



National Poverty Center Working Paper Series

#06-10

June, 2006

**How Culture Matters for Poverty:
Thickening our Understanding**

**Michèle Lamont, Harvard University
Mario Luis Small, Princeton University**

This paper is available online at the National Poverty Center Working Paper Series index at:
http://www.npc.umich.edu/publications/working_papers/

Any opinions, findings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the view of the National Poverty Center or any sponsoring agency.

How Culture Matters for Poverty: Thickening our Understanding¹

Michèle Lamont
Harvard University

Mario Luis Small
Princeton University

Paper prepared for *The Colors of Poverty*, edited by David Harris and Ann Lin (to be submitted to the Russell Sage Foundation). **DRAFT ONLY**: Please do not quote or cite without permission.

INTRODUCTION

The term “culture” figures prominently in the poverty literature, though rarely with much theoretical or empirical sophistication. For some, it is a residual category to explain why statistical models do not account for all the variance in poverty-related outcomes. For others, it is an intermediary mechanism—an endogenous variable that helps explain why structural conditions such as neighborhood poverty lead to unwanted outcomes—but not an independent causal force.² Still others reject cultural explanations altogether, arguing that these inevitably “blame the victims” for their problems. In this literature, “culture” is rarely defined explicitly. Conceived at times as a group’s norms and values, at other times as its attitudes toward work and family, and on yet other occasions as patterns of behavior,³ culture in the poverty literature has been studied with neither the depth nor the precision that characterize analyses of such matters as demographic trends, selection bias, and the impact of public policies on work and family structure. This chapter aims to remedy the situation while examining whether and how culture helps explain the causes and consequences of racial disparities in poverty.

While poverty scholars provide a rather thin understanding of culture, over the last two decades cultural sociologists have produced theoretical and empirical research that has yielded a subtle, heterogeneous, and sophisticated picture of how cultural factors shape and are shaped by poverty and inequality. They have used concepts such as “frames,” “cultural repertoires,”

¹ We thank Lydia Bean, Suzanne Berger, Rebecca Blank, Sheldon Danziger, Joshua Guetzkow, David Harding, David Harris, Christopher Jencks, Annette Lareau, Ann Lin, Katheine Newman, Alice O’Connor, Maureen Waller, Bill Wilson, and Christopher Winship for their useful comments on an earlier draft of this paper. All its shortcomings are our own.

² Even scholars deep in the sociological tradition who believe cultural factors are important often argue that culture itself stems from economic or structural conditions. For instance Wilson (1987) argues that the social isolation fostered by concentrated poverty influences one’s cultural orientation (through the scarcity of conventional role models). This model stresses adaptations to constraints and opportunities. However, Sampson and Wilson (1995) describe community contexts as “cognitive landscapes” concerning behavioral norms.

³ A straightforward indicator of the messiness of culture research among poverty scholars is its failure to distinguish attitudes from behavior. For instance, failure to marry (a pattern of behavior) does not necessarily indicate an anti-marriage attitude, just as infidelity does not signal the belief that adultery is acceptable. In a recent study of the differences between what employers say concerning their willingness to hire ex-convicts and what they actually do, Pager and Quillian (2005) rightfully note that “the resolution of these differences represents an important focus of sociological investigation in its own right. Although low correlations between attitudes and associated behaviors are often viewed as a purely methodological test of survey questions, in many cases, these discrepancies actually may provide clues for a better substantive understanding of the cognitive-emotional basis for action.”

“narrative,” “collective identity,” “symbolic boundaries,” “cultural capital,” and “institutions” to study how poor individuals interpret and respond to their circumstances. By no means has this literature coalesced into a coherent perspective on culture. Also, search for subtlety has often come at the cost of lost parsimony. Nevertheless, social scientists are in the process of filling gaps in what is known about the causes and consequences of poverty.

This work is often ignored by poverty scholars, and has low impact on the community of poverty researchers, for at least two reasons. First, much of the work has been conducted by social scientists who are not part of the community of economists, demographers, sociologists, and political scientists working on poverty and policy.⁴ Second, much of it is based on data-gathering techniques that are appropriate for the study of culture, such as participant observation, in-depth interviewing, comparative historical research, and content analysis. Quantitative social scientists often lack familiarity with these techniques and may not have at their disposal the cognitive tools needed to evaluate it. Some may be tempted at times to dismiss qualitative work as “anecdotal” or worse, “non-empirical” (by which they mean non-quantitative). Even quantitative research in the sociology of culture, such as research on cultural consumption and on networks, remains ignored by the interdisciplinary core of inequality scholars, much to the detriment of scholarship.⁵

The consequences of ignoring this scholarship are not limited to the ivory tower. Culture is the subject or subtext of the recurrent public debates about poverty. It remains the subtext of the distinction between the deserving and undeserving poor, and it underlies claims that the welfare system has been too permissive (see chapters by Bullock and by Soss and Schram, this volume). It is referenced, often crudely, in the discussions of American individualism, responsibility, hard work, and fairness that characterize debates on poverty and immigration. The writings of influential policy researchers such as George Borjas (2001), David Ellwood (1988), and Lawrence Mead (1986) rely on assumptions about culture among the poor—assumptions often stemming from “culture of poverty” theory—that have been criticized repeatedly since their emergence in the early 1960s (for example, Valentine 1968; Young 2004), and that have long been thrown in the dustbin of bankrupt concepts by sociologists of culture. The policy discourse often relies on unsubstantiated assumptions about American culture (for example, about what its core values are), assumptions that, in addition to lacking empirical foundation, have become part of a powerful narrative that equates liberalism with moral decadence and laissez-faire economics with fairness (O'Connor 2001a; Somers and Block 2005).⁶

⁴ The reception of a few works, such as Newman (1999), Anderson (1999), and Edin and Kefalas (2005), is an exception.

⁵ This is not the venue for an extended discussion of methodology. We proceed on the assumption that social science requires multiple methods, because some questions are only or best addressed through particular methods. Still, we believe that culture may be studied through multiple methods, including quantitative methods.

⁶ Certainly, authors may believe that the welfare system should require work, but stating that *Americans* believe this idea requires empirical substantiation. For example, criticizing Charles Murray’s critique of AFDC programs during the 1980s, David Ellwood wrote: “But what is often missed in this frenzy is that although Murray is almost certainly wrong in blaming the social welfare system for a large part of the predicament of the poor, he is almost certainly correct in stating that welfare does not reflect or reinforce our most basic values” (1988:6). What are these basic values? Ellwood acknowledges the difficulty of answering this question. Yet he does not hesitate to try. He writes: “I have yet to find a definitive and convincing statement of our fundamental American values. The work of philosophers is often esoteric and the results of surveys are difficult to distill. Yet, I see recurring themes in public and academic discussion of what it is Americans believe. Four basic tenets seem to underlie much of the philosophical and political rhetoric about poverty” (1988:16). Ellwood’s “four value tenets” are the autonomy of the

These issues cannot be resolved without taking seriously the scholarship on poverty among sociologists of culture. In what follows we do not summarize or review all of this literature. Rather, we: (a) identify those works we believe exemplify significant improvements on thin and dated conceptions of culture; (b) discuss the pitfalls any new work on culture should avoid; and (c) chart a research agenda for the study of poverty and inequality that takes into account the difficulties in research on culture. Our review does not state where the field is headed—it states where we believe it *should* head. While the scholarship we review has much to offer poverty research, it still varies widely in the extent to which its empirical claims can be evaluated by quantitative poverty scholars. We take pains, therefore, to identify the limitations of the work we review and suggest issues to address for culture scholars themselves.

We will limit our discussion with respect not only to theories but also to topics. An exhaustive review would examine cultural processes among various poor groups, such as the white rural poor, the state-dependent elderly, low-income immigrants in the informal sector, poorly-educated youth in Native American reservations, drug traffickers in corporate gang structures, and others. It also would examine, comparatively, the impact of poverty on different groups. For example, 68 percent of births among blacks are to unmarried mothers, and since single parenthood is strongly associated with poverty, the dynamics of poverty and culture among blacks may be different from those among whites, where the rate is only 29 percent.⁷ Similarly, different ethnic groups have different institutions at their disposal (McRoberts 2005 on churches; Mooney forthcoming)⁸, and racial stereotypes affect various groups differently in school settings (Chin and Phillips forthcoming). We cannot cover all topics, but we can create some order in what is currently a rather complex terrain of inquiry, by focusing on the *analytical tools* sociologists of culture have employed. Thus, we merely begin to untangle the social processes at work and may offer more questions than answers.

We should note that several of the analytical tools we describe are useful for the purpose of process-tracing, rather than as variables in statistical models (on process tracing, see Bennett and George 2005). That is, while it is necessary to examine *whether* two phenomena are associated, it is also necessary to examine *how* one leads to the other, or under what circumstances it does so – questions that are often best addressed with the help of qualitative data. Tackling such questions has become a necessity in the study of poverty for some time. Indeed, in a review of the evidence on the spread of single-parent families, noting that “quantitative social science does best with sharp turning points and tight links between dependent and independent variables,” Ellwood and Jencks skeptically conclude that “quantitative models have done about as well as could be expected given the limits of our methods for investigating a complex system” (2004, p. 60). This point being noted, many of the concepts we discuss **below** *style sheet forbids “below” and “above”* (such as repertoires, frames, narratives, and boundaries) may be turned into variables and studied quantitatively, for example through content analysis. Nevertheless, they are essential if we are to gain a better understanding of the social and cultural mechanisms that produce poverty—of “how” culture matters for poverty.

individual, the virtue of work, the primacy of the family, and the desire for and sense of community. Thus, the author presents a major statement about the characteristics of “American culture” based on no empirical data.

⁷ Figures are from the *Statistical Abstract of the United States* (2004-05).

⁸ McRoberts, Omar. 2005. *Streets of Glory : Church and Community in a Black Urban Neighborhood*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Background and Concepts

For years, the most prominent and controversial theory of culture and poverty was Lewis' (1969) "culture of poverty." Lewis argued that this culture emerged when populations that were socially and economically marginalized from a capitalist society developed patterns of behavior to deal with their low status. This behavior was characterized by low aspirations, political apathy, helplessness, disorganization, provincialism, and the disparagement of so-called middle-class values (1969:190-192). Once this culture was in place, Lewis argued, it developed mechanisms that tended to perpetuate it, even if structural conditions changed.⁹

Lewis' work was in part an attempt to bridge the structure-culture divide that had been a feature of opposing explanations for poverty. Cultural explanations emphasized values and norms that directed behavior; structural explanations emphasized economic and structural constraints upon behavior. However, the idea that the culture of poverty was self-perpetuating placed Lewis, in the eyes of many, on the cultural side, and the perspectives eventually became two caricatures of what were, in fact, complex social processes: while some argued that the poor are poor because of their inadequate values, others blamed "the system." The cultural conservatism of the 1980s polarized research even further, such that politically moderate social scientists were wary of associating themselves with cultural explanations for fear of being considered reactionary (Patterson 1997; Wilson 1987).

From the 1980s to the present, the sociological research on these questions has taken multiple trajectories. Some scholars have examined the interaction between culture and structure with respect to issues such as agency, free will, and determinism, moving well beyond the simple dichotomy (Sewell 2005). Others have abandoned these questions and asked how people develop meaning systems—how social circumstances shape scripts, frames, repertoires, and so forth, rather than the other way around. Thus, not all of the researchers we cover argue that culture helps explain poverty outcomes.

Early approaches such as Lewis' also reflected a Parsonian conception of culture, whereby culture is a unitary and internally coherent set of attributes that characterizes a social group, such as inner-city African-Americans or "the Japanese." Today, there is no one consensus conception of culture, because different scholars focus on different social processes and employ different metaphors to describe and explain what they observe. However, most would disagree with the Parsonian conception (Sewell 2005, Chapter 3). Many contemporary scholars have been influenced by Geertz (1973): "Believing, with Max Weber, that man is an

⁹ More specifically, the culture of poverty perspective argued that the poor remained in poverty not merely as a result of their economic conditions but also because of cultural values and practices they had developed from poverty. This perspective, as exemplified by Lewis and Banfield, argued that culture constituted a set of norms and values that guided the behavior of individuals. They also, however, conceived of culture as a "lifestyle," at times called a "worldview," which made the escape from poverty difficult or impossible. Both authors catalogued a series of characteristics that defined this culture. These included an orientation toward the present and instant gratification, a preference for happiness over work, a tendency to value familial ties over moral considerations of right or wrong, engaging in sex with multiple partners over the life course, and others. There were several problems with the culture of poverty conception: (1) it assumed that individuals' practices were caused by their values, largely ignoring that many people, rich or poor, constantly act in violation of their values; (2) despite this, its catalogue of the culture of poverty included both values and behaviors, leading to an often circular argument (people have multiple sexual partners because they have a culture characterized by the presence of multiple sexual partners); (3) it assumed that a single culture categorized very diverse people; (4) it assumed that people's culture is fundamentally static and does not change over their lifetimes, as though people play little role in the creation of their own culture or practices. For a critique, see Small and Newman (2001).

animal suspended in webs of significance he himself has spun, I take culture to be those webs” (1973, p. 5). In this conception, culture refers to the meaning systems through which human beings perceive and understand the world. For Parsons, one could have “a” culture; for Geertz, one simply existed in the midst of, responded to, and created cultural symbols.

In this respect, we fundamentally agree. The idea that races or ethnic groups “have” a culture—for example, that there is an “Anglo-American culture” that differs from “Asian culture” or “Afro-American culture”—is unhelpful, and is not substantiated by the research. Intra-group differences are often larger than inter-group differences. Consequently, our understanding of racial disparities in poverty does not account for these as a function of inherent ethnic cultures. Most of the new researchers in this tradition probably would agree with our position; however, they differ dramatically in how they define and operationalize various cultural dimensions.

In what follows, we examine seven ways culture has been conceived and examined—as frames, as repertoires, as narratives, as cultural capital, as symbolic boundaries, as habitus, and as institutions—and assess what researchers studying poverty have uncovered on the basis of each conception.

CULTURE AND POVERTY TODAY

Culture as Frames

Building on insights from Schultz (1962), Berger and Luckman (1966), Goffman (1963), and others, cultural sociologists ask how individuals cognitively perceive the world around them. Whereas normative conceptions focus on how individuals evaluate good and bad, cognitive ones ask the prior question of how something is perceived as real. The philosophical underpinnings of this work stem from (Kant 1982 [1781]), whose distinction between the noumenal and phenomenal worlds introduced the idea that the world as it truly is differs from the world we represent to ourselves—as people, we only have access to the latter.

Sociologists in this tradition assume that no individual simply sees things “as they are.” Instead, every individual’s perception of the social world—of social relations, the class system, race, the neighborhood, organizations—is filtered through cultural frames that highlight certain aspects and hide or block others.

The most prominent empirical application of the conception of culture as frames stems from the social movements literature. Snow and Benford define a frame as “an interpretive [schema] that simplifies and condenses the ‘world out there’ by selectively punctuating and encoding objects, situations, events, experiences, and sequences of actions within one’s present or past environment” (1992, p. 137). Much of this literature evolved in response to the resource mobilization perspective on social movements, which argued that these were successful largely to the extent their leaders could access and mobilize resources for their cause. The framing perspective’s critique of resource mobilization theory is that cultural or symbolic elements are essential for the possibility of action. Regardless of resources, activists will be unable to mobilize potential participants without transforming their perception of their situation by ‘framing’ the issues in such a way that mobilization appears necessary (Small 2002, p. 23).

This perspective has been applied to the study of poverty. Small’s *Villa Victoria* (2004) analyzes local participation in a Latino Housing Project in Boston created thirty years earlier as a result of political mobilization. He examined differences among current residents in their level of local community participation and found that their expressed values seemed to bear little relation to differences in participation. Rather, participants differed from non-participants in

their (cognitive) framing of the neighborhood. Some residents framed the neighborhood as a place with a significant history of political and social involvement. Others framed it as little more than “the projects,” a low-income area with no especially notable history. The various answers differed in whether they include the neighborhood’s history, defined the latter as an important entity, equated it with “projects,” and employed the term “community” to describe it, thus revealing various underlying conceptions of the neighborhood upheld by residents.

Small showed that regardless of the heterogeneity of beliefs or values about participation in general, residents who had not framed the neighborhood as a place with a significant history did not participate in community activities. Those few who increased their participation level over time adopted frames consistent with those of other participants, by stressing the history of the political mobilization that led to the creation of the neighborhood. The differences in neighborhood frames tended to stem from the historical experiences through which people came to live in the neighborhood, whether as participants in the earlier efforts or as newcomers with no knowledge of its past.

Harding (2005) also examines how framing influences the response to poverty. Whereas Small focused on how individuals frame their neighborhood, Harding focuses on (among other things) how they frame the idea of pregnancy. He finds that adolescents in disadvantaged neighborhoods in Boston exhibit greater *heterogeneity* of frames than those in other neighborhoods. For example, there is more heterogeneity in the response to questions on whether being pregnant as a teen would be “embarrassing” or “not all that bad” in disadvantaged than in non-disadvantaged neighborhoods. As a result, adolescents in the former neighborhoods are exposed to a greater array of options for conceiving their circumstances that include both mainstream and alternative conceptions of the world.

This literature improves upon the culture of poverty perspective in at least one respect. Whereas by definition this latter perspective expects a single set of cultural responses to arise from conditions of structural poverty, both Small and Harding make clear that heterogeneity in response is common and salient. Both studies reject the notion of a collective “ghetto” culture shared universally by residents in high poverty, and show important within-neighborhood differences in cultural frames.

A second contribution of this work is to redefine the relation between culture and behavior. The norms-and-values perspective posited a cause-and-effect relationship between values and behaviors, whereas the frame perspective tends to posit what Small (2004; 2002) has called a “constraint-and-possibility” relationship. Frames do not cause behavior so much as make it possible or likely. However, a consequence of this redefinition is that cultural frames are, by design, insufficient explanations of behavior; they may be thought of as necessary but insufficient conditions. Thus, the analyst must resist the temptation to conceive of culture statically and should identify how other factors, including human agency, shape behavior.

Culture as Repertoires

Scholars have also conceived of culture as a repertoire of practices, beliefs, and attitudes that individuals call forth at the time of action. One of the most widely cited scholars in this tradition has been Swidler (1986), who approaches culture as a “tool kit” that individuals employ in unsettled times. She argues that “culture influences action not by providing the ultimate values toward which action is oriented but by shaping a repertoire or ‘tool kit’ of habits, skills, and styles from which people construct ‘strategies of action’” (1986, p. 273). Whereas a metaphor in the frames perspective might be that culture is the particular tint of the glasses

through which individuals see the world, in the repertoires perspective it is the set of tools individuals have at their disposal to manage the social world.

For Swidler, it is less important whether individuals are shaped by their values than what repertoires of action are available to them in their figurative toolkits. Different toolkits contain different repertoires of action, and the toolboxes of some have more repertoires than those of others. The notion of *strategies of action*, which she defines as “persistent ways of ordering action through time” (1986, p. 273), is important. Speaking explicitly about a perennial issue in the urban poverty literature, Swidler explains that asking whether the poor share the values of the middle class will yield very little:

The irony of this debate is that it cannot be resolved by evidence that the poor share the values and aspirations of the middle class, as indeed they seem to do. In repeated surveys, lower-class youth say that they value education and intend to go to college.... People may share common aspirations while remaining profoundly different in the way their culture organizes their overall pattern of behavior.

Culture in this sense is more like a style or a set of skills than a set of preferences or wants. If one asked a slum youth why he did not take steps to pursue a middle-class path to success (or indeed asked oneself why one did not pursue a different life direction) the answer might well be not “I don’t want that life,” but instead “Who, me?” One can hardly pursue success in a world where the accepted skills, style, and informal know-how are unfamiliar. One does better to look for a line of action for which one already has the cultural equipment. (1986, p. 275)

For Swidler, one may utilize a practice only if it exists in one’s toolbox.

This perspective views culture as a heterogeneous set of attributes, rather than a single, coherent system. It allows for cultural differentiation and contradictions within a group. Preceding Swidler, Ulf Hannerz’s classic but often overlooked *Soulside* (2004[1969]) argued that ghetto residents have access to a repertoire that included both ghetto-specific and mainstream forms of behavior. Wilson (1996) extended this idea by arguing that under conditions of high joblessness, many mainstream forms of behavior are difficult to implement. Sharon Hays’s *Flat Broke with Children* (2003) shows that low-income mothers make use of the alternative strategies of action available to them, and that these are often in contradiction. She finds that the notions of responsibility and financial self-sufficiency are clearly part of low-income women’s cultural toolkits.

As for the “frame” perspective, the added value of the “culture as repertoire” perspective for understanding poverty is that it leaves room and accounts for diversity within groups and for the multiplicity of perspectives within a single actor. Since individuals can and do resort to different repertoires in the course of action, this perspective makes it possible to understand what to outsiders may appear as inconsistencies -- for example, between a reported belief in the sanctity of marriage and a birth out of wedlock. In addition, this perspective helps identify which actions are unlikely: if the strategies for obtaining a college degree or for sustaining a long-term marriage are not part of one’s toolkit, one is not likely to pursue that course of action. Today, the strategies for entering a competitive college include contacting the Educational Testing Service and registering for the SAT; obtaining studying materials or enrolling in a preparatory course; indicating which colleges one wants the grades sent; and many others. If a

17-year old does not know to do these things, it is unlikely she will pursue a college education in a competitive institution even if, in theory, going to college seems like a rational thing to do.

As Lamont (1992, chapter 7) argues, the tool-kit perspective presents problems, particularly in that it does not explain why some repertoire choices, rather than others, are chosen in a course of action. In a sense, it is concerned with the “supply side” of culture, but not with the factors that make various groups of people more or less likely to have access to, and use, one set of tools (for example, concerning how to get access to a college education) rather than another. The choice itself depends on opportunities and structural constraints that are shaped by cultural and non-cultural factors. In addition, Swidler allows a slippage among the terms strategies, repertoires, skills, styles, and habits, which weakens the powerful simplicity of the tool-kit concept. Nevertheless, this approach does address many of the weaknesses of earlier paradigms, notably, their incapacity to deal with heterogeneity or contradiction.

Culture as Narratives

In contrast to frames and repertoires, narratives are *stories* and they often present a beginning, middle, and end, and they are clearly identifiable as a chunk of discourse (Polletta forthcoming, p.7) Narratives of personal experience have informed the study of social class since the pioneering work of William Labov on the African-American vernacular in South Harlem (see also Bertaux 1984).¹⁰ Although the term “narrative” is generally used very loosely and one finds many variations in how narrative analysis is practiced, in general it suggests that people develop an understanding of themselves, their environment, and others that shape their actions (Somers 1994). This approach posits that, when faced with two courses of action concerning, for instance, their project of social mobility, individuals are likely to pursue the plan that is most consistent with their personal narrative, as opposed to the plan that may seem most rational to an outsider (for example Abelmann 2003 on gendered projects of upward mobility in South Korea). Thus narratives are an important component of self-efficacy and their orient action. They shape how social actors relate to others and how they go about securing resources for themselves in the political sphere and elsewhere (Ewick and Silbey 2003). In these senses, narratives can be used to explain action and are a crucial dimension of how social classes, including the poor, are produced and transformed.

Whether scholars use the concept of narrative explicitly or not, they often argue that the “stories” people tell themselves influences how they make sense of their lives and of their difficulties. For example, Young (2004) finds that the young low-income residents of a Chicago public housing project he interviewed put little emphasis on racial prejudice in their account of the limitations and possibilities they encounter in their life trajectory. The hyper spatial segregation they experience means that they rarely interact with whites. As a consequence, this group is not salient in their causal explanations of their own social trajectory. Also, Hochschild (1995) shows that poor blacks are more committed to the idea of the American dream—that with hard work and sacrifice, anyone can make it—than are middle class blacks, in part because this latter group is in closer contact with whites and more acutely aware of the ways that discrimination challenges the ideal of an equal opportunity society.

The narrative perspective is particularly useful in demonstrating how self-conception, including one’s sense of self-limitations and responsibility toward others, influences action – for instance how one goes about passing on resources to one’s children (for example, (for example, Abelmann 2003; Steedman 1987). This perspective has enormous potential and

¹⁰ <http://www.ling.upenn.edu/~wlabov/sfs.html> include this reference in the biblio. Google to get full reference.

should be more fully explored in the American context. It shows how action is not an automatic response to incentive: it is made possible within the context of narratives around which people make sense of their lives. Qualitative methods are best suited to tap the stories actors have about their lives, because their distinctive strength is to make contextual understanding (or *Verstehen*) possible. However, narratives can also be studied through discourse and content analysis, surveys, cognitive mapping, and other techniques that are amenable to quantification (Abdelal et al. 2006; Jepperson and Swidler 1994). Hence, they are easily used for systematic and detailed comparative analysis, and as such, have considerable untapped potential for the study of poverty.

Culture as Symbolic Boundaries and Identity

“Symbolic boundaries” are conceptual distinctions made by actors to categorize objects, people, and practices. These boundaries operate as a “system of rule that guide interaction by affecting who comes together to engage in what social act” (Lamont and Fournier 1992, p. 12). Such boundaries are the necessary, but insufficient condition for the creation of social boundaries (Lamont and Molnár 2002) manifested in spatial segregation, labor market segregation, and patterns of intermarriage. Thus, the importance of paying heed to the boundaries that are drawn by members of various groups, what criteria are used to draw and justify them, and what groups they exclude or stigmatize. They revealed how individuals implicitly and explicitly characterize members of various classes, and particularly what they view as the characteristics and flaws of groups, including the poor. Thus, in the United States, workers’ self-definition stresses hard work and self-sufficiency. In valuing their own attributes, they draw strong moral boundaries toward the poor, who they view as lazy and as taking advantage. In France, in contrast, workers are more likely to see the poor as worthy of support as workers who are temporarily displaced by the forces of capitalism. This view is sustained by cultural repertoires making the notions of solidarity widely available, which repertoires are sustained by a strong socialist tradition, by Catholicism, and by Republicanism (Lamont 2000; Lamont and Thévenot 2000).¹¹ This cross-national contrast correspond to wider patterns in the exclusion of the poor in the United States as compared to France (see also Gallie and Paugham 2000); (Katz 1989); (Silver 1993).

The literature on boundary work is ultimately concerned with the making of groupness. It is part of a much broader literature on how collective identity constituted by the interplay of processes of internal and external definitions (or self-identification and social categorization). On the one hand, individuals must be able to differentiate themselves from others by drawing on criteria of community and a sense of shared belonging within their subgroup. On the other hand, this internal identification process must be recognized by outsiders for a collective identity to emerge (Cornell and Hartman 1997, chapter 4; Jenkins 1996, chapter 4). Much of this process of self and other definition also involves boundary work separating “us” from “them.”¹²

¹¹ Kefalas, M. 2001. *The Last Garden: Culture and Place in a White Working Class Chicago Neighborhood*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kefalas (2001) analyzes how white working class people in Chicago define and defend their identities largely against blacks who they code as “the poor,” in what they perceive to be an imperiled environment. They defend themselves through the care with which they keep their homes clean, cultivate their gardens, maintain their property, defend the neighborhoods, and celebrate the nation. In both studies, the meanings given by workers to the poor are closely tied to their own identities as responsible, hard-working, moral people.

¹² In recent years, social psychologists, sociologists, and political scientists have made considerable progress in specifying different dimensions of collective identity. For instance, social psychologists have differentiated between

Complementary to the study of boundary work, social identity theory, elaborated by social psychologists, suggests that “Pressures to evaluate one’s own group positively through in-group/out-group comparison lead social groups to attempt to differentiate themselves from each other.” This process of differentiation aims “to maintain and achieve superiority over an out-group on some dimension” (Hogg and Abrams 1988; Tajfel and Turner 1985, pp. 16-17). Hence, in-group favoritism is common, especially among high status groups (for a review, see Sidanius and Pratto 1999). Thus, people adapt to their environment through cognitive categorization and stereotyping, also often organized around an “us/them” opposition. Understanding this process affects how we account for people’s success and failures—with external/environmental as opposed to internal/individual and self-blaming explanations (Crocker, Major and Steele 1998). This literature helps inform our understanding of social representations of the poor and the social identity of the poor. Nevertheless, it is largely concerned with intra-individual processes rather than the content that people give to their identity and to the relative salience to them of various dimensions of identity.

To learn about content, we turn to cultural sociologists and anthropologists who have implicitly or explicitly analyzed what kinds of typification systems, or inferences concerning similarities and differences, groups mobilize to define who they are. Studies of boundary work and identity among the poor have focused on how they self-define (as workers, good parents, or moral beings), as opposed to assigning them an identity by isolating specific cultural patterns as central and enduring aspects of a “culture of poverty.” These studies also consider whether, how, and by whom such self-identifications are validated, and whether they can crystallize as social categories and in turn affect behavior. For instance, in *No Shame in My Game*, Newman (1999) studied how the working poor of Harlem who work in the fast-food industry contrast themselves with the unemployed poor. They develop a sense of their identity as workers in contrast to that of the unemployed poor, and create a status hierarchy which echoes the dominant social hierarchy, as well as the dominant narrative of the American Dream. Similarly, in *The Code of the Street*, Anderson (1999) analyzes intra-racial boundaries that separate “decent” from “street” poor African-Americans, and examines how the latter develop behavioral traits and identity defined in opposition to those of whites. In *Promises I Can Keep*, Edin and Kefalas (2005) document how poor urban mothers, as meaning-making individuals, understand their choices to procreate outside of marriage, and how they develop positive self identities around motherhood despite being at the bottom of social hierarchies. Similarly, in *My Baby’s Father*, Waller (2002) shows how unmarried poor men understand their identities as fathers and describes the *emotional* contributions they make to the lives of their children (contra governmental programs that focus only on their material contributions). Waller contrasts her

types of identity (based on content and degree of agreement within a group over the content of the shared category) (Ashmore, Deaux, and McLaughlin-Volpe 2004). They have specified aspects of identity such as self-categorization, evaluation, importance, attachment and sense of interdependence, social embeddedness, behavioral involvement, and content and meaning. For their part, sociologists have distinguished between social location and self-understanding as dimensions of identity, and between commonality, connectedness, and groupness as dimensions of self-understanding (Brubaker and Cooper 2000). As for political scientists, they have examined a wide array of methodological options for the study of identity with the goal of increasing consistency and clarity in defining and measuring identity, and of improving cross-disciplinary and cross-subfield coordination of identity research (for example, Abdelal, Herrera, Johnston, and McDermott forthcoming). While a widely-agree upon agenda and approach to social identity has yet to emerge, social scientists agree for a need for greater terminological standardization and parsimony, and for the productive of cumulative knowledge (esp. *ibid*).

approach with earlier ones: “rather than examining whether low-income unmarried parents adopt sub-cultural values that contrast with those in the rest of society, [the] analysis [shows] that these parents draw their ideas, justifications, and practices regarding fatherhood from various sources, including their families, communities, other institutions, and general culture.” (p. 45). These authors capture the conditions that make possible the choices made by the poor, helping social scientists move beyond conceptualizing the mothers’ life choices as aberrational.

These studies demonstrate the heuristic payoff of studying how concepts of self-identity (and self-worth) vary across low and high status group groups—a topic rarely visited by social psychologists working on the self and identity (as for instance reviewed in Gecas and Burke 1995; but see Markus and Kitayama 1991 on the self; Reicher and Hopkins 2001 on the historical character of social categorization). This approach contrasts with earlier approaches that did not attempt to identify the range of self-constructs that groups mobilize. Nevertheless, more work is needed to integrate the psychological, cultural, and social mechanisms involved in this process, as well as the cognitive and emotional dimensions.

This literature on boundaries is essential if we are to understand how inequality is sustained (through identity and boundary formation); how structural circumstances are confronted differently, due to different concepts of self-identity, including self-efficacy and authenticity, which may impede upward mobility; and how ethnic and racial differences, which may overlap with the boundary between the poor and the non-poor, are defended and contested—including by parents who reinforce ethnic identity in order to prevent their children from assimilating downward (Noh 2003). Without the concepts of identity and group boundaries, analysts may miss important dimensions of what explains the choices that the poor make.

Culture as Cultural Capital

Cultural capital refers to the “institutionalized, i.e. widely shared, high status cultural signals...” used to exclude others in various contexts (Lamont and Lareau 1988, p.156). The concept, proposed by Bourdieu and Passeron in *Reproduction* (1977[1970]) in the 1960s, has become widely used as an analytical device. It is mobilized primarily to illuminate processes of social and cultural reproduction, and more particularly, to illuminate how middle and upper middle class adults (professionals and managers, or what Bourdieu calls “les classes dominantes”) pass on advantages to children, mostly by familiarizing them with high culture, which is valued by the educational system. While the early American literature on this topic tended to focus primarily on familiarity with high culture (for example DiMaggio 1982), more recent work has tended to focus on high status signals more generally.

According to this framework, children of poor and working class families are handicapped by a schooling system that systematically uses criteria of evaluation that are biased in favor of middle class culture. For these children, this bias often results in over-selection, self-exclusion, and “relegation” (or marginalization Lamont and Lareau 1988). The living conditions of poor and working class children often lead them to internalize the notion that upper-middle and middle class culture is superior. Thus, they are also victims of a *symbolic violence* that leads them to downplay the value of their own class culture and to evaluate themselves through the prisms of standards that favor the middle class.¹³

¹³ More specifically, in *Reproduction* Bourdieu, Pierre, and Jean-Claude Passeron. 1977[1970]. *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. Beverly Hills: Sage., Pierre Bourdieu and Jean-Claude Passeron propose that the lower academic performance of working class children cannot be accounted for by lower ability but by institutional biases. They suggest that schools evaluate all children on the basis of their familiarity with the culture of the

One of the issues raised by students of cultural capital is whether various currencies of capital operate in different environments, and whether women, ethnic groups, the poor, or the working class have relatively autonomous understandings of what counts as cultural capital (Erikson 1996; Hall 1991; Lamont and Lareau 1988). Thus, forty years after the publication of *Reproduction*, sociologists are studying various coinages that are operative across social worlds and the resources they give access to. For instance, in *Keeping it Real*, Carter (2005) writes about non-dominant forms of cultural capital (NDCC) that she contrasts with theories of oppositional culture and reactive assimilation. She challenges the assertions of the “acting white” thesis that suggests that poor African-Americans reject education as an act of resistance. Drawing on ethnographic data, she documents a wider and richer range of attitudes that poor minority students have toward education and school culture. Foremost in Carter’s argument and evidence are the importance that students attach to educational achievement *and* to maintaining cultural authenticity in schools. The latter requires involvement with, and admiration for, non-dominant forms of cultural capital that are associated with African-American youth culture, through which students gain peer respect, but which may be read by teachers as disrespecting school values. Thus, Carter locates students in the broader cultural contexts in which they live, and the dynamics between various types of cultural coinage that are valued in their environment—not only those that are institutionally sanctioned. She also shows that meaning-making concerning the self should be factored into any explanation of school failure among urban youth.

Lareau’s (2004) *Unequal Childhoods* shows that middle class parents on the one hand, and working class and poor parents on the other hand, manage differently the extra-curricular

dominant class (or cultural capital), thus penalizing lower-class students. Extensive vocabulary, wide-ranging cultural references, and command of high culture are valued by the school system, and students from higher social backgrounds are exposed to this class culture at home. Hence, children from other classes, including the poor, are over-selected by the educational system. They are not aware of it, as they remain under the spell of the culture of the dominant class. They blame themselves for their failure, which leads them to drop out or to sort themselves into lower prestige educational tracks.

This work can be read as a direct extension of Karl Marx's and Friedrich Engels's Marx, Karl, and Frederick Engels. 1979. *The German Ideology*. London: Lawrence and Wishart. “dominant ideology thesis,” which centers on the role of ideology in cementing relations of domination by camouflaging exploitation and differences in class interests. However, the control of subjectivity in everyday life through the shaping of common sense and the naturalization of social relations is the focus of their attention. Bourdieu and Passeron broaden Marx and Engels by suggesting that crucial power relations are structured in the symbolic realm proper and are mediated by meaning. They *de facto* provide a more encompassing understanding of the exercise of hegemony by pointing to the incorporation of class-differentiated cultural dispositions mediated by both the educational system and family socialization.

In *Distinction* Bourdieu, Pierre. 1984[1979]. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press., Bourdieu applies this analysis to the world of taste and cultural practice at large. He shows how the logic of class struggle extends to the realm of taste and lifestyle, and that symbolic classification is key to the reproduction of class privileges: dominant groups define their own culture and ways of being as superior (opposing refined food to heavy food, linen to polyester, tennis to bingo, etc.). *style sheet forbids “e.g.” “i.e.” and “etc.”* Thereby they exercise “symbolic violence,” that is, impose a specific meaning as legitimate while concealing the power relations that are the basis of its force (Bourdieu and Passeron 1977[1970], p. 4). They define legitimate and “dominated” cultures in opposition: the value of cultural preferences and behaviors are defined relationally around binary oppositions (or boundaries) such as high/lower, pure/impure, distinguished/vulgar, and aesthetic/practical (p. 245). The legitimate culture they thereby define is used by dominant groups to mark cultural distance and proximity, monopolize privileges, and exclude or recruit new occupants for high status positions (p. 31). Through the incorporation of “habitus” or cultural dispositions, cultural practices have inescapable and unconscious classificatory effects that shape social positions. Thus, this framework accounts for how the cultural marginalization of the poor is central to processes of domination and to the reproduction of inequality.

activities of their children, thus providing them with different endowments or assets of cultural capital. Drawing on ethnographic fieldwork in a number of poor, working class, and middle class families, Lareau finds that middle class people favor “purposeful cultivation” and organize a large number of extra-curricular activities for their children. In contrast, working class and poor people favor “natural growth” and are much less involved in managing their children’s lives than are their middle class counterparts. The leisure time of the working class and poor is relatively unstructured and does not contribute to teaching children skills that middle class children learn and that would prepare them for professional life (self-directiveness, multitasking, leadership, and so on). Thus, Lareau shows how the use of “free time” contributes to the reproduction of class inequality, even beyond differences that can be explained simply by class differences in time and money. Differences are found in the types of cultural references, orientations, and habits of the mind (or habitus) that parents pass on to their children.¹⁴ Class differences are greater than differences within racial groups; for instance, the black and white middle class parents resemble each other in the way they manage children’s leisure time. This study shows that class differences in the ability to pass on advantages are crucial to understanding how cultural processes contribute to the reproduction of class and racial inequality. Moreover, it demonstrates that a cross-class analysis illuminates aspects of social processes of exclusion that remain invisible to studies that focus exclusively on the cultural world of the poor.

Studies of cultural capital qua cultural consumption help us understand how culture contributes to poverty by documenting patterns of cultural differentiation and segmentation across classes. For instance, drawing on the General Social Survey, Bryson (1996) shows how the middle class distinguishes itself from other groups by its omnivorous musical tastes—from pop to jazz and classical music, as it were. She also shows that members of the middle class appreciate “anything but heavy metal,” that is, they most dislike the musical tastes associated with groups socially and culturally farthest from their own (the working class, which appreciates heavy metal, and blacks, who like hip hop and rap). Thus, building on Bourdieu (1984), she shows that shared dislikes are as crucial to understanding boundary work as are patterns of cultural similarities. Meanwhile, the poor and the working class appreciate a smaller range of musical genres, and their narrowness acts as a class marker in a cultural universe that values cultural breadth. Bryson (1996) proposes that cultural tolerance constitutes a multicultural capital more strongly concentrated in the middle and upper classes than in the lower classes. In our view, such shared patterns of distastes and tastes result in culturally isolating practices for the privileged and poor alike, which work in conjunction with class- (and often race-) segregating institutions (housing, schools, families, cities, etc.) *style sheet forbids “e.g.” “i.e.” and “etc.”* to create pervasive us/them boundaries. Such insights must be incorporated in the literature on

¹⁴ In *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (1977), Bourdieu defines habitus as “the durably installed generative principle of regulated improvisations.” Repeated exposure to similar social conditions leads individuals to develop a set of *dispositions* toward action that are class-specific, or to simplify, specific to the distance toward material necessity that is characteristic of each class. One of the most successful applications of the concept has been MacLeod’s (1995) *Ain’t No Makin’ It*, in which the author studies two small groups of adolescent boys (whites and blacks) as they develop their aspirations in a housing project. He shows that as working class children, the white boys had developed a habitus (a set of “rules” about their own lives) through which they expected no more than working class lives. To speak of their habitus is to invoke the habitual element of their culture, whereby they expected a working class life because it had never occurred to them or their parents that another life was reasonably possible. In contrast, the high aspirations of the black boys stemmed, in part, from what they saw as the reduction in racial injustice that resulted from the civil rights struggles of their parents’ generation—thinking that their own opportunities would be greater than their parents’, their aspirations were appropriately higher.

poverty if we are to develop a more encompassing understanding of how cultural mechanisms contribute to the reproduction of inequality and, more generally, of how symbolic and social boundaries work together. Policies can sustain or challenge such boundaries, but they generally work in conjunction with cultural templates (see Steensland 2006, discussed below). *style sheet forbids “below” and “above”* Institutional discrimination may have a multiplier effect against this background of cultural differences. One of the challenges ahead is to tackle the cascading and compounding effects of cultural templates and institutions working together.

CULTURE AS INSTITUTION

A growing literature considers how institutional channels may have cascading or compounding effects on individual attitudes. These channels are germane to the goal of understanding mechanisms and opportunities for incorporation and exclusion. Institutions, defined either robustly, as formal and informal rules, procedures, routines and norms (Hall and Taylor 1996) or as socially constructed shared cognitive and interpretive schemas (Meyer and Rowan 1991), or more narrowly yet, as formal organizations, enable or constrain shared definitions and experiences of race, class, and gender, which in turn affect poverty. Thus, institutions are the last culture-related analytical device to which we turn. They are particularly salient when one considers how cultural constructs feed into poverty-related policy, as for instance when the latter resonates with institutionalized, taken-for-granted, boundaries.

Examining guaranteed annual income proposals in the 1960s and 1970s, Steensland (2006) analyzed the role of culture in the schematic, discursive, and institutional mechanisms leading to policy outcomes. In previous research, he suggests, explanations centered on the impact of social movements, state autonomy, and business interests and “the role of culture is recognized empirically, but disappears theoretically” (p. 10). In contrast, Steensland emphasizes interpretive feedback mechanisms (p. 9) and shows that supporters and opponents of guaranteed annual income proposals “use language that buttressed cultural categories of worthiness” (for example, welfare recipients versus the working poor, or “income supplement” versus “welfare support”), that in turn influenced the shape of policies. This illustrates how templates for categorization (or boundaries) encounter discursive opportunity structures that influence the likelihood that specific schemas diffuse, become institutionalized in policy, and affect who gets what. Moreover, “categories of worth exert institutional influence when they interlock with patterned practices in ways that channel routinized action.” (cite) In other words, through feedback or loop effects, boundaries become institutionalized, that is, largely taken for granted and embedded in policies, in informal organization, and in cultural practices. Institutional arrangements come to reproduce themselves and result in systematic exclusions of some categories of the population.

Such processes have consequences for how the poor are incorporated and “dealt with” across advanced industrial societies. For instance, Silver (2006) contrasts French, British, and other European policies of social inclusion (and their concerns with “social exclusion”) with American approaches that isolate the poor, namely through means-tested (as opposed to universal) welfare programs (Silver 1993). Such cultural *qua* institutional processes help explain patterns of racial incorporation (for instance, through laws against employment discrimination, or through social security and welfare) in these different contexts. For instance, Lieberman (2005) analyzes different configurations of “institutions, group-state linkages, and cultural repertoires” that result in the unintentional but systemic exclusion of blacks in favor of whites in

the United States, mediated by labor market access and state structure. In turn, individuals interpret the cultural frameworks sustained by policies to make sense of their place in the world. Similarly, drawing on in-depth interviews with welfare recipients, Soss (2005) describes how the latter understand their client status and the potential effectiveness of collective action (see also Soss and Mettler 2004) and (Jenson and Papillon 2001) on the framing of membership. Investigating such institutionalized processes requires reframing poverty knowledge within a broader perspective. It requires focusing less on individuals and more on structures and institutions, including the cultural and social mechanisms that maintain classification systems that demarcate the poor from “us” (O'Connor 2001b).

REMAINING CHALLENGES

The conceptual tools described so far illuminate aspects of processes that contribute to the production and reproduction of poverty, which processes cannot be captured by accounts provided by the culture of poverty thesis and its many implicit descendants. How low-income individuals draw on mainstream cultural frames and repertoires to make sense of their lives, the distinctive cultural templates through which they understand the paths to a good life, how they uphold multiple and often inconsistent beliefs, how they define who they are (and are defined) in opposition to others, and engage in cultural practices that may marginalize them, are all elements of an explanation. The picture that emerges is a far more complex and multidimensional than that generated by the assumption that living in poverty creates self-perpetuating and pernicious cultural orientations. Only by mobilizing a range of concepts that point to different cultural processes – as opposed to referring to “culture” broadly defined – can the relevant aspects be brought to light.

For the poverty literature to produce works that build on and improve upon the literature just described, several changes will be necessary.¹⁵ First, this literature should provide a broader understanding of how various disciplines accumulate empirical evidence. Certainly some of the ideas discussed here can be examined through quantitative, survey-based methods. Nevertheless, many are best studied through other data gathering techniques. Inductive research and field-based methods are a *sine qua non* if we are to capture the distinctive frameworks through which the poor make sense of their *lives* **life**. It is also uniquely suited to capture causation through path-dependency and process-tracing. Familiarity with a variety of methods is probably a requirement for fulfilling the promise of the field.

Second, concerns with endogeneity should not stop researchers from considering how culture-related phenomena figure in the production and reproduction of inequality. Indeed, while the question of what is cause and consequence is crucial for research that aims at assessing the relative significance of various factors in multivariate models, it is of much less relevance and consequence in studies concerned with process-tracing, where loop-back effects and other similar processes are common. This should be stressed because problems of endogeneity have often deterred quantitatively inclined social scientists from considering the causal role of culture.

Third, we need more heterogeneous views about how culture and poverty are causally related: cultural practices may shape responses to poverty, cultural repertoires may be limited by

¹⁵ The poverty literature is hardly unique in its use of a rather thin conception of culture. Indeed, building on Kornhauser (1978), social scientists studying crime and deviance are also leaving unexamined the impact of cultural mechanisms on their object (Sampson and Bean 2005), and those studying sexuality among the poor have also tended to use a theoretically impoverished model to understand patterns of behavior across a population (for a critique, see Fosse 2005).

poverty, cultural frames may be expanded by neighborhood poverty, cultural narratives may change irrespective of poverty, and so on. To consider whether cultural change will lead to structural change or vice versa is to ask the wrong question. This simple dichotomy is premised on the notion that “culture” has a single referent, as opposed to being a multivalent concept (indeed, a concept as fluid and multidimensional as that of structure). It is imperative that the terms of the debate be changed, to make room for conceptions of culture that go beyond thin accounts of simple preferences. This in turn should lead to more appropriate policy recommendations, based on more accurate and encompassing understandings of the social world in habited by the poor.¹⁶

A few recent poverty studies show the promise and potential pitfalls of rethinking how culture is examined. In *Promises I Can Keep*, Edin and Kefalas (2005) paint a convincing picture of how poor single mothers understand the place of fathers, husbands, and children in their lives. While they document in detail how poor white, black, and Latina women living in Philadelphia account for their lives, they do not spell out in their explanation how these accounts feed into the reproduction of poverty. They explain that their respondents give meanings to various aspects of their lives, which include (a) the meaning they give to marriage: if women do not marry, it is because they hold marriage in very high regard and wish to avoid divorce; (b) the meaning they give to children: if women do not postpone childbearing, it is because having a child is a source of self-esteem, given their low labor-market prospects; (c) the meaning they give to autonomy: if they hold off from marriage, it is in part to protect their independence from men through financial security. These cultural orientations (and others) intersect with the structural factors discussed by Wilson (1987), such as social isolation, to explain the high rate of non-marital birth among the poor. What is missing, however, is an explicit account of how one meaning is connected to another, and through what processes the women come to give a particular issue a given meaning—for example, whether tropes available from feminism, entertainment television, or Catholicism (especially among the Latina respondents) converged to produce the distinct meanings these women give to autonomy. Being clearer about such processes would lead to explicit and more detailed process-tracing with regard to the relationship between culture and poverty, and it would help us compare processes from case to case and from setting to setting.

Another example is Young’s *The Minds of Marginalized Black Men* (2004), based on interviews with 26 young, low-income African-American men. Young’s respondents clearly aspire to a college education, without knowing how to achieve it, in part because they are not in frequent contact with the college-educated. Their isolation from the middle class makes it difficult to engage in practices likely to lead to higher educational attainment. Thus, their firm belief in educational achievement cannot be easily translated into behavior.¹⁷ Just as these respondents value going to college but don’t have a cultural template of how to get there, Edin and Kefalas (2005)’s respondents value marriage, but view it as nearly unattainable because they

¹⁶ From our analysis, one should not conclude that there exist no cultural traits or orientations that are concentrated among various categories of poor people. There may be large differences in the types of verbal interaction and the words used among professional, working class, and low income parents when talking with their children (Hart and Risley 1995, for example, count class differences in numbers of words employed with children—in the tens of millions by as early as age 3; see also Farkas 2003). However, we suggest that such differences should be understood not through the prism of essential or permanent differences between class norms or attitudes, but as elements in a broader account that employs multiple analytical tools to examine the problem.

¹⁷ It is also the case that professing faith in these ideals is a means of acquiring cultural citizenship in a context of acute social exclusion, an issue Lamont has discussed elsewhere (Lamont 2000; Lamont and Molnar 2002).

posit that it requires “the white picket fence lifestyle” (2005 pp. 74, 111). The parallel between the findings of these two studies is striking and cries for further exploration of the disjuncture between the cultural toolkits made available by the American dream, the disconnect between these toolkits and the lived reality of some Americans, and how this disconnect results in the institutionalization of popular repertoires among the poor that may be dysfunctional from the perspective of social incorporation.

We hope our discussion has made clear that researchers are unlikely to understand racial disparities in poverty by looking at racial or ethnic “cultures,” in the sense of sets of values or attitudes that all or most members of a racial or ethnic (or class) group share. This idea was ineffective in its “culture of poverty” incarnation, and it has recently been shown to be of limited value in other realms as well – see for instance the criticisms of the “oppositional culture” thesis (Ainsworth-Darnell and Downey 1998; Cook and Ludwig 1998; Fordham and Ogbu 1986; Ogbu 1978). The concepts we have discussed all locate cultural process in individuals or in relations between individuals, rather than in groups. This suggests that the most promising venues for understanding racial disparities through cultural concepts lie in how *individuals* of different racial backgrounds face differential discrimination, access to structural opportunities, wealth advantages, social capital, and other opportunities and constraints. Cultural factors are more likely operating in conjunction with these factors than independently of them.

There is much work we have not covered and many issues we have ignored in this short article -- for example, (Patterson 1997; 2000) has attempted to demonstrate the long-term cultural impacts among African-Americans of the experience of slavery. While this and other studies are in some senses couched in older conceptions of culture, they nevertheless introduce a concern with meaning that has too often been neglected by poverty scholars. Such studies, which are mainstays of the poverty literature, show a way toward a more encompassing understanding of the intersection between culture and inequality. What remains to be done is to enrich this literature with the conceptual tools produced in other, more hospitable, terrains, so as to move toward a thicker understanding of the cultural mechanisms involved in the production of poverty. Without this import, a good part of the puzzle will remain unsolved.

- Abdelal, Rawi, Yoshiko M. Herrera, Alastair Iain Johnston, and Rose McDermott. 2006. "Identity as a Variable: A Guide to Conceptualization and Measurement of Identity." Cambridge, MA.
- Abelmann, Nancy. 2003. *Melodrama of Mobility: Women, Talk, and Class in Contemporary South Korea* The University of Hawaii Press.
- Ainsworth-Darnell, James W., and Douglas B. Downey. 1998. "Assessing the Oppositional Culture Explanation for Racial/Ethnic Differences in School Performance." *American Sociological Review* 63:536-553.
- Anderson, Elijah. 1999. *Code of the Street. Decency, Violence, and the Moral Life of the Inner City*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Bennett, Andrew, and Alexander George. 2005. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

- Berger, Peter L., and Thomas Luckmann. 1966. *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Bertaux, Daniel and Martin Kohli. 1984. "The Life Story Approach: A Continental View " *Annual Review of Sociology* 10:215-237.
- Borjas, George J. 2001. *Heaven's Door: Immigration Policy and the American Economy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1984. *Homo Academicus*. Paris: Editions de Minuit.
- . 1984[1979]. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre, and Jean-Claude Passeron. 1977[1970]. *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Bryson, Bethany. 1996. "Anything But Heavy Metal: Symbolic Exclusion and Musical Dislikes." *American Sociological Review* 61:884-99.
- Carter, Prudence. 2005. *Keepin' It Real: School Success Beyond Black and White*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Chin, Tiffany, and Meredith Phillips. forthcoming. "The Ubiquity of Oppositional Culture."
- Cook, Phillip, and Jens Ludwig. 1998. "The Burden of 'Acting White': Do Black Adolescents Disparage Academic Achievement?" Pp. 375-401 in *The Black-White Test Score Gap*, edited by Christopher Jencks and Meredith Phillips. Washington, DC: Brookings.
- Cornell, S., and D. Hartman. 1997. *Ethnicity and Race. Making Identity in a Changing World*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Crocker, Jennifwe., Brenda. Major, and Claude. Steele. 1998. "Social Stigma." Pp. 504-553 in *Handbook of Social Psychology*, edited by Daniel T. Gilbert, Susan T. Fiske, and Gardner Lindzey. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- DiMaggio, Paul. 1982. "Cultural Capital and School Success: the Impact of Status Culture Participation of the Grades of U.S. High School Students." *American Sociological Review* 47:189-201.
- Edin, Kathryn, and Maria Kefalas. 2005. *Promises I Can Keep: Why Poor Women Put Motherhood before Marriage*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Ellwood, David. 1988. *Poor Support: Poverty in the American Family*. New York: Basic Books.
- Ellwood, David, and Christopher Jencks. 2004. "The Uneven Spread of Single Parent Families: What Do We Know? Where Do We Look for Answers? ." in *Social Inequality*, edited by Kathryn Neckerman. New York: Russel Sage.
- Erikson, B. 1996. "Culture, Class and Connections." *American Journal of Sociology* 102.
- Ewick, Patrick, and Susan Silbey. 2003. "Narrating Social Structure: Stories of Resistance to Legal Authority." *American Journal of Sociology* 108:1328-72.
- Fordham, Signithia, and John U. Ogbu. 1986. "Black students' school success: Coping with the burden of 'acting White'." *The Urban Review* 18:176-206.
- Gallie, Duncan, and Serge Paugham. 2000. *Welfare Regimes and the Experience of Unemployment in Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gecas, V., and P.J. Burke. 1995. "Self and Identity." Pp. 41-67 in *Social Perspectives in Social Psychology*, edited by KS Cook, Fine GA, House J. Needham: Allyn & Bacon.
- Gertz, Clifford. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers.
- Goffman, Erving. 1963. *Stigma*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hall, John R. 1991. "The Capital(s) of Cultures: A Non-Holistic Approach to Status Situations, Class, Gender, and Ethnicity." in *Cultivating Differences: Symbolic Boundaries and the*

- Making of Inequality*, edited by Michèle Lamont and Marcel Fournier. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hall, Peter A., and Rosemary C. R. Taylor. 1996. "Political Science and the Three New Institutionalisms."
- Hannerz, Ulf. 2004[1969]. *Soulside: Inquiries into Ghetto Culture and Community*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Harding, David J. 2005. "'Mechanisms of Neighborhood Effects: Linking Culture and Structure to Adolescent Outcomes in Poor Neighborhoods.'" Ph.D. Dissertation." Program in Sociology and Social Policy, Harvard University.
- Hays, Sharon. 2003. *Flat Broke with Children: Women in the Age of Welfare Reform*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hochschild, Jennifer L. 1995. *Facing up to the American Dream*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Hogg, M.A., and D. Abrams. 1988. *Social Identification*. London: Routledge.
- Jenkins, R. 1996. *Social Identity*. London: Routledge.
- Jenson, Jane, and Martin Papillon. 2001. *The Changing Boundaries of Citizenship. A Review and a Research Agenda* Ottawa: Canadian Policy Research Networks.
- Jepperson, Ronald L., and Ann Swidler. 1994. "What Properties of Culture Should We Measure?" *Poetics* 22:359-371.
- Kant, Immanuel. 1982 [1781]. *Critique of Pure Reason*. Aalen: Scientia.
- Katz, Michael. 1989. *The Undeserving Poor: From the War on Poverty to the War on Welfare*. New York: Pantheon.
- Kefalas, M. 2001. *The Last Garden: Culture and Place in a White Working Class Chicago Neighborhood*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lamont, Michèle. 1992. *Money, Morals, Manners: The Culture of the French and American Upper Class*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 2000. *The Dignity of Working Men: Morality and the Boundaries of Race, Class, and Immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lamont, Michèle, and Marcel Fournier (Eds.). 1992. *Cultivating Differences: Symbolic Boundaries and the Making of Inequality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lamont, Michèle, and A. Lareau. 1988. "Cultural Capital: Allusions, Gaps, and Glissandos in Recent Theoretical Developments." *Sociological Theory* 6:153-68.
- Lamont, Michèle, and Viràg Molnár. 2002. "The Study of Boundaries Across the Social Sciences." *Annual Review of Sociology* 28:167-195.
- Lamont, Michèle, and Laurent Thévenot (Eds.). 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.
- Lareau, A. 2004. *Unequal Childhoods: Class, Race, and Family Life*. Berkeley, CA: University of California.
- Lewis, Oscar. 1969. *A Death in the Sanchez Family*. New York: Random House.
- Lieberman, Robert C. 2005. *Shaping Race Policy: The United States in Comparative Perspective*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Markus, H.R., and S. Kitayama. 1991. "Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion and motivation." *Psychological Review* 98:224-53.
- Marx, Karl, and Frederick Engels. 1979. *The German Ideology*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

- McRoberts, Omar. 2005. *Streets of Glory : Church and Community in a Black Urban Neighborhood*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mead, Lawrence M. 1986. *Beyond Entitlement: The Social Obligations of Citizenship*. New York: Free Press.
- Meyer, John W., and Brian Rowan. 1991. *Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Mooney, Margarita. forthcoming. "Analyzing Religion and Civil Society through the Lens of Haitian Immigrants in Miami, Montreal and Paris."
- Newman, K. 1999. *No Shame in My Game: The Working Poor in the Inner City*. New York: Knopf and the Russell Sage Foundation.
- Noh, Samuel and Violet Kaspar. 2003. "Perceived discrimination and depression: moderating effects of coping, acculturation, and ethnic support." *American Journal of Public Health* 93:232-238.
- O'Connor, Alice. 2001a. *Poverty Knowledge*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- O'Connor, Alice 2001b. *Poverty Knowledge: Social Science, Social Policy, and the Poor in Twentieth-Century U.S. History*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Ogbu, John U. 1978. *Minority education and caste: The American system in cross-cultural perspective*. New York: Academic Press.
- Patterson, Orlando. 1997. *The Ordeal of Integration: Progress and Resentment in America's "Racial" Crisis*. Washington, D.C.: Counterpoint/Civitas.
- . 2000. "Taking Culture Seriously: A Framework and an Afro-American Illustration." in *Culture Matters: How Values Shape Human Progress*, edited by Samuel P. Huntington and Lawrence E. Harrison. New York: Basic Books.
- Polletta, Francesca. forthcoming. *It was Like a Fever: Storytelling in Protest and Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Reicher, S., and N. Hopkins. 2001. "Psychology and the end of history. A critique and a proposal for the psychology of social categorization." *Political Psychology* 22:383-407.
- Schultz, A. . 1962. *Collected Papers, vol. 1*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Sewell, William H., Jr. 2005. *Logics of History : Social Theory and Social Transformation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sidanius, Jim, and Felicia Pratto. 1999. *Social Dominance : An Intergroup Theory of Social Hierarchy and Oppression*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Silver, Hilary. 1993. "National Conceptions of the New Urban Poverty: Social Structural Change in Britain, France and the United States." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 17:336-354.
- . 2006. "From Poverty to Social Exclusion: Lessons from Europe." in *Poverty and Race in America: The Emerging Agendas*, edited by Chester Hartman: Lexington Books.
- Small, Mario L. 2004. *Villa Victoria*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Small, Mario Luis. 2002. "Culture, Cohorts, and Social Organization Theory: Understanding Local Participation in a Latino Housing Project." *American Journal of Sociology* 108:1-54.
- Snow, David, and Robert Benford. 1992. "Master Frames and Cycles of Protest." Pp. 133-55 in *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*, edited by Aldon Morris and Carol Mueller. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

- Somers, Margaret. 1994. "Reclaiming the epistemological 'Other': Narrative and the social constitution of identity." in *Social Theory and the Politics of Identity*, edited by C. Calhoun. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Somers, Margaret, and Fred Block. 2005. "Two Hundred Years of Welfare Debate." *American Sociological Review* 70:260-288.
- Soss, Joe. 2005. "Making Clients and Citizens: Welfare Policy as a Source of Status, Belief, and Action." Pp. 291-328 in *Deserving and Entitled: Social Constructions and Public Policy*, edited by Anne Schneider and Helen Ingram: State University of New York Press.
- Soss, Joe, and Suzane Mettler. 2004. "The Consequences of Public Policy for Democratic Citizenship: Bridging Policy Studies and Mass Politics." *Perspectives on Politics* 2:55-73.
- Steedman, Carolyn K. 1987. *Landscape for a Good Woman*. New Brunswick NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Steensland, Brian. 2006. "Cultural Categories and the American Welfare State: The Case of Guaranteed Income Policy." *American Journal of Sociology* 111.
- Swidler, Ann. 1986. "Culture in Action: Symbols and Strategies." *American Sociological Review* 51:273-286.
- Tajfel, H., and J.C. Turner. 1985. "The Social Identity Theory of Intergroup Behavior." Pp. 7-24 in *Psychology of Intergroup Relations*, edited by Stephen and William G. Austin Worchel. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Valentine, Charles A. 1968. *Culture and Poverty: Critique and Counter-Proposals*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Waller, Maureen R. 2002. *My Baby's Father: Unmarried Parents and Paternal Responsibility*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Wilson, William J. 1987. *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wilson, William Julius. 1996. *When Work Disappears: The World of the New Urban Poor*. New York: Random House.
- Young, Alford A., Jr. 2004. *The Minds of Marginalized Black Men: Making Sense of Mobility, Opportunity, and Future Life Chances*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.