do they have at their disposal to do so? How are their responses shaped by neoliberalism? How can responses to stigmatization foster social resilience?

This chapter enriches our understanding of social resilience by considering whether and how stigmatized groups may be empowered by potentially

[1] This research developed in the context of an international research project. Conversations with our collaborators Joshua Guetzkow, Hanna Herzog, Nissim Mizrachi, Elisa Reis, and Graziella Silva de Moraes fed our thinking in multiple ways. Our chapter also benefitted from the input of the members of the Successful Societies Program and the support of the Canadian Institute for Advanced Research, as well as from comments from Kathleen Blee, Robert Castel, Anthony Jack, Carol Greenhouse, and Andreas Wimmer. The research was presented in a number of settings where the reactions of the audience broadened our thinking: the Institut Marcel Mauss; Ecole des Hautes études en sciences sociales; the Centre Maurice Halbwachs; Ecole normale supérieure; the Obervatoire sociologique du changement, Sciences Po; the seminar "Cities are Back in Town," Sciences Po; the Humanities Center, University of Pittsburg; the Departments of Sociology at Yale University, Boston University, Brandeis University, and Brown University; the Faculty of Social Sciences and History of the Diego Portales University, Santiago de Chile; the POLINE conference on Perceptions of Inequality, Sciences Po (Paris, May 2011); the Nordic Sociological Association meetings (Oslo, August 2011); the Adlerbert Research Foundation Jubilee Conference on "Creating Successful and Sustainable Societies" (Gothenburg, November 2011); and the meetings of the Association for the Study of Ethnicity and Nationalism (London, March 2012). Funding for the comparative study of responses to stigmatization and for data gathering in Brazil was provided by a faculty grant and a Weatherhead Initiative grant from the Weatherhead Center for International Affairs, Harvard University. Research on African American responses to stigmatization was funded by a grant from the National Science Foundation (# 701542). Research on Israeli responses to stigmatization was funded by a grant from the US-Israeli Binational Science Foundation. Michèle Lamont acknowledges the generous support of the Canadian Institute for Advanced Research. We thank Travis Clough for his technical assistance.

contradictory contextual forces – more specifically, by cultural repertoires that enable their social inclusion. We consider repertoires to be social scripts, myths, and cultural structures and that the content of these repertoires varies to some extent across national contexts (Lamont and Thévenot 2000).[2] We also consider that certain repertoires can foster resilience by feeding the capacity of individuals to maintain positive self-concepts; dignity; and a sense of inclusion, belonging, and recognition.[3] We argue that societies provide individuals with different means for bolstering their identity and building resilience. This is accomplished by making available repertoires that are fed by national ideologies, neoliberalism, and narratives concerning the collective identity of their groups.[4]

Considering repertoires is an essential macro complement to the generally more micro approaches to resilience and responses to stigma. It shifts the focus on social resilience conceived as a feature of groups as opposed to a feature of individuals. It also brings to light neglected conditions for recognition and social inclusion, which are essential dimensions of successful societies (Hall and Lamont 2009). For instance, Wright and Bloemraad (2012) show that societies that adopt multicultural narratives about collective identity and multicultural policies (i.e., that score high on the multiculturalism index) signal to immigrants that they value their contributions to the host society. These societies not only provide recognition to immigrants but also foster their emotional and cognitive engagement in this host society as manifested for instance in their greater political participation. This means that repertoires matter. Also, while stigmatization and discrimination toward particular groups is a universal feature of societies, national histories of group boundaries, conflict, and reconciliation vary. Societal trajectories of group relations shape the opportunities and resources individuals have at their disposal for understanding and dealing with stigmatization and thus affect their resilience.

Although this chapter concerns primary the United States, we adopt a comparative approach and also describe responses to stigmatization in Brazil and Israel, countries where the boundaries separating the main stigmatized group from other groups differ in their degree of permeability and porousness

[2] On repertoires, see Swidler (1986), and Tilly (2006). Although collective imaginaries provide to a group a sense of shared past and future, as well as shared identity (see the introduction to this volume), the term "repertoire" can be apply to such collective imaginaries, as well as to other relatively stable schemas or cultural structure.

[3] On recognition, see Taylor (1992), Honneth (1996), and Fraser and Honneth (2003). Walton and Cohen (2011) have shown that social belonging increases self-reported well-being among African American college students. In future research, we will consider how various types of responses to stigmatization influences subjective well-being. On collective imaginaries and health, see Bouchard (2009).

[4] Other repertoires may be more relevant in other societies and historical periods. We take Jenkins (1996) theory concerning social identity as a point of departure: we understand it as resulting from both self-identification (e.g., what it means for African Americans to belong to this group) and group categorization (the meaning given to this group by outgroup members; see also Cornell and Hartman 1997 and Brubaker and Cooper 2000).

(Lamont and Bail 2005). In the three national settings under consideration, we focus on responses to stigmatization among members of groups that are marked on different bases and with different intensities, that is: (a) African Americans in the New York metropolitan area; (b) Afro-Brazilians in Rio de Janeiro; and (b) Ethiopian Jews, Mizrahis (Oriental Jews), and Arab citizens of Israel in the greater Tel Aviv. Whereas the first three groups have historically been stigmatized based on phenotype, Mizrahis are discriminated against based on ethnicity – although they are a majority group in Israel. For their part, Arab Israelis are primarily stigmatized because of their ethno-religious identity –that is, as Arabs and non-Jews.[5]

The comparison is informed by interviews conducted with large samples of "ordinary" middle class and working class men and women in each of these three national contexts (with 150 interviews in the United States, 160 in Brazil, and 125 in Israel).[6] These individuals are ordinary in the sense that they are not characterized by, nor selected on the basis of, their involvement in social movements related to identity politics (unlike Moon 2012). They were selected as research participants generally randomly based on criteria such as place of residence, occupations, and level of education (see Appendix for details). This approach is most appropriate for documenting the whole range of responses to stigmatization found in a population without privileging social actors who are most politicized. This is necessary because we are concerned with how the consolidation of collective identity may affect everyday responses to racism.[7]

The empirical focus of interviews is accounts of rhetorical and strategic tools deployed by individual members of stigmatized groups to respond to perceived stigmatization (a broad term that includes or accompanies perceived assaults on dignity, blatant racism, and discrimination,). Responses to stigmatization

[5] Bases of stigmatization are historically contingent, with (for instance) biological racism being replaced by cultural racism in the so-called "post-racialism" era in the United States (Bobo 2011)

[6] This research was conducted by three groups of social scientists who have engaged in a collaborative study since 2005. We adopted a comparative approach with parallel research designs and data collection procedures. Core collaborators in Israel are Joshua Guetzkow (Department of Anthropology and Sociology, Hebrew University), Hanna Herzog, and Nissim Mizrachi (Department of Anthropology and Sociology, Tel Aviv University). For Brazil, collaborators are Elisa Reis and Graziella Silva (Interdisciplinary Center for the Study of Inequality, Federal University of Rio). For the United States, the core team consists of Crystal Fleming (Department of Sociology, State University of New York at Stony Brook), Michèle Lamont (Department of Sociology and Department of African and African American Studies, Harvard University), and Jessica Welburn (Department of Sociology and Department of African-American Studies, University of Michigan). The U.S. team benefitted from the assistance of Monica Bell, Mellisa Bellin, Steven Brown, Moa Bursell, Nathan Fosse, Nicole Hirsch, Veronique Irwin, Anthony Jack, Michael Jeffries, and Cassi Pittman.

[7] The notion of "everyday response to stigmatization" is inspired by Essed (1991)'s notion of everyday racism as "... integration of racism into everyday situations through practices that activate underlying power relations" (50). It also expands on Aptheker (1992)'s definition of anti-racism as rhetoric aimed at disproving racial inferiority. For a discussion of everyday anti-racism, see Pollock (2008). On stigma, see Goffman (1963).

can be individual or collective, and they take a variety of forms such as confronting, evading or deflating conflict, claiming inclusion, educating or reforming the ignorant, attempting to conform to majority culture or affirming distinctiveness, wanting to "pass" or denouncing stereotyping, and engaging in boundary work toward undesirable "others" when responding to stigmatization. They also include "exit" strategies, such as "limiting contacts," "absorbing it," "ignoring the racists," and "managing the self" (Fleming, Lamont, and Welburn 2011). These responses (including decisions to not respond) occur both in private (when individuals ruminate about past experiences and try to make sense of them) and in public (when they interact with others while reacting to specific events or incidents) (see Bickerstaff 2012 on public and private responses).

As we explored responses to stigmatization, we paid special attention to interviewees' references to national histories and scripts and to collective myths, as well as to their views concerning what grounds cultural membership and belonging – criteria ranging from economic success to morality and cultural similarities (Lamont 2000). In doing so, we aimed to capture what repertoires respondents drew on in describing situations of stigmatization and how they dealt with them. We also gathered information on their beliefs about, and explanations for, equality and differences between human groups.[8] Although comparative studies of race relations are generally focused on political ideology and state structures (e.g., Marx 1998; Lieberman 2009) or elite discourse (e.g., Van Dijk, 1993; Eyerman, 2002),[9] we connect such ideologies to individual narratives about daily experiences, intergroup relationships, and group boundaries.[10]

Our topic is particularly significant at the present juncture and this, for two reasons: First, to the extent that neoliberalism is often associated with individualization, depoliticization, and a flight away from social justice movements (Lazzarato2009; Greenhouse 2011), we need to better distinguish between responses to stigma aim to correct the situation of the individual or that of the group (see also Ancelovici [Chapter 12] on French responses to class domination). Second, in the current period of growing economic inequality, members of stigmatized groups are often more vulnerable (Pierson and Hacker 2010; also Welburn 2012 on the downwardly mobile African American middle class).[11] In this period of increased insecurity, it is particularly urgent to

[8] This approach is developed in Lamont (2000). Drawing on the sociology of science, it focuses specifically on how ordinary people construct facts on the nature of human groups based on various types of evidence. See also Morning (2009) on racial conceptualizations and Roth (2012) on racial schemas.

[9] Space limitation precludes a comparison of our approach with the influential critical discourse analysis approach to racism (e.g., Wodak 2001) or to more political studies of white and black anti-racism (Feagin and Sikes 1994; Picca and Feagin 2007; for a review, see O'Brien 2007.)

[10] On groupness and ethno-racial boundaries, see Zolberg and Lit Wong (1999); Lamont (2000); Lamont and Molnar (2002); Todd (2004); Wimmer (2006); Pachucki, Pendergrass, and Lamont (2006); Bail (2008); Brubaker (2009); Alba (2009); and Massey and Sanchez (2010).

[11] In May 2012, the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that 7.4 percent of whites were currently unemployed compared with 13.6 percent of African Americans. Research has also consistently

better understand which resources (cultural and others) enable the development of their social resilience and the lessening of vulnerabilities.

Our concern is subjectivities in the neoliberal age. The growing literature on the neoliberal subjectivities has focused primarily on the transformation of middle and upper-middle class selves under late capitalism (e.g., Hearn 2008), described alternatively (under the influence of Giddens 1991, Boltanski and Chiafello 1999, and others) as having self-actualizing, networked, branded, and cosmopolitan selves. Social scientists have generally neglected the national scripts or myths made available to "ordinary" working class people, who make up half of our respondents and more than the majority of the American population. This group is also neglected in studies of everyday responses to racism – despite a huge literature on African Americans' responses to racism, particularly through social movements (but for a few exceptions, e.g., Frederick (2010) on African Americans' aspirations to be millionaires).

The paper opens with two examples of experiences and responses to stigmatization by African American men. It discusses what most African Americans interviewees believe is the best way to respond to racists: confrontation. It also explores how this response is shaped by American national histories and myths. Second, drawing on the collective work of our collaborators in Brazil and Israel (as presented in a special issue of *Ethnic and Racial Studies* by Lamont and Mizrachi 2012), we sketch how responses to stigmatization in these countries are also shaped by national collective myths, including those that concern the history, place, and salience of ethno-racial minorities in the polity. Third, we take a closer look at the American case to examine how responses to stigmatization are shaped by (a) repertoires about matrices of human worth that are connected to neoliberalism and that emphasize competition, consumption, individualization, and personal achievement and (b) repertoires tied to African American collective identity, its tradition of resilience, and its distinctive criteria of worth. Information on research design, selection, interviews, and data collection and analysis are available in the Appendix.

Drawing only on questions we asked interviewees concerning their ideal or "best approaches" to responding to stigmatization, the chapter highlights the responses to stigmatization in Brazil, Israel, and the United States. We found that the most popular response among African Americans we talked to is confronting racism (Fleming et al. 2011), which is motivated by a national history of *de jure* racial exclusion and fed by the lasting legacy of the civil rights movement. In contrast, most Afro-Brazilian interviewees assert the centrality of racial mixture (variously defined) in their society, including the notion that

shown that African Americans have considerably less wealth than whites, which includes lower homeownership rates, less saving, and few investments (e.g., Conley 1999; Oliver and Shapiro 2006; Pew Charitable Trust Foundation 2011). For example, Shapiro and Oliver (2005) find that African Americans control only ten cents for every dollar whites control. A 2011 report by the Pew Charitable Trust Foundation shows that the wealth gap has only grown since the 2008 global recession.

"we are all a little black." In this context, they promote accommodation over confrontation (Silva and Reis 2011) as more compatible with national identity and culture (with reference to the notion of racial democracy). For their part, interviewees from stigmatized Jewish groups in Israel emphasize shared religion over ethno-racial identity and respond to stigmatization by asserting the Jewish identity they share with the majority group (Mizrachi and Herzog 2011). Finally, in the face of strong ethnic and religious discrimination, Arab Israelis respond by evoking the universal respect of human dignity. They also avoid making claim based on group rights (Mizrachi and Zawdu 2012). We suggest that in each case, these responses are facilitated by widely available cultural myths about national belonging – more specifically, by the American dream, the myth of Brazilian racial democracy, and Israeli Zionism.

A closer look at the American case reveals that African Americans draw on two additional repertoires in responding to stigmatization. First, they use a repertoire made more readily available by neoliberalism, which focuses on scripts that value competition, consumption, individualization (Bourdieu 1998), and personal achievements (in line with market fundamentalism (Somers 2008). These scripts of response go hand in hand with individualist explanations of low achievement, poverty, and unemployment, which are often associated with poor moral character (laziness, lack of self-reliance), as opposed to market and structural forces.[12] Second, they use a repertoire that is connected to group identity and that celebrates shared culture and experiences. These narratives are sources of pleasure and comfort that can act as a counterweight to feelings of isolation and powerlessness, and as such, enable social resilience. These repertoires also emphasize moral strength and a history of survival that mitigate self-blaming and may also act as a resource for social resilience. Finally as Lamont (2000) argued based on interviews conducted in 1993, we also find an alternative moral matrix of evaluation that allows African Americans to not measure themselves by the dominant standard of socioeconomic success.[13] These alternative repertoires can potentially act as sources of social resilience by broadening the criteria of social inclusion.

National narratives that stress the American history of racism and fight against racial domination (of the type associated with the American civil right movement and with African American social movements, such as the Black Panthers) and representations of shared African American collective identity characterized by resilience can enable collective responses oriented toward confrontation. But scripts central to neoliberalism may favor also primarily individualist responses to stigma, particularly the pursuit of individual mobility.

[12] Similarly, Greenhouse (2011) argues that the moral construction of African Americans and poverty has been profoundly transformed under neoliberalism – with a stronger stigmatization of welfare dependency and celebration of a neoliberal self. This means that the tools with which African Americans respond to racism are themselves the product of neoliberalism.

[13] This is one of the three elements of definition of social resilience at the center of this collective volume. The two other dimensions are ability to imagine better futures that are within one's reach and the ability to resist discrimination, exploitation, and exclusion.

Addressing whether individual or collective responses have positive or negative association with social resilience is beyond the scope of this chapter. However, we point out ways in which the various repertoires respondents draw on may affect social resilience. For instance, although a focus on personal achievement may encourage African Americans to escape stigma through an agenticand universalist logic (as one respondent puts it, "get the skills to get the job – may the best man win"), it may also limit the appeal of alternative matrixes of evaluation (e.g., the notion that blacks have a caring self and solidarity) (Lamont 2000) that emphasizes morality, downplays socioeconomic success, and thus sustains positive self-images despite low social status.

This chapter builds directly on *Successful Societies: How Institutions and Culture Affect Health*, which focused on the capability of individuals and groups to respond to the challenges they encounter and on how institutions and shared cultural repertoires serve as resources and buffers against the "wear and tear of inequality" that epidemiologists address (Clark, Clark, and Williams 1999; Hertzman and Boyce 2010). National identity, scripts provided by neoliberalism, and scripts about collective identity, are some of the main repertoires or toolkits on which individuals draw to gain recognition and respond to the challenges they face (Lamont 2009). Thus, resilience is maintained not only by inner moral strength and resourcefulness or by social support (often emphasized in popular and scholarly writings) but also through the repertoires that sustain recognition or the institutionalization and circulation of positive conceptions of individual or collective selves. From this perspective, members of stigmatized groups vary with regard to their ability to reshape group relations in ways that allow for the widespread adoption of representations and narratives asserting the dignity and worth of their group.

This argument complements social psychological approaches to resilience. Social psychologists typically focus on the psychological orientations that foster individual resilience, such as privileging the in-group as a reference group (Crocker, Major, and Steele, 1998)[14] and having a strong racial identification or biculturalism (Oyserman and Swim 2001). They also consider the impact of cognitive ability, positive self-perception, and emotional regulation on resilience, as well as the broader environment, generally network and community support (see Son Hing, Chapter 5).[15] In contrast, again, our analysis centers on the cultural supply side of the equation, that is, on cultural repertoires

[14] See also Pinel (1999) on "stigma consciousness" and Clark et al. (1999) on how minority groups cope psychologically with the "perceived stressor" of racism and prejudice. Also Son Hing 2012. See Link and Phelan (2000) for a broader review of the literature on stigma, which is most often concerns with the stigma of "stressors" such as mental illness and physical disabilities and their impact on health.

[15] Son Hing (Chapter 5) considers that "protective factors (i.e., strengths or capabilities) may reside within the individual (e.g., emotional regulation, self-enhancement), the family (e.g., secure attachments, authoritative parenting), or the community or environment (e.g., community resources, programming)." Cultural repertoires are not part of the protective factors they have paid attention to.

and the relative availability of alternative ways of understanding social reality (also Harding, Lamont, and Small 2010).

It is important to note that institutional and structural forces also play a crucial role in shaping responses and diffusing repertoires. Indeed, a large literature addresses the role of public policies in defining the conditions of reception for minority groups, including how they understand their place in the polity (e.g., Kastoryano 2002, Ireland 2004, Koopmans et al. (2005, Wimmer and Min 2006). These topics are beyond the scope of this chapter, so we leave them aside. For the most part, we also leave aside the important questions of how repertoires diffuse, why individuals or groups are more likely to draw on one script rather than another (see, e.g., Lamont 1992; Schudson 1988), and variations in the salience of ethno-racial identities across groups.[16]

African Americans Experiencing and Responding to Stigmatization

How does it feel to be outside of a boundary? Most of the African American men and women we interviewed perceive themselves as being underestimated, distrusted, overscrutinized, misunderstood, feared, overlooked, avoided, or plainly discriminated against at some point in their lives. This perception can be persistent for some respondents and situational for others. Two examples provide suitable illustrations. They both concern two strikingly similar narratives in which an African American man finds himself inside an elevator with outgroup members.[17]

In the first case, Marcus, a black court employee, enters an elevator in which there is a middle-aged Indian woman who also works at the court.[18] He describes the situation thus: "She clutches her purse. I almost fainted. I almost fainted.... It devastated me. But it's happened to brothers before. Welcome to the Black race, brother. You've got it. I've got it." Her reactions prompt Marcus's anger and humiliation because, as he explains, he often feels that people think he does not belong in the court building. For instance, he

[16] Of the three groups of African descent, African Americans are most likely to self-define through their racial identity, and they are more likely to label an interaction or a person as "racist." Afro-Brazilians and Ethiopian Jews have racial identities that are less salient or that are expressed primarily through class (in Brazil) or religious (in Israel) frames. Thus, national contexts make various kinds of historical scripts, myths, or repertoires more or less readily available to social actors to make sense of their reality (Lamont and Thévenot 2000; see also Swidler 1986; Mizrachi, Drori, and Anspach 2007.) Along with Wimmer (2008) and Brubaker (2009), we analyze not only social identity but also identification processes and the development of groupness. However, unlike these scholars, we are centrally concerned not only with cognition but also with the role of emotion (particularly anger, pain, pride, and other feelings directly associated with identity management; see Archer 2003; Summers-Effler 2002). And we also connect the drawing of group boundaries to everyday morality (e.g., Lamont (2000) and Sayer (2005) in the case of class).

[17] For a discussion of the place of our argument in the literature on African American anti-racism (e.g., in relation to the work of Karyn Lacy, Joe Feagin, and others), see Fleming et al. (2011).

[18] We use "African American" and "black" interchangeably to reflect the use of these terms by our respondents.

is routinely questioned about whether he truly works at the court and knows others who work there. Marcus has to carefully consider how he should respond to the situation. Should he ignore the slight and let it go? Should he confront the woman, and if so, how? And what will be the costs of confrontation (emotional, interactional, potentially legal)? Marcus wants to maintain his image of professionalism *and* stand up for himself. How can he do both? He explains that these are the questions that often emerge when he experiences stigmatization. The repeated experience of such an internal dialogue can take a toll and contribute to the "wear and tear of everyday life" that results in huge disparities in the health and well-being of ethno-racial groups in the United States and elsewhere.

In a second example, Joe, a recreation specialist, faces a more blatant racist situation. His account viscerally expresses perceptions of the health impact of anger in the experience of stigmatization (see Mabry and Kiecolt 2005). He finds himself alone with several white men in an elevator. He recalls the scene thus:

> One made a joke about Blacks and monkeys. I said, "Man, listen, I ain't into jokes." . . . His demeanor changed, my demeanor changed. All of the positive energy that was in there was being sucked out because the racial part. And the other guys, you could actually see them shrinking up in the corner because they didn't want no parts of it. . . . [I told myself] get out of it because if I stay in it, I'm going to be in that circle and [won't be able to] get out. . . . The stress level rose. My tolerance was getting thin, my blood pressure peaking and my temper rising. By the grace of God, thank you Jesus, as I stepped off the elevator, there was a Black minister walking past. I said, "Can I speak to you for a minute because I just encountered something that I got to talk about because I'm this far [to exploding]. . . . " I had been at the job for a week. This is all I need to get me fired. He said, "You're a better man than me." [Now] I'm trying to get through the affair [to decide] if I was to go to the city [to complain].

Joe knows that anger and impulse control are imperative if he wants to keep his job. He has to manage his emotions and finds an outlet when a chance encounter with an African American pastor offers relief – or a buffer – from a fellow group member who can relate to. Similar to the majority of our interviewees, Joe factors in pragmatic considerations when weighing various courses of action (Fleming et al. 2011). But his normative response is that one needs to confront racism. This gap between ideal responses and situational constraints may have consequences for the emotional well-being of our respondents.

When probed about the "best approach" for dealing with racism (using an open-ended question format), three quarters of the 112 African American interviewees who addressed this question focused on how to respond (what we call "modalities" of responses): half of them (47 percent) favored confronting or challenging racism and discrimination. They prefer to "name the problem," "openly discuss the situation," and "make others aware that their action makes me uncomfortable." This compares to a third (32 percent) who prefer conflict-deflecting strategies – believing that it is best to ignore, accept, forgive, manage

anger, or walk away (Fleming et al. 2011). The rest favor a mixed strategy, choosing to "pick their battles" or to "tolerate." Two thirds (65 percent) focused not on "modalities" but on what they consider to be the specific "tools" for responding to discrimination. For one third of them (37 percent), the best approach is educating stigmatizers and (in some cases) fellow blacks about tolerance, diversity, and the lives and culture of African Americans. For one fifth of them (17 percent), the best tool is to increase formal education for African Americans to improve mobility outcomes for members of the group.[19]

An illustration of the desire to confront is provided by a prison instructor. When asked how we should deal with racism, he responds:

> Confront it. 'Cuz people will try to tell you that it doesn't exist and it does exist... confront it. Not in a negative way, but just bring it up, discuss it. White folks will try to act like it doesn't exist and then they'll try to reverse it on you,

This is typical of the responses voiced by many interviewees. Their shared belief in the legitimacy of confrontation as a response is bolstered by the widespread availability of national scripts about the racist history of the United States, to which they often make reference in the context of the interviews (whether they talk about the history of chattel slavery, Jim Crow, or the experiences of their parents growing up in the South). Equally important is their awareness of the civil rights movements (including the struggles around school desegregation, the Newark Riots, the marches on Washington) and their current experiences with discrimination at work or elsewhere. More specifically, among 302 mentions of landmark historical events made during the course of the interviews, 30 percent concerned slavery, 16 percent concerned the 2008 elections, 15 mentioned the civil rights movement, and 11 mentioned the race riots. For instance, one interviewee explains that "my wife's father had a black garage in South Carolina. The Ku Klux Klan burned it down. That's why they moved up here, to get away from it. A lot of older people, they don't even like to talk about it.... We just had to deal with it."

As suggested by the examples of Marcus and Joe (and as observed by social psychologists), the ideal of confronting racism is tempered by pragmatic consideration concerning costs (material, symbolic, or emotional). Individual strategies are constrained by what respondents believe is possible and doable given their needs and dependency on resources. In the presence of obstacles to confronting, a majority of middle class African American respondents focus on hard work and achievement as the key to challenging racial inequality (also Welburn and Pittman 2012) –[20] essential to the pursuit of the American dream. Many embrace this crucial national collective myth (Hochschild 1995),

[19] A number of other tools (e.g., gaining information) were mentioned by only a few respondents and thus are not reported here. Some respondents mentioned more than one "best approach" for dealing with racism.

[20] The forty five African-American middle class respondents interviewed by Welburn and Pittman (2012) more frequently explain racial inequality by motivational than by structural problems. These authors find 79 mentions of the former in interviews (e.g., decline in values and morality,

through educational and economic achievement, and through the consumption it enables (as one respondent, a network technician, puts it: "You need to do something positive with your life. The American dream is out there; all you got to do is grab it and run with it." We will see that this individualist response coexist with a more collectivist strategy grounded in a shared African American identity.

The continued commemoration of the African American history of discrimination and courage (e.g., through the institutionalization of Black History Month, the existence of African American studies as an academic discipline, as well as important aspects of black popular culture) enables interviewees to believe that it is legitimate to denounce and confront racism and discrimination. This orientation is less frequent among respondents in Brazil and Israel (Silva and Reis 2012; Mizrachi and Herzog 2012).

National Responses Compared

Israel

Similar to the African Americans we spoke with, Israelis anchor their responses to stigmatization in national history and myths. Indeed, Mizrachi and Zawdu (2012) show that ordinary Ethiopian Jews use the Zionist national narrative to neutralize the stigma associated with blackness – unlike political activists who have attracted the attention of the Israeli media in 2011. They downplay their phenotypical markings (e.g., skin tone) and define their identity as "just another group of immigrants," similar to other Jewish immigrant groups who eventually assimilate and prosper in Israel (often referring to the Russian Jews who preceded them en masse in the 1990s). This identification as "Jewish immigrants" grounded in the Zionist narrative serves as an equalizer: it legitimates their participation in the larger society. Similarly, the Mizrahis mobilize an assimilationist state ideology as a cultural tool for gaining recognition – an ideology that defines all Jews, regardless of regional, phenotypical, or other characteristic, as members of the polity. Both groups find in this ideology empowering repertoires of religious citizenship that makes their responses to stigmatization possible (Dieckhoff 2003). These accounts contrast with the responses to stigmatization by Arab Israelis, which appeal to universal human dignity, as opposed to shared religion (Mizrahi and Herzog 2012). Members of this group attempt to depoliticize social difference by avoiding the use of a language of human rights and mobilize Jews in their social network in their defense (ibid.). Their ethno-religious identity, however, remained explicit and firmly differentiated from that of the Jews.

Brazil

When interviewing middle class and working class Afro-Brazilians about their views on the best approach for responding to stigmatization, Silva and Reis

lack of efforts, making excuses) compared with 65 mentions of the latter ("fewer opportunities for African American males," "racism and discriminations," and so on).

(2012) find that they most frequently embrace a dialogical and fuzzy "racial mixture" script as a response. This term is used to describe the multiracial character of the Brazilian population ("we are all a little black") and its hybrid culture and identity, as much as the notion that everyone, independently of phenotype, can be fully committed a multiracial society. Racial mixture is a crucial collective myth for the Brazilian nation (along with the myth of racial democracy), and it acts as a more inclusive and less politically loaded cultural basis for cultural membership than does shared religion in the Israeli case.[21] Silva and Reis remark that few interviewees consistently used one single concept of racial mixing throughout the interview, switching between meanings according to contest (p. 396). In a recent review of the literature on racial mixture, Telles and Sue (2009) suggest that in Latin America especially, the centrality of mixed racial categories does not translate into a decline in racial inequality. Marx (1998) also analyzes the role of the state in creating racial boundaries and hierarchies. Governments feed collective imaginaries by defining rules of membership across a number of policy areas that have a direct impact on those who experience exclusion as well as on shared conceptions of cultural membership (alternatively, ethnic boundaries also shape state action – see also Lieberman (2009) for a cross-national illustration concerning state responses to aids in Brazil, India, and South Africa).

This analysis suggests that some strategies are more likely to be found in some contexts than others (e.g., promoting racial mixture in Brazil and confronting in the United States). However, the use of repertoires is linked not only to their availability but also to proximate and remote determinants that make that some individuals are more or less likely to use certain repertoires than others (Lamont 1992). A more detailed look at the interaction between repertoires, social resources, situational cost, and opportunity structure will be the object of future analysis. For now, suffice to restate that national ideologies do not push individuals toward a single strategy – they simply make strategies more or less likely across contexts, enabling and constraining them.

The United States: Other Repertoires

Neoliberalism

We now provide a closer look at African American responses enabled by neoliberalism, that is, responses that emphasize (a) self-reliance and autonomy (connected to individualization and the privatization of risk (Sharone 2013)), (b) competitiveness and educational and economic achievement, and (c) the

[21] Silva and Reis (2012) identify four uses of the term "racial mixture:" (a) to describe whitening among blacks, (b) to celebrate Brazilian negritude (which is defined as mixed); (c) to describe Brazilian national identity; and (d) to describe a personal experience or non-racist strategy for responding to racism, that is, "non-essentialist racialism" which can mobilize by whites as well). Although the last two frames are used by more than 50 percent of the respondents, the last one is the most popular (being used by 66 percent of the 160 respondents), and the first one is the least popular (being used by 17 percent only).

signaling of social status through consumption. These individualist responses may be alternative to, and often threaten, collective responses, such as social movement and political mobilization (Bourdieu 1998; see below).

It may be objected that these responses exist independently of neoliberalism because they are central to the tenets of the American creed (as described by Hochschild 1995; also see Fischer 2010). However, their centrality and availability are likely to be accentuated in the neoliberal era because the two types of repertoires (the American dream and neoliberalism) become intertwined under the influence of market fundamentalism (see Greenhouse 2011; also Richland 2009). In the neoliberal era, the American dream is less about individual freedom and equality and more about individual success, performance, competition, and economic achievement.

Although there is great variation in how African Americans interpret "the American dream," some defining it as nightmare, many of our interviewees believe that the best response of racism is for blacks to work to get ahead through education and that they should persevere regardless of persistent discrimination (also Welburn and Pittman 2012 based on data on African Americans living in New Jersey). Moreover, the desire to "make it big" is very salient in interviews, and a large number of the individuals we talked to dream of starting their own business; they mention the distance from racists that being self-employed can provide together with the advantage of financial security (also Frederick 2010). They also value hard work and its most important outcome, financial independence. It is worth quoting one working class man who is a particularly vocal advocate of economic achievement. He describes the people he likes as "hustlers" who, like him, hold several jobs and are willing to do anything to make money. He talks about his friend Thomas, who he says "does landscaping in the morning for a company. Then he has his own contracts in the middle of the day, sleeps and goes to work for Fed Ex at night. . . . I like to see hustlers because that's something that I do: just hustling. No laws are being broke, no one is being hurt."

Respondents also put a great emphasis on self-reliance for themselves and others. In so doing, they may want to mark distance toward the stereotype of low-income African Americans who depend on others for their subsistence and "don't want to pull their own weight." For instance, a woman who works for a dry-cleaning business and a grocery store and who admits to struggling financially says:

> I don't like beggars. I don't like anybody's looking for a handout, I like people that want to get out and do something for themselves and help themselves. . . . I just can't deal with beggars.

This script, which is found in many interviews, is embraced by white and black American working class men alike (Lamont 2000; also Pattillo-McCoy 1999). It is reinforced by the script of privatization of risk central to neoliberalism (Hacker 2006) and is embodied in the Personal Responsibility and

Work Opportunity Act of 1996, which implicitly defined the poor as lazy and immoral (Guetzkow 2010).

Similar responses are found among middle class respondents, with a focus on professional achievement and improving their social and economic status. The majority of the respondents in this class category describe themselves as strongly committed to such goals. They also often define themselves by their ability to "do the job" as well or better than whites, and they conceive of competence as an important anti-racist strategy (Lamont and Fleming 2005). Others celebrate the virtue of competition and define African American culture as embracing it (as a transit technician puts it, "We love to compete. Anything you put us in that's athletic, we just excel. [We] love to compete.") These respondents say they want to hire other African Americans when possible but that incompetence defines the limits of racial solidarity (as one respondent says: "You fuck up and I am done with you.") The conditions for cultural memberships that are imposed on middle class African Americans may put limitations on their racial solidarity toward low-income blacks if achievement and economic success are *sine qua non* for cultural membership (Lamont and Fleming 2005).

Formal education and individual educational attainment are viewed by many as essential in a highly competitive neoliberal climate, especially for African Americans who have experienced greater job market instability than members of other racial groups in recent years. Accordingly, when asked about the best way to respond to racism, the pursuit of education is frequently mentioned. As one of them puts it, speaking of young African Americans:

> You can't take a diploma from them.... It's recorded.... They are African-Americans so... there are some strikes. Get all the education so when you're sitting down with the competition, at least you know [what it's like]. He has it, your competition has it. You're going to get it. I'll go in debt to get my sons the education money.... You can take sports away, but you can't take a diploma away.

Echoing this interviewee, a writer also celebrates education as a tool for gaining inclusion while noting its limitation. She also stresses the importance of financial independence and points the importance of "being on top":

> My mother said, "Girl, go to school. Get your education. They can't take it out of your head... you'll get the job. You'll get fair treatment." So that's what I expected from a job. But that's not what it's all about.... Go get your education, but don't make that everything. Have you some side something going on.... When the cards fall, as they will, you have to decide you want to be on top. And the only way you can be on top is if you get something for yourself.

Along similar lines, a teacher explains the importance of education for autonomy, the utility of separatism, and the self-reliance of African Americans in a context of pervasive racism:

> Even though we will never be integrated fully, we will never be accepted, as long as we can educate a number of our people, we can challenge these different cultures that

we face each and every day. Or we can have our own hospitals, our banks, our own, be our and have our own so we don't have to be subjected with negativity each and every day.

Although getting a formal education is not exclusive of collective solutions (as getting education may contribute to "lifting the race") and of collective empowerment ("to put our people in place . . . to create a future for us"), the prime beneficiary of a college degree is its holder. One interviewee, a property manager, emphasizes that collective empowerment in more important than individual success when he says (after stating "you need the monetary flow . . . if you want to make your own rules"):

> I don't believe in pursuing in the American dream by just having physical things. It's more important that we establish the institutions that would give our people longevity and empowerment in the future. The American dream tells us to be successful as individuals, where[as] everybody else comes here and is successful as a group. Our American dream is an illusion because most of our dreams are through credit . . . which makes us sharecroppers.

He asserts the importance of collective empowerment over the simple accumulation of goods and individual achievement for fighting racism. Nevertheless, of the respondents who discussed formal education when we questioned them about the best tool for responding to stigmatization, a third spoke of its importance for the improvement of the group, and two thirds referred to its importance for the individual. This is in line with the neoliberal emphasis on the privatization of risk and with the related question of how African Americans explain their fate (as resulting from individual effort or linked fate). Recent research demonstrates that African Americans have become more individualist in their explanation of inequality over the past few decades (Bobo et al. 2012; Welburn and Pittman 2012).

As a correlate of the emphasis put on economic and educational achievement, some African American respondents also emphasize consumption as a means to providing proofs of cultural citizenship. Some respondents define their success in term of what they are able to afford to buy – whether a house, a car, or an education for their children. Being able to use money as an equalizer (e.g., by shopping at brand stores, sporting professional attire, or driving a nice car) is often seen as a fool-proof means of demonstrating that one belongs and that one has achieved a middle class status that lessens, to some extent, the stigma of being black in contemporary American (Lamont and Molnar 2002; Pittman 2012).[22] Although the literature emphasizes conspicuous consumption of luxury goods among African Americans (ibid.), we find that our respondents are most concerned with consuming items that are associated with a "decent" or "normal" middle or working class lifestyle. For instance, the dry-cleaner and

[22] These behaviors had already been noted for the black middle class in Franklin Frazier's 1957 *Black Bourgeoisie*, and in reaction to Wilson's (1978) writing on the spatial and cultural isolation of the black middle class.

grocery store employee expresses regrets: "I wish I had my own condo, a decent car to drive.... I take a vacation and sit at home." Also, many interviewees value having the means to support themselves, to buy health insurance, and to have "a little cushion." But as is the case for elite African Americans (Lamont and Fleming 2005), using access to economic resources as a criterion for cultural membership excludes all low-income African Americans.

It would be important to ascertain whether and how neoliberalism has transformed African American understandings of the conditions for gaining cultural membership and whether economic achievement looms larger in these scripts today than it did a few decades ago, reinforcing themes central to the national scripts centered on achievement and individualism (Sears, Sidanius, and Bobo 2000). This is not an easy task because the spread of neoliberalism occurred concurrently with economic, educational, political, and legal gains for African Americans, which led some to believe in the advent of a "post-racial America," especially in the wake of Barack Obama's presidential election in 2008. Although racial discrimination persists, it is equally difficult to ascertain the relative impact of neoliberalism on stigmatized groups in other countries. However, given the relative significance of governmental efforts to promote neoliberal policies and to protect workers from its impact across advanced industrial societies, one can presume that this impact has been particularly important in the United States.[23] More than ever, many African Americans may have become convinced that self-reliance, economic success, individual achievement, and consumption are the best response to stigmatization. However, many of our respondents are nostalgic about a time when black collective movements were dynamic, and they have vivid memories of the systematic dismantling of radical collective movements, such as the Black Power movement, by the state. Thus, it is not surprising that there is a clash between individualist responses inspired by neoliberalism and other responses enabled by repertoires celebrating collective identity, as we suggest in the next section.

African American Collective Identity

The collective identity and vision of a common past serves as a buffer against stigmatization for a number of African Americans. This is accomplished through (a) a shared narrative of "we-ness" that can act as a source of comfort and pleasure; (b) an awareness of a shared tradition of resilience in the context of continued discrimination, which helps individuals make sense of their experience; and (c) an identity defined in opposition to that of whites that reinforces non-economic matrixes of worth. We gathered evidence on these questions by

[23] This is confirmed by Greenhouse (2011)'s ethnographic analysis of the entanglements of politics and identity in the major American legislation of the 1990s. See also Chauvel (2010) on the impact of the welfare state on the economic instability of youth across advanced industrial societies.

probing interviewees on what it means for them to be African Americans, what makes their group distinctive, and related questions.

In the context of interviews, a large number of individuals explained that African Americans have a common culture and social experience or a shared "background" that provides them a sense of pleasure. This sense of "cultural intimacy" (Herzfeld 1996) is described by one middle-aged African man thus:

> That's what I like about our people. Good or bad, we're coming together.... We all got an uncle somewhere that chases young girls, and a grandmother somewhere who has certain sayings.... Or an aunt who can cook a sweet potato pie.... You put us together in a restaurant and we'll walk out of there laughin' because it's going to be something that we have in common. And that's just our people; it's just the way it is. I haven't met anybody that didn't have a grandmother like my grandmother. Or an aunt. Somebody.

Similarly, one interviewee describes African Americans as "having a bond," as being "on the same frequency," and another explains that African Americans generally knowing where other blacks "are coming from." It is noteworthy that this sense of cultural intimacy is also salient in discussions of interracial relationships, where the absence of shared experiences of discrimination is described as a major challenge. This is illustrated by one middle class interviewee who discards white romantic partners after one negative experience. Referring to his former girlfriend, he explains that "she can't get the joy out of watching Mandela walk out of jail.... She can't understand when three white police officers shoot two black males for nothing. She could say 'they shouldn't have been out there.' See, I'd have to choke her...."

When probing interviewees about what are the distinctive characteristics of African Americans, we find that the notion of "a shared culture" is frequently mentioned spontaneously, *ex aequo* with similar responses that all point to other aspects of "cultural sameness:" morality, the importance of religion, the importance of caring, the richness of black culture, and black aesthetics and popular culture (each received 11 percent of the 307 responses given to this probe). These figures support the relatively high salience of shared culture in "folk" or "racial" conceptualization of blackness among African Americans (Morning 2009; Silva 2012).

Psychologists have shown that shared identity provides a feeling of comfort and of being understood that can act as buffers or provide solace when one feels being underestimated, distrusted, overscrutinized, misunderstood, feared, overlooked, avoided, or discriminated against (e.g., Neblett, Shelton, and Sellers 2004). As such, widely available repertoires presenting and making salient African American shared identity and culture can act as resources that sustain social resilience. Such repertoires are crucial sources for recognition that have been neglected by social psychologists who tend to focus on networks, family, and community as environmental sources of resilience (as summarized by Son Hing in Chapter 5). If they are absent, individuals are more likely to find themselves vulnerable, isolated, and less able to respond to assaults on

their sense of dignity – as was the case for Joe before he ran into a black minister when exiting an elevator in the incident related earlier. Such repertoires are likely to be more widely available in societies that support multiculturalism (see Kymlicka 2007; Wright and Bloemraad 2012) and adopt institutional structures that mitigate a clear ingroup–outgroup demarcations (Emmenegger et al. 2011).

In describing what African Americans have in common, a number of respondents often mention resilience and a tradition of overcoming barriers. Indeed, when probing interviewees about the distinctive characteristics of African Americans, we find that, respectively, 15 percent and 12 percent of the responses concern "resilience" and a shared history of overcoming racial barriers. Accordingly, respondents refer with respect and admiration to the stories their parents have told them about their past experiences with combating or dealing with racism. These stories make salient shared identity and past struggles. They also provide individuals standardized tools for making sense of their individual experience and for avoiding internalizing negative messages. As such, they do contribute to the social resilience of their group. However, a number of respondents also mentioned what they perceive to be the more negative features of African Americans: self-destructiveness, lack of solidarity, lack of self-respect, the use of Ebonics, hip hop fashion, and the prevalence of youth violence – for a total 12 percent of the characteristics mentioned. Thus, collective identity can be a source of collective shame as well as a source of pleasure and pride.

African American social resilience is also likely to be strengthened by a widely available repertoire that defines blacks in opposition to whites and puts their "caring self' above the "disciplined self" of whites. Based on interviews conducted in 1993, Lamont (2000) argued that the African American working class men she talked with perceived themselves as more caring and accepting, as "having the spirit" or "soul" or as more in contact "with the human thing" than whites. Some contrasted this portrayal with a view of whites as materialist, power obsessed ("he who has the gold makes the rules'), arrogant, and self-serving – as manifested in the "illusion of white superiority." Lamont (2000) argued that by defining themselves as more moral than whites, African Americans promoted a matrix of evaluation that counterbalanced the emphasis on economic achievement promoted by neoliberalism. This matrix functions as an alternative measuring stick and enables low to middle income earners to cultivate a sense of dignity and self-pride despite their lower socioeconomic status. These observations appear to hold for the respondents we interviewed in 2012 (a topic to be explored in future publications.)[24]

Awareness of the need to cultivate alternative matrixes of evaluation is strong among some respondents. A few emphasize the importance of celebrating a range of achievements by African Americans and of cultivating knowledge of black culture and tradition (knowing "their roots") among young

[24] For a complementary perspective, see Stephens, Fryberg and Markus (2012).

people. They also lament the weak sense of black pride in their community. For instance, a property manager explains:

> Most of our problems as Black people stem from the fact that we do not have our connection to our roots.... We don't look back to our story for any type of strength or encouragement.... We don't have a village where there are elders who direct the youth.

This man stresses the importance of giving black children a sense of purpose and pride by reconnecting them with their group identity (also Bouchard 2009). He wants to broadcast an alternative collective narrative about the group's past and future that may bolster social resilience – in lieu of scripts of consumerism and individual achievement that are enabled and made more salient by neoliberalism. Strengthening the connection with the past could provide a way for low-income blacks to gain a sense of cultural membership despite their being low on the totem pole of individual achievement – a way not to be "loser" in an increasingly dominant neoliberal competition.

Conclusion: What Confers Social Resilience?

In examining the question "How can responses to stigmatization confer social resilience?" this chapter has focused on social resources that may sustain recognition by focusing on the cultural repertoires on which African Americans draw to consider what are the ideal responses to racism. We have suggested that these repertoires act as resources that sustain social resilience, conceived as features of groups. Such repertoires are part of an environment that feeds the sense of empowerment and worth of group members. They may be unevenly available across social contexts, depending on the success of mobilization efforts enacted by the stigmatized as well as their allies and the extent to which societies support multiculturalism or other means of creating more porous boundaries between various types of ingroups and outgroups.

In the preceding section, we have argued that exposure to cultural repertoires that make salient and celebrate a shared culture has positive effects on social resilience. This complements findings from social psychology described by Son Hing (see Chapter 5) that strong ingroup (racial) identification fosters resilience for those who experience lower levels of discrimination. Indeed, among ethnic minority youth in Scotland, the more girls experienced collective self-esteem, the lower their depression and their anxiety (Cassidy, Howe, and Warden 2004). Similarly, Asian American children experiencing discrimination from their peers have higher self-esteem if they feel more positively toward their ethnic group (Rivas-Drake, Hughes, and Way 2008). This work suggests that the mere fact of partaking in a similar experience and of sharing a similar narrative may provide a buffer in the form of social support. Although psychologists are generally not concerned with the cultural sources of such strong group identities, our chapter illuminates this part of the puzzle.

Future research should explore which of the three types of repertoires considered here – national myths, neoliberalism, and collective identity and

history – have the most positive impact on social resilience. However, this cannot be an easy task for several reasons: (a) although social actors generally privilege a repertoire, they often alternate between them across situations and over time, making it difficult to establish a direct causal relationship between types of repertoires, social resilience, and well-being; (b) the three types of repertoires may be becoming increasingly braided, especially under the growing influence of neoliberalism; and (c) Neoliberal themes may have simultaneously beneficial and pernicious effects on social resilience. Indeed, they may promote self-blaming for failure (see Chapter 5), encourage African Americans to escape stigma through a universalist logic (e.g., compete to "get the skills to get the job" according to the principle of "the best man for the job"), and limit the appeal of alternative moral matrixes of evaluation that may allow low-status individuals to fare better. To complicate matters further, neoliberalism may also encourage stigmatized group to make claims based on human rights (also see Chapters 2 and 3) while undercutting in practice collective claims by promoting individualization. Finally, neoliberalism may promote competition with members of other stigmatized groups and thus affect negatively the potential for collective mobilization.[25]

There is also the possibility that individuals are using repertoires differently under neoliberalism: they may be increasingly skeptical of collective projects and collective myths and find refuge in their private lives. For example, this is suggested in the paradoxical fact that in early 2011, the French were found to be more pessimistic about the future than most other national groups being compared yet were producing more children.[26] Privatization may be more likely in a context where individuals have few resources to realize their dream and yet are asked to deploy entrepreneurialism and other neoliberal virtues.

It is too early to determine whether patterns in responses to stigmatization are converging across the national cases we are considering and whether, overall, African Americans are better off (e.g., in terms of subjective well-being) than their Brazilian or Israeli counterparts. Also, more comparative analysis is needed before we can draw conclusion on the relative impact of neoliberalism on social resilience for African Americans compared with Afro-Brazilians and stigmatized groups in Israel. Nevertheless, we venture to predict that the former are less culturally buffered from the pernicious effects of neoliberalism than their counterparts in Brazil and Israel, given the centrality of individualism and economic achievement in the collective myth of the American dream. Moreover, the fact that in the United States, the "losers" of market fundamentalism (as

[25] Future research should draw on ethnographic observation to assess how accounts of responses to stigmatization compare with actually responses. This is essential to better understand the relationship between interaction and available grammars of action – two deeply intertwined aspects of social life, which each gives us only a partial view of human action.

[26] The annual BVA–Gallup international survey revealed the French to be the "world champions of pessimism." It found that 61 percent of French thought that 2011 would bring economic difficulties compared with an average of 28 percent in the 53 countries surveyed (http://www.bva.fr/fr/sondages/les_perspectives_economiques_2011.html).

measured by unemployment rate and other indicators) are disproportionately symbolic "outsiders" (immigrants and African Americans) can also increase the legitimacy of neoliberal themes in this national context. Although the American dream empowers many, it often leaves those who cannot achieve it without hopes. This is both the grandeur and the tragedy of the American collective imaginary.

Methodological Appendix

Case Selection

Our countries of comparison were selected to maximize differences in frequency in perceived discrimination across cases, the latter being an indicator of the strength or permeability of boundaries across national contexts. The selection was based on a comparison by Lamont and Bail (2005) of the relative strength of social boundaries in various realms (labor market, spatial segregation, and so on), as well as that of symbolic boundaries (pertaining to collective identity) across half a dozen countries. We had hypothesized that *overall*, perceived discrimination, and by extension, the range and salience of anti-racist strategies, would be greater for Muslim Palestinian citizens of Israel than for *Negros* in Brazil, for whom interracial sociability and interracial sexual relationships are relatively frequent. We originally viewed the American case as an intermediary one, one in which racism would be very salient, but also one in which intergroup boundaries would be weaker than in Israel, with different patterns of response. Of course, as data collection proceeded, we became increasingly aware of the complexity of the comparison, which would be far less linear and more multidimensional than we had anticipated.

Research Design

The research designs for the three national cases were largely parallel in each site. We conducted interviews with a relatively large number of respondents (by the standards of qualitative methods), with the goals of reaching saturation and of systematically comparing anti-racist strategies across populations. The data collection consisted of open-ended two-hour interviews with working and middle class men and women. In the United States, we conducted interviews in the New York metropolitan area, which presents a full spectrum of social classes for both majority and minority groups. In Brazil and Israel, we chose as major metropolitan centers Rio de Janeiro and Tel Aviv because, similar to New York, they are mixed cities where relationship between members of various ethno-racial groups are frequent and highly routinized without the clear predominance of one particular group (on mixed cities, see Monterescu and Rabinowitz 2007). These metropolises should not be viewed as representative of the national population because there are large regional variations in the spatial distribution of ethno-racial groups in each of the three countries under consideration.

Selection of Respondents

Respondents were limited to native-born interviewees (with the exception of Ethiopian immigrants to Israel). The samples comprise males and females in roughly comparable numbers for each site. Middle class respondents have a two- or four-year college degree and are typically professionals or managers. The working class respondents have a high school degree (or equivalent) but no college degree. The age range is between 20 and 70 years, with small variations across the three countries.

Sampling

Methods for sampling respondents varied slightly cross-nationally in response to the specific challenges associated with locating respondents from various class and racial groups across sites given the local patterns of social and spatial segregation and concentration and cultural factors.

In the United States, middle and working class respondents were recruited using two primary techniques. First, we used a survey research company to recruit participants. The company used census track and marketing data to identify potential participants who met a number of criteria. Then the company mailed letters announcing the study to these randomly sampled African Americans living in northern New Jersey and called potential participants to encourage participation and confirm their eligibility for the study. Second, to increase our sample size, we used snowball sampling techniques, with no more than three referrals per participants. This method was particularly fruitful for recruiting working class respondents and men, who were less likely to respond to requests from our survey research company. Respondents were paid $20 for their participation.

In the case of Brazil, sampling procedures were as follows. Because the number of black middle class individuals remains limited, we identified respondents through firms (e.g., in the sectors of oil and telecommunication), networks (i.e., Facebook for black professionals), and professional associations in addition to some snowball sampling from a wide networks of contacts (with up to three referees per respondents). Working class respondents were identified by a survey firm and paid for their participation (this was not the case for the middle class because we anticipated that this would not create a good context of exchange for the interview).

Finally, in Israel, the sample was constructed through multi-entry snowballing. Interviewers reached out to individuals meeting our various sampling criteria in a large range of settings. They aimed to diversify the composition of the sample in terms by occupation.

Interviews and Data Analysis

In the three sites, most respondents were interviewed by an ethno-racial (but not a class) ingroup member (for all but a few exceptions). The interviews were confidential, conducted in a location of the respondent's choosing, and were recorded with the interviewee's consent. Respondents were questioned

on a range of issues concerning what it means to be an "X" (e.g., African American), similarities and differences between them and other ethno-racial groups, their views on social mobility and inequality, past experiences with racism, what they have learned in their family and at school about how to deal with exclusion, and so on. Discourse was elicited by asking respondents to describe past, most recent, and general experiences with racism and discrimination; relationships with coworkers, neighbors, family members, and community members involving discrimination; and the strategies they used for handling these situations.

The interview schedule, first developed for the American case, was carefully adapted to the Brazilian and Israeli cultural contexts. Most importantly in the Brazil case, instead of explicitly asking questions about racial identity, we waited for it to emerge spontaneously in the context of the interview. If it did not, we asked questions on this topic at the end of the interview – the salience of racial identity being one of the key foci of the project.[27] In Israel, we were particularly interested in the articulation between various types of stigmatized identities (blackness, Arab identity, and the backwardness that are often likened in views about the Mizrahis).

The interviews were fully transcribed and systematically coded by a team of research assistants with the help of the qualitative data analysis software Atlas.ti. The coding scheme was developed iteratively by the three national teams of coders, with the American coders taking the lead. This coding scheme includes more than 1,500 entries. A substantial portion of the interviews were coded by more than one person. Codes and a list of interviewees are available upon request.

Studying Responses to Stigmatization

In the three countries, we documented responses to stigmatization by asking interviewees about ideal or "best approach" for dealing with racism, independently of context, their responses to specific racist incidents, the lessons they teach their children about how to deal with racism, their views on the best tools their group has at its disposal to improve their situation, and their reactions to a list of specific strategies. We also considered how these responses vary with a number of social and cultural indicators (including gender, class, age; whether individuals live in integrated or segregated environments; whether racist incidents occurred in public or private spaces and entailed violence, assaults against one's dignity, or institutional discrimination).

References

Alba, Richard. 2009. *Blurring the Color Line: The New Chance for a More Integrated America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

[27] We initially postponed mentioning the centrality of race in our project in our interviews with African Americans, but this created awkward situations because most respondents expected the study to be concerned with this topic.

Aptheker, Herbert. 1992. *Anti-Racism in U.S. History: The First Two Hundred Years.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Archer, Margaret. 2003 *Structure, Agency and the Internal Conversation.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bail, Christopher. 2008. "The Configuration of Symbolic Boundaries against Immigrants in Europe." *American Sociological Review* 73 (1): 37–59.

Bickerstaff, Jovonne. 2012. "Ethnic Versus Racial Identification: Variation in the Anti-racist Responses of First Generation French Blacks." *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race* 9 (1): 107–31.

Bobo, Lawrence D. 2011. "Somewhere between Jim Crow and Post-Racialism: Reflections on the Racial Divide in America Today." *Daedalus* 140 (2): 11–31.

Bobo, Lawrence D., Camille Z. Charles, Maria Krysan, and Alicia D. Simmons. forthcoming "The Real Record on Racial Attitudes." In *Social Trends in the United States 1972–2008: Evidence from the General Social Survey*, edited by Peter V. Marsden. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press: 38–83.

Boltanski Luc and Eve Chiapello. 1999. *Le nouvel esprit du capitalisme.* Paris: Gallimard.

Bouchard, Gérard. 2009. "Collective Imaginaries and Population Health." In *Successful Societies: How Institutions and Culture Affect Health*, edited by Peter A. Hall and Michèle Lamont. New York: Harvard University Press: 169–200.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1998. "The Essence of Neo-liberalism." *Le Monde Diplomatique.* http://mondediplo.com/1998/12/08bourdieu.

Brubaker, Rogers. 2009. "'Ethnicity, Race, and Nationalism." *Annual Review of Sociology* 35: 21–42.

Brubaker, Rogers and Frederic Cooper. 2000. "Beyond "Identity." *Theory and Society* 29: 1–47.

Cassidy, O'Connor, Christine Howe, and David Warden. 2004. "Perceived Discrimination and Psychological Distress: The Role of Personal and Ethnic Self-Esteem." *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 51 (3): 329–39.

Chauvel, Louis. 2010. *Le destin des générations structure sociale et cohortes en France du XXè siècle aux années 2000.* Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Clark, R., Anderson, N. B., Clark, V. R., and Williams, D. R. 1999. "'Racism as a Stressor for African Americans: A Biopsychosocial Model." *American Psychologist* 54 (10): 805–16.

Cornell, Stephen and Douglas Hartman. 1997. *Ethnicity and Race. Making Identity in a Changing World.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Crocker, Jennifer, Brenda Major, and Claude Steele. 1998. "Social Stigma." In *Handbook of Social Psychology*, edited by Daniel T. Gilbert, Susan T Fiske, and Gardner Lindzey. Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Dieckhoff, Alain. 2003. *The Invention of a Nation: Zionist Thought and the Making of Modern Israel.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Emmenegger, Patrick, Silja Häusermann, Bruno Palier, and Martin Seeleib-Kaiser. 2011. *The Age of Dualization: The Changing Face of Inequality in De-industrializing Societies.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Essed, Philomena. 1991. *Understanding Everyday Racism: An Interdisciplinary Theory.* London: Sage Publications.

Eyerman, Ron. 2002. *Cultural Trauma: Slavery and the Formation of African American Identity.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Feagin, Joe. R. and Melvin P. Sikes. 1994. *Living with Racism: The Black Middle Class Experience*. Boston: Beacon.

Fischer, Claude. 2010. *Made in America. A Social History of American Character and Culture*. Berkeley: California University Press.

Fleming, Crystal, Michèle Lamont, and Jessica Welburn. 2012. "Responding to Stigmatization and Gaining Recognition: Evidence from Middle Class and Working Class African-Americans." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 35 (3): 400–17.

Fraser, Nancy and Axel Honneth. 2003. *Redistribution or Recognition? A Political-Philosophical Exchange*. London: Verso.

Frazier, Franklin. 1957. *The Black Bourgeoisie: The Book That Brought the Shock of Self-Revelation to Middle-Class Blacks in America*. New York: Free Press Paperbacks.

Frederick, Marla. 2010. "Rags to Riches. Religion, the Media and the Performance of Wealth in a Neoliberal Age."In *Ethnographies of Neo-liberalism*, edited by Carol Greenhouse. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press: 221–37.

Giddens, Anthony. 1991. *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Goffman, Erving. 1963. *Stigma*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Greenhouse, Carol. 2009. *Ethnographies of Neo-liberalism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Greenhouse, Carol. 2011. *The Paradox of Relevance: Citizenship and Ethnography in the United States*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Guetzkow, Joshua. 2010. "Beyond Deservingness: Congressional Discourse on Poverty, 1964–1996." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 629: 173–99.

Hacker, Jacob. 2006. *The Great Risk Shift*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hall, Peter A. and Michèle Lamont, eds. 2009. *Successful Societies: How Institutions and Culture Matter for Health*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Harding, David, Michèle Lamont, and Mario Small. 2010. "Reconsidering Culture and Poverty." Special Issue of *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 629: 6–27.

Hearn, Alison. 2008. "Meat, Mask, and Burden: Probing the Contours of the Branded 'Self.'"*Journal of Consumer Culture* 8 (2): 197–217.

Hertzman, Clyde and Tom Boyce, 2010. "How Experience Gets Under the Skin to Create Gradients In Developmental Health." *Annual Review of Public Health* 31: 329–47.

Herzfeld, Michael. 1996. *Cultural Intimacy: Social Poetics in the Nation State*. London: Routledge.

Hochschild, Jennifer. 1995. *Facing Up to the American Dream: Race, Class, and the Soul of the Nation*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press

Honneth, Alex. 1996. *The Struggle for Recognition: The Moral Grammar of Social Conflicts*. London: Polity Press.

Ireland, Patrick R. 2004. *Becoming Europe: Immigration, Integration, and the Welfare State*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Jenkins, Richard. 1996. *Social Identity*. London: Routledge.

Kastoryano, Riva. 2002. *Negotiating Identities: States and Immigrants in France and Germany*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Koopmans, Rudd, Paul Statham, Marco Giugni, and Florence Passy. 2005.*Contested Citizenship: Immigration and Cultural Diversity in Europe*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Krysan, Maria. 2012. "From Color Caste to Color Blind? Contemporary Era Racial Attitudes, 1976–2004." In *The Oxford Handbook of African American Citizenship*, edited by Henry Louis Gates, Claude Steele, Lawrence D. Bobo, Michael C. Dawson, Gerald Jaynes, Lisa Crooms-Robinson and Linda Darling-Hammond. New York: Oxford University Press: 235–78.

Kymlicka, Will. 2007. *Multicultural Odysseys: Navigating the New Global Politics of Diversity*. New York: Oxford University Press.

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 "Responses to Racism, Health, and Social Inclusion as a Dimension of Successful Societies." In *Successful Societies: How Institutions and Culture Matter for Health*, Edited by Peter A. Hall and Michèle Lamont. New York: Cambridge University Press: 151–168.

Lamont, Michèle and Christopher Bail. 2005. "'Sur les Frontières de la Reconnaissance. Les Catégories Internes et Externes de l'Identité Collective. *Revue Européenne De Migrations Internationales* 21 (2): 61–90.

Lamont, Michèle and Crystal Fleming. 2005. "'Everyday Anti-Racism: Competence and Religion in the Cultural Repertoire of African-American Elite and Working Class." *Du Bois Review* 2 (1): 29–43.

Lamont, Michèle and Nissim Mizrachi. 2012. "Ordinary People Doing Extraordinary Things, One Step at the Time: Responses to Stigmatization in Comparative Perspective." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 35 (3):365–81.

Lamont, Michèle and Virag Molnar. 2002. "The Study of Boundaries in the Social Sciences." *Annual Review of Sociology* 28: 167–95.

Lamont, Michèle and Laurent Thévenot. 2000. *Rethinking Comparative Cultural Sociology: Repertoires of Evaluation in France and the United States*. London: Cambridge University Press and Paris: Presses de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

Lazzarato, Maurizio. 2009. "Neoliberalism in Action: Inequality, Insecurity, and the Reconstitution of the Social." *Theory, Culture and Society* 26 (6): 109–33.

Lieberman, Evan. 2009. *Boundaries of Contagion: How Ethnic Politics Have Shaped Governmental Responses to Aids*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Link, Bruce. G. and Jo Phelan. 2000. "Evaluating the Fundamental Cause Explanation for Social Disparities in Health." *Handbook of Medical Sociology* edited by Chloe E. Bird, Peter Conrad, and Allen M. Fremont. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press 33–46.

Mabry, B. and J. K Kiecolt. 2005. "Anger in Black and White: Race, Alienation, and Anger." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 46 (85): 1–101.

Marx, Anthony. 1998. *Making Race and Nation: A Comparison of South Africa, the United States and Brazil*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Massey, Douglas S. and Magaly Sánchez R. 2010. *Brokered Boundaries: Creating Immigrant Identity in Anti-Immigrant Times*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Mizrachi, Nissim, I. Drori, and Renee Anspach. 2007. "'Repertoires of Trust: The Practice of Trust in a Multinational Organization Amid Political Conflict." *American Sociological Review* 72: 143–65.

Mizrachi, Nissim and Hanna Herzog. 2012. "Participatory Destigmatization Strategies among Palestinian Citizens of Israel, Ethiopian Jews and Mizrahi Jews." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 35 (3): 418–35.

Mizrachi, Nissim and Adane Zawdu. 2012. "Between Global Racial and Bounded Identity: Choice of Destigmatization Strategies among Ethiopian Jews in Israel." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 35 (3): 436–52.

Moon, Dawn. 2012. "Who am I and Who are We? Conflicting Narratives of Collective Selfhood in Stigmatized Groups." *American Journal of Sociology* 117 (5): 1336–70.

Monterescu, Daniel and Dan Rabinowitz. 2007. *Mixed Towns/Trapped Communities: Historical Narratives, Spatial Dynamics and Gender Relations in Jewish-Arab Mixed Towns in Israel/Palestine*. London: Ashgate Publishing.

Morning, Ann. 2009. "Toward a Sociology of Racial Conceptualization for the 21st Century." *Social Forces* 87 (3): 1167–92.

Neblett, Enrique. W., J. Nicole Shelton, and Robert. M. Sellers. 2004. "The Role of Racial Identity in Managing Daily Racial Hassles." In *Racial Identity in Context: The Legacy of Kenneth Clark*, edited by G. Philogene. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association Press: 77–90.

O'Brien, Eileen. 2007. "'Antiracism." *Handbook of the Sociology of Racial and Ethnic Relation*. Edited by Herman Vera and Joe Feagin. New York: Springer.

Oliver, Melvin L. and Thomas M. Shapiro. 2006. *Black Wealth/White Wealth: A New Perspective on Racial Inequality*. New York: Routledge.

Oyserman, Daphne and J. K. Swim. 2001. "'Social Stigma: An Insider's View." *Journal of Social Issues* 57 (1): 1–14.

Pachucki, Mark, Michèle Lamont, and Sabrina Pendergrass. 2006. "Boundary Processes: Recent Theoretical Developments and New Contributions." *Poetics* 35 (6): 331–51.

Pattillo-McCoy, Mary. 1999. *Black Picket Fences. Privileges and Perils Among the Black Middle Class*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Pew Charitable Trust Foundation 2011. "Wealth Gaps Rise to Record Highs Between Whites, Blacks and Hispanics." Retrieved from http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2011/07/26/wealth-gaps-rise-to-record-highs-between-whites-blacks-hispanics/.

Picca, L. H. and Joe R. Feagin. 2007. *Two-Faced Racism. White in the Backstage and Frontstage*. New York: Routledge.

Pierson, Paul and Jacob Hacker. 2010. *Winner-Take-All Politics*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Pinel, E. C. 1999. "Stigma Consciousness: The Psychological Legacy of Social Stereotypes." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 76 (1): 114–28.

Pittman, Cassi. 2012. *Race, Class, and Social Context: an Examination of the Impact of Race on the Consumption Preferences and Practices of Middle and Working Class African American*. Unpublished dissertation, Department of Sociology, Harvard University.

Pollock, Mica. 2008. *Everyday Antiracism: Getting Real About Race*. New York: The New Press.

Richland, Justin B. 2009. "On Neoliberalism and Other Social Diseases: The 2008 Sociocultural Anthropology Year in Review." *American Anthropologist* 110 (2): 170–76.

Rivas-Drake, Deborah, Diane Hughes, and Niobe Way. 2008. "A Closer Look at Peer Discrimination, Ethnic Identity, and Psychological Well-Being Among Urban Chinese Sixth Graders." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 37 (1): 12–21.

Roth, Wendy 2012. *Race Migrations: Latinos and the Cultural Transformation of Race*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Sayer, Andrew. 2005. *The Moral Significance of Class*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Schudson, Michael. 1988. "How Culture Works." *Theory and Society* 18: 153–180.
Sears, David O., James Sidanius, and Lawrence Bobo, eds. 2000. *Racialized Politics: The Debate about Racism in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Shapiro, Thomas M. and Melvin L. Oliver 2006. *Black Wealth, White Wealth, A New Perspective on Racial Inequality*. London: Routledge.
Sharone, Ofer. 2013. *Unemployment Experiences: Job Searching, Interpersonal Chemistry, and Self-Blame*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Silva, Graziella Moraes D. 2012. "Folk Conceptualizations of Racism and Antiracism in Brazil and South Africa." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 35 (3): 506–22.
Silva, Graziella Moraes D. and Elisa Reis. 2012. "The Multiple Dimensions of Racial Mixture: From Whitening to Brazilian Negritude." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 35 (3): 382–99.
Somers, Margaret. 2008. *Genealogies of Citizenship*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Son Hing, Leanne. 2012. "Responses to Stigmatization: The Moderating Roles of Primary and Secondary Appraisals." *Du Bois Review* 9 (1):149–68.
Stephens, Nicole M, Stephanie A. Fryberg, and Hazel Rose Markus. 2012. "It's Your Choice: How the Middle Class Model of Independence Disadvantages Working Class Americans." In *Facing Social Class*, edited by Susan T. Fiske and Hazel Rose Markus. New York: Russell Sage Foundation: 87–106.
Summers-Effler, Erika. 2002. "'The Micro Potential for Social Change: Emotion, Consciousness and Social Movement Formation." *Sociological Theory* 20: 21–60.
Swidler, Ann. 1986. "'Culture in Action: Symbols and Strategies." *American Sociological Review* 51: 273–86.
Taylor, Charles, with commentary by K. Anthony Appiah, Jurgen Habermas, Steven C. Rockefeller, Michael Walzer, Susan Wolf. Edited and introduced by Amy Gutman et al. 1994. *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Telles, Edward E. and Christina A. Sue. 2009. "Racial Mixture: Boundary Crossing in Comparative Perspectives." *Annual Review of Sociology* 35: 129–46.
Tilly, Charles. 2006. *Regimes and Repertoires*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Todd, Jennifer. 2004. "'Social Transformation, Collective Categories and Identity Change."*Theory and Society* 34 (4): 429–63.
Van Dijk, Teun A. 1993. *Elite Discourse and Racism*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
Walton, Gregory M and Geoffrey L. Cohen. 2011. "A Brief Social-Belonging Intervention Improves Academic and Health Outcomes for Minority Students." *Science* 331 (6023): 1447–51.
Welburn, Jessica. 2011. *Managing Instability: Conceptions of Opportunity and Success among African Americans from Middle-Income Households*. PhD dissertation, Harvard University.
Welburn, Jessica and Cassi Pittman. 2012. "Stop Blaming 'The Man': Perceptions of Inequality and Opportunities for Success in the Obama Era Among Middle Class African-Americans." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 35 (3): 523–40.
Wilson, William Julius. 1978. *The Declining Significance of Race*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Wimmer, Andreas. 2008. "The Making and Unmaking of Ethnic Boundaries: A Multi-Level Process Theory." *American Journal of Sociology* 113 (4): 970–1022.

Wimmer, Andreas and B. Min. 2006. "From Empire to Nation-States. Explaining Wars in the Modern World." *American Sociological Review* 71 (6): 267–97.
Wodak, Ruth. 2001. "The Discourse-Historical Approach." In *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, edited by Ruth Wodak and M. Meyer. London: Sage.
Wright, Matthew and Irene Bloemraad. 2012. "Is There a Trade-Off between Multiculturalism and Socio-Political Integration? Policy Regimes and Immigrant Incorporation in Comparative Perspective." *Perspectives on Politics* 10: 77–95.
Zolberg, Aristide and L. L. Woon. 1999. "'Why Islam is Like Spanish: Cultural Incorporation in Europe and the United States." *Politics and Society* 27 (1): 5–38.

5

Stigmatization, Neoliberalism, and Resilience[1]

Leanne S. Son Hing

This chapter applies the theories and tools of contemporary psychology to explore the relationship between neoliberalism understood as a set of values and socioeconomic conditions and various aspects of intergroup relations. My focus is on the sources and effects of prejudice or stigmatization and on the factors that confer resilience in the face of discrimination. There are significant puzzles here. Important contemporary social debates about immigration, racial equality, and aboriginal rights center on intergroup relations and such debates are now conditioned by neoliberal ideas (see Chapters 2 and 3). Does the prevalence of neoliberal beliefs increase the incidence of prejudice, as some suspect, or render it less likely by bringing meritocratic values to the fore (Becker 1957)? How might the popularity of neoliberal beliefs affect the resilience of people who experience discrimination? These are issues on which contemporary psychological research can shed light (e.g., Son Hing et al. 2011).

After considering the forms that prejudice can take, I begin by reviewing the changes in prejudice that have taken place during the neoliberal era. Second, drawing on literatures in psychology that associate prejudice with experiences of psychological threat, I explore how societal changes linked to neoliberal policies, practices, and narratives might have increased the incidence of prejudice. Finally, I review psychological research, including my own, that examines the relationship between attitudes that reflect prejudice and beliefs associated with neoliberalism.

[1] Paper prepared for "Social Resilience in the Age of Neoliberalism, edited by Peter Hall and Michèle Lamont. My research discussed here was supported by funding from the Canadian Institute for Advanced Research. Thank you to Vishi Gnanakumaran for assistance with the General Social Survey data; to Susan Pankiw for assistance with manuscript preparation; to Dustin Burt and Homan Allami for assistance with researching the literature; to Mark Zanna for his feedback on this chapter; and to my Canadian Institute for Advanced Research colleagues, particularly Nyla Branscombe, Donna Garcia, Peter Hall, Michele Lamont, and Ron Levi, for their help in developing this chapter.