UC Merced
UC Merced Previously Published Works

Title

U.S. racial and ethnic relations in the twenty-first century

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7gn584t5

Journal
Ethnic and Racial Studies, 40(13)

ISSN
0141-9870

Authors
Valdez, Zulema
Golash-Boza, Tanya

Publication Date
2017-10-21

DOI
10.1080/01419870.2016.1262052

Peer reviewed

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

U.S. Racial *and* Ethnic Relations in the 21st Century

Zulema Valdez[a1] and Tanya Golash-Boza[b]

[a,b]Department of Sociology, University of California, Merced, Merced, USA

Abstract

The study of U.S. racial *and* ethnic relations is often reduced to the study of racial *or* ethnic relations. This article reveals the limitations of a focus on ethnicity or race, in isolation, and instead urges a new framework that brings them together. We consider three cases that have been conceptualized by the ethnicity paradigm as assimilation projects and by the race paradigm as structural racism projects, respectively: 1) African-American entrepreneurs; 2) the Mexican middle class; and 3) black immigrant deportees. We reveal the shortcomings of the ethnicity paradigm to consider race as a structural force or to acknowledge that structural racism conditions incorporation in marked ways; and the limitations of the race paradigm to take seriously group members' agency in fostering social capital that can mediate racial inequality. Instead, we offer a unifying approach to reveals how ethnicity and race condition members' life chances within the U.S. social structure.

Keywords

race relations, middle class minorities, assimilation, critical race theory, race and ethnicity, undocumented immigrants

[1] Zulema Valdez: zvaldez@ucmerced.edu, @_zulema_valdez

INTRODUCTION

US immigration scholars are primarily concerned with how immigrants and their descendants integrate into the United States economy and society, or "assimilate into the mainstream." These scholars use an ethnicity framework to understand the incorporation of immigrants – the vast majority of whom in the contemporary period are ethnic minorities. Studies have examined this process by investigating earnings and educational attainment (Portes and Rumbaut 1996; Alba 2005), the emergence of the minority middle class (Jimenez 2010), intermarriage (Bean and Lee 2011), ethnic enclaves (Portes and Bach 1980), ethnic entrepreneurship (Light and Bonacich 1988; Waldinger et al 2006) and the process of ethnic identity formation (Waters 1990), to name a few. The empirical objective of these studies is to assess the degree to which immigrant minorities reach parity with or converge to the social and economic outcomes of the dominant cultural group, i.e., middle class whites (Yinger 1995). More recently, researchers have broadened the reference group beyond whites, observing the gains made by second and later generation ethnics when compared against their first generation or middle class counterparts (Jimenez 2010; Vallejo 2009; Vasquez 2011a). Regardless of the measures or the reference group, the ethnicity paradigm highlights ethnic minority inclusion in American life (Alba 2003).

American race relations scholars, in contrast, are concerned with

persistent racial inequality. Drawing from race-centered theories, they argue that racism is structural and systemic, endemic to the social structure of the highly stratified U.S. economy and society (Bonilla Silva 1997, Feagin 2006). Consequently, observed racial inequality is an expected outcome that is maintained and reproduced over time (Feagin and Elias 2013). Contemporary research on structural racism has focused on topics ranging from colorblind racism (Bonilla-Silva 2006), scientific racism (Steinberg 2007), racial profiling (Glover 2009), mass incarceration (Alexander 2012) mass deportation (Golash-Boza 2015), to racism in public places (Feagin and Sikes 1994), the labor market (Browne and Misra 2003; Harvey 2005), housing (Rugh and Massey 2010), intimate relationships (Steinbugler 2012), and the like.

Researchers who investigate ethnic or racial relations are for the most part engaged in uncovering relationships of ethnic inclusion or racial exclusion, respectively; rarely do they entertain the possibility that both paradigms are valid or consider them together. We contend that these research programs are not engaged in a fruitful debate; instead, they talk past one another. The distinct epistemologies of the ethnicity and race paradigms inform the different meanings and salience of the concepts of race and ethnicity, influence the research questions that emerge, the types of ethnic and racial projects associated with them (Omi and Winant 1994), and ultimately the knowledge that they produce (Hunter 2002). The absence of dialogue between scholars engaged in ethnic or racial relations research

prevents a more comprehensive understanding of race and ethnicity, or how these social group formations combine to shape inclusion and exclusion within the United States social structure.

We identify the limitations of traditional approaches that focus on either ethnicity or race and instead suggest a new framework that considers how ethnicity and race combine to determine the life chances of members of groups that are ethnically and racially defined. Towards this end, we specify the following: 1) ethnicity and race are conceptually distinct categories of identity and group belonging; they are not interchangeable or tiered, although they both operate within the system of white supremacy; 2) the ethnicity paradigm is focused ultimately on observing ethnic incorporation or assimilation; the race paradigm is focused on revealing systemic racism and persistent racial inequality. In other words, the project of the ethnicity paradigm is one of inclusion; the project of the race paradigm is one of exclusion; 3) assimilation scholars engaged in an ethnicity project pose different research questions from those of structural racism scholars engaged in a race project. Research questions that stem from these distinct schools of thought are often unrelated with regard to their theoretical assumptions and empirical implications; and 4) methodologically, the ethnicity paradigm tends to emphasize meso- or group-level processes whereas the race paradigm emphasizes macro- or structural-level processes.[i]

By clarifying the conceptual differences between the categories of ethnicity and race, and the orientations of these different schools of thought,

we can begin to see how social groups that are based on these distinct affiliations work together and what they contribute to our understanding of group processes that condition social inclusion or exclusion in the U.S. To begin this much-needed conversation, we consider three separate cases that have been conceptualized by the ethnicity paradigm as assimilation projects and by the race paradigm as structural racism projects, respectively: 1) African-American entrepreneurs; 2) the Mexican-origin middle class; and 3) black immigrant deportees. We show how the way one would approach these cases – either through a race or an ethnicity framework – shapes the questions one might ask, the answers one might find, and the conclusions one might draw.

Our analysis reveals the limitations of the ethnicity paradigm because it does not consider race as a structural force distinct from ethnicity, nor does it acknowledge that structural racism and racial exclusion condition assimilation trajectories in marked ways. This oversight leads researchers to dismiss “unassimilable” groups from consideration altogether, or to rely on colorblind frames rooted in “culture” to justify persistent racial inequality. Likewise, this analysis exposes the limits of the race paradigm, which applies a structural racism framework to explain racism and racial inequality from everyday microaggressions to the development of new economies (e.g. the prison industrial complex). This macro-level approach dismisses evidence of socioeconomic incorporation among immigrant, ethnic, or racial group members, and the potential role of agency to offset or overcome structural

inequality. Instead, it predicts one outcome only: persistent racial exclusion (Omi and Winant 2013). Yet, ethnicity paradigm scholars have observed ethnic groups that have made strides toward or achieved parity with whites across a number of indicators. Finally, the race paradigm, in much the same way as the ethnicity paradigm, falls short of examining the effects of ethnicity as distinct from race even though doing so would likely broaden the range of this approach to account for different forms of exclusion based on ethnic markers, such as discrimination based on foreignness (Aranda and Vaquera 2015), the racialization of foreign language or accent (Davis and Moore 2014), and legal violence rooted in "illegality" (Menjivar and Abrego 2012).

Do racial minorities face permanent marginalization in the United States because of structural barriers, or is assimilation possible? How does white supremacy condition ethnic identity formation or the capacity to become "American"? In what ways can group solidarity or cohesion alter the life chances of racial minorities within a racially stratified society? How do processes of inclusion and exclusion work together? By bringing both the race and ethnicity paradigms together, we can start a new conversation that begins to answer these questions.

CONCEPTUALIZING RACE AND ETHNICITY

Race and ethnicity are not interchangeable concepts. The ethnicity paradigm defines ethnicity as providing a salient basis for group identity formation that is self-defined, adaptable, and embedded in notions of kinship, culture, and

shared history (Brubaker 2006; Yancey, Erikson and Juliani 1997; Wimmer 2013). Ethnicity is nevertheless fluid and dynamic, with respect to members' socially-constructed and contested meanings of belonging. Ethnicity offers a powerful basis of group association that may facilitate a process of integration; yet, full incorporation into a host country by ethnic group members may require the loss of ethnic characteristics and features associated with the home country as immigrants and their descendants adapt to those of the host society (Alba and Nee 2003). Related to the concept of ethnicity, panethnicity is a social group classification comprised of multiple ethnic subgroups that are perceived to share certain attributes and features (Lopez and Espiritu 1990). Research on panethnicity suggests that its emergence stems from group-based processes akin to that of ethnicity, sometimes linked to instrumental or strategic and often political action (Stokes 2003; Sanchez 2006). Furthermore, while this research may investigate ethnicity alongside panethnicity and even at times invoke a process of racialization (Ocampo 2013; Okamoto 2014); the explicit absence of race as an additional or separate social group category in this research suggests that the concept of panethnicity is often used interchangeably with race. The lack of a distinct consideration of race, racism, and racial structures in panethnicity research belies its ethnicity paradigm roots. For these reasons and due to space constraints, we see panethnicity as squarely rooted in the ethnicity paradigm tradition so do not focus on it as a separate category to be interrogated here (for more on this topic, see Valdez 2009,

2011b).

In contrast, race relations research conceptualizes race as a social construction that is externally-imposed. This paradigm underscores the unavoidable and compulsory classification of individuals into distinct races by the dominant group – non-Hispanic whites – based on ascribed phenotypical characteristics, such as skin color or hair texture, regardless of self-identification. This process of “race-making” determines members’ position within the U.S. racial hierarchy (Bonilla-Silva 1997; Feagin 2006). In the racially-stratified United States economy and society, racial classification is nontrivial; it is structurally important and confers greater or lesser privilege or oppression (Bashi 1998). Bonilla-Silva (1997, 469) underscores the conceptual differences between ethnicity and race:

> Ethnicity and race are different bases of group association. Ethnicity has a primarily sociocultural foundation, and ethnic groups have exhibited tremendous malleability in terms of who belongs; racial ascriptions (initially) are imposed externally to justify the collective exploitation of a people and are maintained to preserve status differences. Hence scholars have pointed out that despite the similarities between race and ethnicity, they should be viewed as producing different types of structurations.

In other words, ethnicity and race are distinct concepts capturing relationships that reproduce different aspects of the social structure.

The disciplinary area of “racial and ethnic relations” presupposes

research on race *and* ethnicity; yet, scholars tend to focus on one category or the other, use them interchangeably, or treat race as a subtype of ethnicity (Wimmer 2013, 7), thereby at least disregarding the conceptual distinctions between them and at most ignoring the violent material foundations of race and its essential role in the formation of the United States (Feagin 2001). However, as Loveman (1999, 891) cautions, "…the attempt to theorize the former ['race'] in intellectual isolation from the latter ['ethnicity']…limits our understanding of whether or to what extent these analytical categories actually capture theoretical and conceptual differences." That is, research programs that neglect to consider the distinctive and interrelated aspects of these categories limit our understanding of the ways in which race and ethnicity shape the American social structure and fail to explain the persistence and reproduction of each in society. We suggest that the singular focus on ethnicity on the one hand and race on the other, by scholars engaged in research on inclusion or exclusion, respectively, maps onto very different epistemologies that are tied to their respective paradigms. We further suggest that it is worthwhile to adjudicate these differences to better understand the relationship between them for a more comprehensive understanding of U.S. ethnic and racial relations. The goal of this exploration is not to dismiss the research on ethnicity or race as one-sided but rather to develop an understanding of their complexity, separately and together, in shaping the life chances of affiliated group members. We argue that by doing so, we can develop a paradigm that

simultaneously speaks to (ethnic) inclusion and (racial) exclusion.

The disparate objectives of these two distinct research programs can be traced to historically-contingent, contrasting ideological and theoretical assumptions that undergird their study. The ethnicity paradigm starts from the premise that, as Omi and Winant (1994) explain, there was a transition from biological race-thinking to cultural ethnicity-thinking. Efforts to explain persistent inequality shifted from biological inferiority to cultural difference; accordingly, and through a process of “eventual and inevitable” assimilation, immigrants and their descendants would join the American mainstream. Although earlier studies in this research tradition tended to explain the success or failure of a given group to assimilate in cultural terms, contemporary research on the post-1965 “second generation” brings in a contextual dimension that considers not only culturally ascribed traits, but how an ethnic group’s “modes of incorporation,” which include the composition of their ethnic community, their labor market opportunities, and targeted immigration policies, shape this process (Portes and Rumbaut 2006). Despite the consideration of such contextual effects, the ethnicity paradigm remains largely a meso-level theory that explains assimilation trajectories primarily as the result of ethnic group-specific attributes that interact with ethnic group-specific reception contexts that result in distinct patterns of incorporation (Portes and Rumbaut 2006; see Valdez 2011a).

Race paradigm scholars dismiss the premise behind the ethnicity paradigm, concluding that it gives short shrift to the primacy of race as a

structural force (Treitler 2015). They concede that the ethnicity paradigm acknowledges racial classification as one of many ethnic group features that may shape members' societal reception context, especially for "non-phenotypically white groups" (Portes and Rumbaut 2006); the implication that racial classification can be subsumed under ethnicity, however, does not recognize race as a distinct structural force that conditions racial exclusion and persistent inequality rooted in racially stratified hierarchies. In particular, the assumption that a given ethnic group faces a unique reception context that is based largely on its relationship to that context, such that, for example, Korean Americans experience a more favorable "context of reception" from that experienced by Mexican Americans, ignores the larger, racially-stratified social structure in which these groups are embedded, and which shapes the process of incorporation for both groups (Valdez 2011a). From a race paradigm perspective, different ethnic groups may encounter unique reception contexts, but such group-level processes take place within a system of white supremacy (Treitler 2013). Ethnic groups cannot avoid the racialized social structure or its effects regardless of their unique ethnic characteristics or distinctive societal reception.

At the same time, the race paradigm does not take seriously the agentic properties associated with racial or ethnic group membership, such as the development of group-based social capital, which may mobilize resources and support to facilitate the process of incorporation by minimizing or perhaps even overcoming the effects of racism. The

overemphasis on the role of race as a structural force that constrains change and reproduces racism does not allow for a consideration of how racial dynamics can transform or mediate unequal race relations.

The Ethnicity Paradigm – Assimilation

Classic assimilation theory detailed a gradual process of integration by Southern, Central and European immigrants and their descendants to the cultural and socioeconomic position of middle-class, white, Anglo-Saxon Protestants, at the turn of the last century. Alejandro Portes, Min Zhou, and colleagues (1992; 2006) offer an updated approach to assimilation for contemporary (post-1965) immigrants. They argue that today's immigrants face greater challenges to mainstream assimilation than those of the past because they are non-white and the economy has changed. They introduce segmented assimilation theory to capture this process. In addition to mainstream assimilation, specifically that of Anglo-conformity, this approach predicts two additional patterns of integration: ethnic cohesion (Zhou 1998), a delayed process of assimilation whereby some groups foster and maintain their own coethnic communities within the host society for ease of entry and settlement, which gives way eventually to mainstream assimilation; and downward assimilation, which predicts that disadvantaged groups will integrate into "permanent poverty and assimilation into the underclass" (Portes and Zhou 1992, 82).

Segmented assimilation theory offers an explanation for "destinies of convergence and divergence" (Zhou 1997, 84) among today's ethnic

minority groups (Portes and Zhou 1992; Alba and Nee 1997; Zhou 1997; Portes and Rumbaut 2001). Accordingly, some groups "may experience rapid social mobility" and demonstrate convergence to the social and economic outcomes of the American mainstream, while others "may end up in the lower rungs of the stratification order" and exhibit divergence (i.e. downward assimilation) (Alba and Nee 1997, 836). Although the segmented assimilation framework can apply to and account for a variety of assimilation trajectories, a challenge to this approach is its failure to convincingly explain assimilation (or lack thereof) among black Americans. Sixty years after Myrdal's *An American Dilemma* (1944), black exceptionalism persists in contemporary assimilation theory. Yet, rather than dismiss blacks from consideration altogether, segmented assimilation theory concludes that black immigrants and their descendants follow in the footsteps of disadvantaged African Americans, a trajectory of "downward assimilation" that relegates this group to a permanent and disadvantaged position outside the mainstream. Although the downward assimilation hypothesis concedes that discrimination may foster a negative reception context that ushers in this downward mobility pathway, it neglects to consider how structural racism conditions and reproduces this process in the first place. A theory that addresses divergent patterns of assimilation among ethnic and racial minority groups cannot ignore how structural racism shapes assimilation trajectories among racially-oppressed groups.

The Race Paradigm -- Systemic and Structural Racism

The United States is comprised of three interlocking systems of oppression and privilege: capitalism, patriarchy, and white supremacy. Capitalism conditions socioeconomic inequality through class; patriarchy conditions socioeconomic inequality through gender and sexuality; and white supremacy conditions socioeconomic inequality through race and ethnicity (Valdez 2011a). To understand the relationship between race, ethnicity, and inequality, an acknowledgment of social stratification rooted in a system of white supremacy is necessary. As will become clear, however, a singular focus on structural and systemic racism limits our understanding of the extent to which ethnicity plays a role in reproducing and challenging these structures of power and domination.

Systemic Racism. Systemic racism is "a diverse assortment of racist practices; the unjustly gained economic and political power of whites, the continuing resource inequalities; and the white-racist ideologies, attitudes, and institutions created to preserve white advantage and power" (Feagin 2001, 16). Systemic racism theory gives primacy to history: Joe Feagin (2001; 2006) explains that systemic racism exists because of the history of the United States as a slaveholding nation and settler-colonist society. Racial oppression was foundational to the history of the United States, and is deeply ingrained in our nation's history. Systemic racism in history and the present day has created a "white racial frame" which shapes the discourses, practices, and structures, of individuals and institutions in the United States. Scholars in this tradition observe that the white racial frame reproduce

racism through everyday discriminatory acts, from hailing a cab to outright physical assault (Feagin 1990), within the structure and functioning of institutions, like elite law schools and the U.S. legal system, which is based on the Constitution and Supreme Court cases but is nevertheless rife with examples of entrenched racism (Moore 2007). Feagin concludes that racism and racial inequality were created by whites, and continue to be perpetuated by white individuals and white-owned institutions (2001; 2006).

The unjust enrichment of whites through slavery and privileged access to resources since the founding of the United States is at the core of an understanding of systemic racism. This unjust enrichment of whites leads to unjust impoverishment of black Americans and other racial minority groups. Past and continuing discrimination has created a situation where black Americans and Latinos have been denied resources whites have come to take for granted – including good jobs, great schools, and well-resourced neighborhoods (Feagin and McKinney 2003; Feagin 2006). The pervasiveness of everyday acts of discrimination, combined with a legacy of unequal distribution of resources throughout every aspect of U.S. society, constitute systemic racism.

Structural Racism. Structural racism points to inter-institutional interactions across time and space. For example, racial inequality in housing leads to racial inequality in schooling, which in turns leads to racial inequality in the labor market. Across generations, this becomes a cycle – those parents who are less well-positioned in the labor market cannot afford housing in the

better neighborhoods that have the preferred schools, and the cycle continues for their children. A structural understanding of racism underscores the “structural relationships that produce racialized outcomes” (Powell 2008, 798).

Melvin Oliver and Thomas Shapiro (2006) offer a sharp analysis of the role of structural racism in reproducing wealth inequalities – today white Americans have 20 times the wealth of black Americans and 18 times the wealth of Latinos (Kochhar, Fry, and Taylor 2011). They explain that wealth inequality “has been structured over many generations through the same systemic barriers that have hampered blacks throughout their history in American society: slavery, Jim Crow, so-called de jure discrimination, and institutionalized racism” (12-13). Oliver and Shapiro (2006) point to three instances of structured inequalities that work together: 1) the transition from slavery to freedom without a material base; 2) the suburbanization of whites and the ghetto-ization of blacks; and 3) contemporary institutional racism in lending and real estate. These three instances work together to create a situation where blacks and Latinos have, on average, one-twentieth the wealth of whites.

Eduardo Bonilla-Silva proposes the concept of “racialized social systems” which refers to “societies in which economic, political, social, and ideological levels are partially structured by the placement of actors in racial categories” (1997, 469). Bonilla-Silva places particular emphasis on racial hierarchies and points to how these hierarchies influence all social relations.

Societies that have racialized social systems differentially allocate "economic, political, social, and even psychological rewards to groups along racial lines" (1997, 442). Bonilla-Silva's framework reflects a structural racism perspective insofar as he focuses on structures of inequality, hierarchies, and social relations and practices that reproduce and justify racial disparities.

For example, Bonilla-Silva contends that today's discourse and practice of "colorblind racism" reproduces racism by promoting the "common sense" notion that racial inequality has nothing to do with racism. Instead, racial disparities are rooted in bad choices, rather than understood as endemic to the larger society (Bell and Hartmann 2007). Eduardo Bonilla-Silva (2006) has identified four colorblind frames that buttress this stance, including abstract liberalism, or the assertion that all people are treated equally in America; cultural racism, or identifying racial inequality as the by-product of a specific group's cultural deficiencies or excellence (i.e., "culture of poverty" or "Tiger mom" arguments); the naturalization of racial group differences, which underscores "preferences" or "inclinations" as the culprit for observed racial differences; and lastly, the minimization of racism, which downplays the cost and consequences of racism. These colorblind frames provide various explanations and justifications for racial disparities that share in common the same basic premise: racial inequality in America is the result of "anything but racism" (Bonilla-Silva and Baiocchi 2001, 117). Ultimately, the discourse and practice of colorblind racism affirms racial

progress and democracy while masking persistent structural racial oppression.

Whether systemic racism or a racialized social structure, race scholars offer a macro-level approach to understanding racial inequality, from everyday acts of discrimination to institutional racism. These frameworks provide a powerful explanation for the observed exclusionary or negative effects of structural forces on the life chances of racial minorities. Yet, with such extreme structural barriers in place, how have some minorities been able to overcome poverty and join the middle class, serve in elected office, or enjoy fame and celebrity? Why is intermarriage on the rise and why do so many of the children of such unions reject the “one drop rule” and instead embrace biracial or multiracial identities, a decision that is recognized in the state-sponsored Census? How do we account for the fact that some minorities are successful? Borrowing from the ethnicity paradigm, race scholars might consider the potential for change that group-level processes capture. For example, group-based social and cultural capitals have been identified by ethnicity paradigm scholars as providing resources and support that combat discrimination. Likewise, the minority cultures of mobility framework, discussed in more detail below, suggests that middle class minorities develop cultural discourses and practices that offer some protection from the prejudice and discrimination they experience in mainstream institutions. Although race scholars observe the development of some group-level discourses, such as “racial counter-framing” (Feagin 2010,

155) which challenges negative stereotyping or colorblind racism, they do not observe race-based resource mobilization efforts (e.g. racial social capital) aimed at neutralizing the material effects of racism.

THEORIZING RACE AND ETHNICITY

Moving beyond the study of racial *or* ethnic relations and towards the study of racial *and* ethnic relations compels scholars of these separate paradigms to talk to each other. It forces scholars of race to consider how ethnic and racial group-level dynamics provide real, material benefits and opportunities, such as social capital, that may allow affiliated members to transcend their racial positioning in such a way that markedly affects their life chances. Likewise, a paradigm that situates racial and ethnic group dynamics within a context of white supremacy, challenges ethnicity paradigm scholars to take seriously the structural forces and contextual effects at play in a highly stratified system that significantly constrains the life chances of minorities.

THREE CASE STUDIES

We present three case studies that have typically been examined from an ethnicity or race paradigm. We then consider each case from the perspective of both. In so doing, we expose the theoretical assumptions and empirical implications that are contained within and the divergent conclusions that are drawn. This exercise does not attempt to present competing paradigms in order to adjudicate the fittest, because as we have argued, these paradigms

are not in conversation. Rather, we seek to motivate scholars engaged in ethnicity *or* race work to see the value-added in cultivating research that brings these different understandings together. The paradigmatic shift we are promoting, the bringing together of distinct yet interdependent social group formations that are consistently studied separately, is simply put, the study of ethnic *and* racial relations. This approach has the potential to move beyond the contemporary stalemate, thereby fostering innovative research that can begin to connect or transcend this (intra)disciplinary divide.

African-American Entrepreneurs

Most studies of ethnic entrepreneurship focus on those groups that disproportionately engage in this activity and use ethnicity-based approaches to explain why some ethnic groups are entrepreneurial and others are not. For example, Ivan Light (1972, 1988) and Jennifer Lee (2003) have written extensively on the entrepreneurial success of Koreans in the U.S.; Alejandro Portes and colleagues (1985, 1996, 2003, 2013) have focused much attention on upwardly mobile Cuban business owners; and Min Zhou (1992, 2007) has highlighted the case of Chinese ethnic enclave entrepreneurs from San Francisco to New York. These entrepreneurial groups are understood to share group-based factors that facilitate enterprise, including cohesive communities with collectivist orientations that rely on ethnic solidarity and social capital. In contrast, those groups with disproportionately low rates entrepreneurship, such as African Americans, are often overlooked or dismissed as independent self-employed workers

(Butler 2005).

The tendency of the ethnicity paradigm to neglect black entrepreneurship is not due to their low rates of participation only. It is also related to the primacy of ethnicity – the presumed significance of *ethnic* rather than *racial* group membership. When black enterprise is investigated, entrepreneurs' racial classification as black is downplayed whereas their ethnicity as African Americans is emphasized; proponents of this approach highlight the historical period between 1910 and 1930, when 4 million African Americans internally migrated from the South to the industrializing North. They contend that this internal "Great Migration" is analogous to the international migration and settlement experiences of foreign-born ethnic groups (Waldinger et al. 2006).

Explanations for African American entrepreneurs' marginal participation rates are rooted in a number of expected economic factors, such as limited human capital, or education and work experience. Cultural and community factors, however, are often implicated. For example, the black community has been blamed for hindering enterprise and reproducing social and economic disadvantages, as "…there is often a kind of collective expectation that new arrivals should not be 'uppity' and should not try to surpass, at least at the start, the collective status of their elders" (Portes and Rumbaut 2006, 87). The ethnicity paradigm attributes low rates of entrepreneurship among African Americans to an unfavorable context, such as a "negative societal reception" based on their "non-phenotypically white"

features, which may “hamper mainstream integration” (Pores and Rumbaut 2006). In this way, the ethnicity paradigm concedes that racial discrimination is operating for African Americans. Notably, a negative and discriminatory reception context is also applied to Asian entrepreneurs. However, whereas this situation is thought to dampen entrepreneurial activity among African Americans, the ethnicity paradigm concludes optimistically that, in the case of Asians, blocked mobility tends to increase entrepreneurialism as a form of “reactive solidarity.”

A race paradigm approach to black enterprise downplays the role of ethnicity, culture, or group-level traits, as explanatory factors and instead contends that structural forces rooted in racism constrain entrepreneurship among blacks and other racialized groups. These include racial segregation which ushered in the development of disenfranchised and impoverished minority communities with few resources or opportunities for business; institutional and statistical racial discrimination that inhibits the securing of a business loan, lease, or government contract; and the negative effects of consumer-based racial discrimination on the open market (Borjas and Bronars 1989; Harvey 2005).

The first author has examined black enterprise through the lens of the ethnicity and race paradigms together to better understand the ways in which group and structural level forces combine to shape their entrepreneurial outcomes. Her research revealed that black entrepreneurs’ reasons for starting their businesses were consistent with those of ethnic

entrepreneurs; they too wanted to make more money and “be [their] own boss”; likewise, they also accessed and used social capital in much the same way (non-black) ethnic entrepreneurs did. For example, both Korean and black entrepreneurs relied on their family and friends to start and maintain their businesses (2008). Moreover, black entrepreneurs reported using social capital to hire workers, access business information channels, and establish trust with workers and customers – strategies that, according to the ethnicity paradigm, are central to ethnic entrepreneurs’ success (2011). Unlike Korean entrepreneurs, however, black entrepreneurs were hindered by class disadvantages associated with structural racism that decreased the quality and quantity of their social capital resources and support. For example, black entrepreneurs were rarely able to rely on family or friends for substantial economic support, like borrowing startup-capital, which was not the case for more economically-established Korean-origin entrepreneurs. Not surprisingly, given the weaker class position of most black entrepreneurs and their limited access to social capital, they earned markedly less than Korean entrepreneurs. In one study, the first author found that almost 50 percent of black entrepreneurs fell into the lowest income-earning category, 25,000 dollars or less, whereas Korean entrepreneurs were among the highest earners, with 25 percent reporting annual earnings over 75,000 dollars (2008).

Like most ethnic entrepreneurs, black entrepreneurs reported discrimination from suppliers, customers, and others. Unlike ethnic

entrepreneurs, however, black entrepreneurs signaled that this unequal treatment was not merely an individual or personal concern, but instead was rooted in larger structural forces associated with a racialized social structure (2011). For example, Mr. Malone, a black business owner, decided to start his business because of problems he faced as “the only black franchise owner” in a Houston-based company. He had a difficult time securing a bank loan for his business (“I got turned down by the best of them”), which he attributed to being black, even as he acknowledged that the banks would never reject his application on that basis. Instead, “they give you a little sheet that says why you didn’t qualify for this and that and it’s all in their [the bank’s] own language. They [bank loan officers] don’t specifically tell you exactly why you didn’t get approved…” (2011). In support of Mr. Malone’s assertions, research on bank lending in Texas revealed that minority-owned firms are “denied credit at a higher rate,” “more likely to pay higher interest rates,” and experienced “credit discrepancies” more frequently than non-minority firms (Johnson, Schauer and Soden 2002, 19-20). Although disparities between non-minority and minority firms are often attributed to differences in education, work experience, and credit worthiness, there is overwhelming evidence that racial inequality in lending persists “even after controlling for differences in credit worthiness and other factors” (Robb and Fairlie 2006, 26). Fairlie and Robb (2008, 114) conclude that “…the evidence from the literature is consistent with the existence of continuing lending discrimination.”

In sum, black entrepreneurs relied on fewer resources, were more likely to report structural barriers to entry, collected and invested a smaller amount of startup capital, and ultimately made less money than quintessential ethnic entrepreneurs (2008; 2011). Although these findings are consistent with the ethnicity paradigm's claim that African Americans are not entrepreneurial, the suggestion that their cultural resources, group characteristics, or community solidarity are dissimilar from those of ethnic entrepreneurs was not supported. Their lower rates of entrepreneurship are linked instead to their more disadvantaged position, which constrains the economic impact of their racial community's social capital resources, and to structural and systemic racism in institutions such as banks, which negatively affect their ability to secure a business loan or real estate lease.

Ultimately, the ethnic entrepreneurship paradigm consistently underscores the cultural basis of ethnic business by attributing entrepreneurial activity to specific ethnic groups that possess certain group attributes, and non-entrepreneurial activity to ethnic groups that do not possess those characteristics. The emphasis on and primacy of ethnicity, however, lessens the extent to which race, as a central category of stratification, impedes (or facilitates) business ownership, and effectively constrains the study of American entrepreneurship to those (non-racial) ethnic groups with high rates of business ownership that are commonly associated with economic progress, like Koreans, Chinese, and Cubans (see Light and Bonacich 1988; Portes and Bach 1985; Portes and Rumbaut 2006).

By bringing together the central tenants of the ethnicity and race paradigms and applying them to the case of black enterprise, a more comprehensive understanding of entrepreneurship is developed, one which demands an accounting of the significant role that structural racism plays in constraining black enterprise, while acknowledging that black entrepreneurs also engage in group-based dynamics that are not unlike those of ethnic entrepreneurs.

The Mexican-Origin Middle Class

The emergence of the minority middle class has been examined from both an ethnicity paradigm and a race paradigm. Not surprisingly, studies that employ an ethnicity paradigm tend to investigate ethnic groups, like Mexican Americans, whereas race paradigm studies focus on racial groups, in particular, the black middle class. Equally predictable, those studies rooted in the ethnicity paradigm present evidence in support of ethnic minority incorporation; in contrast, race-centered studies underscore persistent disparities between the black and white middle class. It is worth investigating the minority middle class from the perspective of both paradigms together to expose the factors that determine processes of inclusion and exclusion.

Recent interest in the study of middle class Mexican Americans by ethnicity paradigm scholars can be traced back to earlier studies which focused on whether or not the U.S. Mexican-origin population as a whole would assimilate into the mainstream. Generally, researchers observed signs of convergence between Mexican Americans and non-Hispanic whites. For example, Grebler and colleagues (1970) found an increase in intermarriage

between these groups over time and generation; Massey (1981) found that the Mexican-origin population was less segregated from whites than blacks were; and high rates of familism and fertility declined over time in the U.S. (1978). In contrast to this evidence for acculturation, weaker evidence of socioeconomic assimilation led Massey to proclaim that “unlike other groups [Mexican Americans] never achieve parity with native white[s],” which he attributed to individual and group disadvantages and the size of the unauthorized population (Massey 1981). On balance, however, researchers concluded that “the process of immigrant assimilation is fundamentally one of social mobility” (Massey 1981, 72).

Recent research has focused on changes that occur between the first and second generations, reasoning that parity with whites might remain elusive but observing intergenerational shifts may signal assimilation in progress. For example, Waldinger and Feliciano (2004) observed that second generation Mexicans were closer to non-Hispanic whites in their rates of joblessness and earnings than their first generation counterparts, and Perlmann (2008) showed that second generation Mexicans earned more and were more likely to attend college than the first generation. In keeping with the predictions of the ethnicity paradigm, these studies confirmed that Mexican Americans were “moving ahead.”

Newer studies direct attention to a subgroup of the Mexican-origin population, the Mexican American middle class (Jimenez 2010; Vallejo 2012; Vasquez 2011). A focus on the middle class is constructive, as it permits

presumably an assessment of mainstream assimilation among the most "assimilable," by excising from consideration those members who are most "at risk" for downward assimilation, e.g., the unauthorized population. This research has investigated middle class Mexican Americans' racial and ethnic identity formation (Jimenez 201o), intermarriage (Vasquez 2011), patterns of "giving back" to family and community (Vallejo 2012), and labor market outcomes (Valdez 2006). These studies start from the premise that the Mexican middle class share the same class position as the white middle class. These studies observe evidence of assimilation across a number of indicators; yet, an enduring cleavage with whites persists.

Findings reveal that middle class Mexican Americans do not escape a process of racialization. They experience a negative societal reception based on perceived and ascribed characteristics, regardless of their class position, which results in a "bumpy" assimilation pathway. For example, Vasquez (2011) found that incidents of discrimination experienced by middle class Mexican Americans encouraged them to embrace their ethnic identity as a form of reactive solidarity. She also found that interracial marriage did not lead to "social whitening" as much as it resulted in biculturalism (2009). Similarly, Jimenez (2010) speculated that due to immigrant replenishment, or the unique pattern of Mexican migration typified by the perpetual arrival of new immigrants, middle class Mexican Americans have not been permitted to assimilate as fully as the earlier "wave" of white European immigrants did. In particular, he notes that middle class Mexican Americans are sometimes

perceived as unwelcome, unauthorized foreigners. Jimenez acknowledges the non-trivial role of race in this process, but downplays its centrality (2010, 154). Instead, he contends that immigrant replenishment is the crucial factor that impedes full assimilation for Mexican Americans, the absence of which allowed European immigrants to “become American.” Likewise, Vasquez (2011) suggests that racialization may hinder straight-line assimilation; however, it is one of many factors, including individual and background characteristics, gender, household strategies, family narratives, name, and immigrant replenishment, which combine to shape Mexican Americans’ “bumpy” assimilation trajectory. Although these researchers suggest that racialization results in observed discrimination against middle class Mexican Americans, they tend to minimize its impact, concluding that it does not deter Mexican Americans’ socioeconomic assimilation, which Vasquez (2011, 231) sums up as “racialization despite assimilation.”

Predictably, ethnicity paradigm studies emphasize ethnicity and its effects over race, even as they concede that Mexican Americans inevitably undergo a process of racialization. Moreover, these studies conclude that racialization does not affect their economic integration. These conclusions are consistent with the ethnicity paradigm, but hardly resonate with the race paradigm’s focus on structural and systemic racism. How might a race paradigm perspective challenge these conclusions? Does race matter for middle class minority incorporation?

Race paradigm studies of middle class minorities offer an alternate

perspective. For example, Mary Patillo-McCoy's (1999) nuanced study of the black middle class revealed differences between them and the white middle class that stemmed from historical and contemporary structural racism. Specifically, she found that job discrimination in the private sector, redlining, and racial bias in lending and housing, concentrated the black middle class in lower middle class occupations in the public sector, and segregated them in residential "black belts," away from whites but adjacent to impoverished black neighborhoods (Patillo-McCoy 1999). She shows convincingly that the black middle class has not achieved parity with the white middle class, and at best, remain relegated to the lower middle class. Likewise, Feagin (2006) argued that the black middle class confronts structural racism in public places and institutions, including racial profiling by police and store clerks, poor or no service in restaurants, and racial slurs or hate-based violence on the street (Feagin and Sikes 1994). These race paradigm projects conclude that structural racism reproduces racial inequality among middle class minorities, regardless of their class position. Oliver and Shapiro (2006, 93) go further, stating that any "realistic appraisal of the economic footing of the black middle class reveals its precariousness, marginality, and fragility." They determine that the white middle class and black middle class constitute "two nations," separated by race. The salience of structural racism observed in these race paradigm studies is largely absent in ethnicity paradigm accounts.

The few studies that offer a race-centered approach to the Mexican

American, Puerto Rican, or Latino middle class tend to emphasize a pattern of exclusion that is similar to studies of the black middle class. These studies have revealed differences between middle class whites and Mexican Americans in wealth, occupational segregation, racial profiling, school tracking, or what Ochoa (2014) has labeled, “academic profiling,” and political disenfranchisement (Bedolla 2005). Yet, the emphasis on racial exclusion masks the observed social and economic progress that some second and later generation Mexican Americans have achieved, as documented by ethnicity paradigm scholars.

The minority cultures of mobility framework (Neckerman, Carter, and Lee 2010; Vallejo 2012) offers an insightful starting point to consider ethnicity and race paradigms together. This approach does not ask whether contemporary ethnic minorities will follow in the footsteps of European immigrants. Instead, it recognizes at the outset that racial stratification excludes ethnic minorities from “becoming white,” regardless of class. As such, middle class minorities are expected to experience racism in majority-minority relations and institutions which predictably affects their process of incorporation. To alleviate or lessen the negative impact of racism, the minority middle class develops “cultures of mobility.” This strategy is particularly salient for the middle class, who are more likely than their poor or working class counterparts to interact with whites as a consequence of their presence in predominately white spaces. Accordingly, Vallejo (2012) found that the Mexican middle class developed minority cultures of mobility

that included seeking out and participating in Hispanic professional organizations and maintaining cultural, bicultural, and symbolic ties to their ethnic community. By fostering such connections, the Mexican middle class enjoyed support and protection from the psychological cost of racism that characterized their majority-minority relations.

This framework concludes that middle class minorities do not and cannot follow an Anglo conformity or “straight-line” trajectory of assimilation; and moreover, that unequal race relations negatively impact their everyday interactions with non-Hispanic whites in significant ways. At the same time this perspective accepts uncritically the premise that the economic position of the minority middle class, by definition, is similar to that of the white middle class, even as it concedes that full integration into the white mainstream is beyond their reach. As follows, this approach goes beyond the traditional ethnicity paradigm in that it recognizes race as a structural force and underscores its centrality in fostering unequal minority-majority relationships. Nevertheless, and unlike the race paradigm, it falls short of acknowledging the real material impact that structural racism has on middle class minorities’ capacity to achieve economic parity with whites.

Aranda and Rebollo (2004) offer another approach that examines the impact of structural racism on middle class minorities. They argue that “the racialization of ethnicity has resulted in ethnoracism,” (2004, 913) which is part of a system of racial oppression. From their perspective, race in America now includes ethnicity, culture, and nativity, or “cultural identities,” (2004,

917) along with inherited traits like phenotype. Notably, this approach blends race and ethnicity together. Although it is useful to consider how ethnoracism affects Puerto Ricans (the subject of their study) and other “sandwiched” groups, it fails to account for those groups that are racialized without regard to any perceived cultural identifiers, i.e. African Americans.

The decision of these scholars to include structures of racial oppression alongside ethnicity as a central component of their analyses moves the conversation forward and in a productive direction. That said, these approaches are not comprehensive; the minority cultures of mobility framework only applies to middle class minorities, whereas the ethnoracism approach is limited to Asian and Latina/o “sandwich” groups. A framework that provides a new and more comprehensive approach will require comparative studies that go beyond the black/white or Asian/Latino binaries, spark innovative research that investigates aspects of inclusion and exclusion as delineated by the ethnicity and race paradigms, and that can be extended to all members of a given group, regardless of class, nativity, or legal status.

The Deportation of Black Immigrants

Scholars who investigate the experiences of black immigrants tend to use either an ethnicity or a race paradigm. Those scholars who use an ethnicity paradigm often use assimilation or segmented assimilation frameworks to explore immigrant integration. The segmented assimilation framework, which has become dominant among immigration scholars, holds that the

children of immigrants tend to integrate into U.S. society in one of three ways: 1) assimilation into mainstream society; 2) selective acculturation; or 3) downward assimilation (Portes and Zhou 1993; Zhou 1997; Portes and Rumbaut 2001). Downward assimilation occurs when the children of immigrants are unable to attain middle class status and identify with the experiences of low-income, native-born blacks and Latinos instead of adopting the optimism of their parents (Kao and Tienda 1995). This downward trajectory is explained to some extent due to discrimination and resource deprivation, yet there is a significant focus on the exposure of children of immigrants to “norms of behavior inimical to mobility and lifestyles and attitudes that reinforce these behaviors” (Portes, Fernandez-Kelly and Haller 2004, 11).

A general idea set forth in this literature is that the children of immigrants who have access to and take advantage of group-based resources are better off than those who do not. With regard to Jamaicans, for example, Mary Waters (1994, 802) contends that “some Jamaican Americans … are experiencing downward social mobility while others are maintaining strong ethnic ties and achieving socioeconomic success.” This statement implies that immigrant youth are either protected by their ethnic cohesion or exposed to the norms of marginalized native-born black and Latino youth around them.

This focus on group-based resources and on individual-level characteristics such as the human capital of immigrants and their ability and

aspirations leaves little room for a consideration of structural racism. Portes, Fernandez-Kelly, and Haller (2004), for example, talk about poverty in inner cities, yet do not mention failing schools, the lack of social services, or the heavy policing of neighborhoods where immigrant youth of color live. Similarly, Kasinitz, Mollenkopf, Waters, and Holdaway (2008, 303) argue that black and dark-skinned immigrants "face more systematic and authoritative racial boundaries" than their lighter skinned counterparts. However, their focus is more on individual-level discrimination than on structural racism.

Ethnicity scholars often make an explicit or implicit comparison between second generation immigrant and African American youth. Their contention that ethnic cohesion provides some protection for immigrant youth certainly holds some truth. However, this raises a question for race scholars about the role ethnic cohesion plays in the protection of African American youth: how does African American culture and group cohesion protect black youth? Another key question we ask is: protection from what? For many ethnicity scholars, ethnic cohesion serves as protection from the norms and values of inner city youth. For race scholars, the main thing youth need protection from is the effects of structural racism.

Whereas ethnicity scholars focus on immigrant integration across generations, scholars who have analyzed the Dominican and Jamaican experiences from a critical race perspective rarely mention the immigrant (or ethnic) experience as part of their analyses. Randol Contreras (2013), for example, explains how Dominican youth in the South Bronx get involved in a

criminal lifestyle. He focuses on the systemic conditions which led to urban blight in the Bronx. Contreras (2013) links these structural conditions with individual agency when he argues that selling drugs offers young people a way to earn income while holding on to their dignity and self-respect. Unlike immigration scholars, he does not mention group-based resources. Although his research focuses on first and second generation Dominican immigrants, he does not cite Peggy Levitt's work on Dominican "transnational villagers" or Mary Waters' work on "black identities." Additionally, the words "assimilation" and "transnationalism" do not appear in the text. This is more of an observation than a criticism, yet it shows the wide chasm between Contreras' book on Dominican "Stick-Up Kids" and Peggy Levitt's (2001) book on Dominican "Transnational Villagers" and the general lack of conversation between race and ethnicity scholars. In this case, the singular focus on structural racism and individual agency does not leave room for a consideration of the importance of the immigrant roots or ethnic characteristics of these groups.

What happens when we attempt to apply both racial and ethnic paradigm approaches to understand the experiences of black immigrants? An analysis of the deportation of black immigrants allows us to consider this question with a group that is both ethnically and racially distinct from the majority population. We focus in this section on Dominicans and Jamaicans because of their high rates of deportation, especially deportations on criminal grounds. Proportionally speaking, Jamaicans and Dominicans are the

legal permanent residents most likely to be deported. About ten percent of legal permanent resident deportees have been Jamaican, yet Jamaicans make up less than two percent of all legal permanent residents. About 20 percent of legal permanent resident deportees have been Dominican, yet Dominicans make up less than 4 percent of the legal permanent resident population. Both Jamaicans and Dominicans are about five times as likely as other legal permanent residents to be deported (Golash-Boza 2015). How do the race and ethnicity paradigms help us to answer this question of why Jamaican and Dominican legal permanent residents are more likely to be deported than other national origin groups?

For ethnicity scholars, the high deportation rates of Jamaicans and Dominicans are best understood as consequences of downward assimilation – implying that, in order to be deported, these immigrants must have adopted the norms and values of marginalized groups. Haller et al (2011), for example, contend that arrest and incarceration are indicators of downward assimilation. In contrast, a structural racism perspective makes it evident that, similar to African-Americans, living in black neighborhoods render Jamaican and Dominican immigrants more vulnerable to arrest and incarceration – regardless of their attitudes or immigrant optimism. Incarceration has become a common event for black American men: sociologists Betty Pettit and Bruce Western (2004) point out that black men born in the 1960s were more likely to have been incarcerated than they were to have served in the army or gone to college.

The rate of incarceration of Jamaicans is higher than that of native-born whites (Hagan and Palloni 1999). A critical race perspective would attribute high incarceration rates to the fact that Jamaican and Dominican immigrants often live in neighborhoods with high levels of drug activity and arrests (Kasinitz 1992; Kasinitz et al 2008; Contreras 2013). An ethnicity perspective would attribute these high rates to the context of reception as well as individual attributes. When we bring these perspectives together, we can see that Dominican and Jamaican immigrants assimilate into neighborhoods with high levels of crime and violence and that these neighborhoods are heavily policed because of the racial politics of policing. Whereas ethnicity scholars would benefit from taking into consideration the structural barriers black immigrants face, race scholars would benefit from considering the extent to which ethnic resources may affect their trajectories.

When we bring these two perspectives together, we achieve a fuller accounting of the experiences of black immigrants and their children as well as a more nuanced comparison with the experiences of African American youth. When we look at black immigrants from a combined perspective, we can ask: Does ethnic cohesion protect youth from structural racism? We also can ask: In what ways and in what communities do black immigrant youth find sources of group-based identification? How do processes of inclusion *and* exclusion work for black immigrant youth? In these ways, a combined perspective offers a more accurate portrayal as well as fosters new

directions in research.

RACE AND ETHNICITY IN LATIN AMERICA

We hope that by this point we have made it clear that a distinction between race and ethnicity is useful for the U.S. context and that a combined approach that looks at race as well as ethnicity is a fruitful endeavor. This, however, raises the question of the utility of this framework for non-U.S. contexts. Some scholars of comparative ethnicity contend that the ethnicity framework is best suited for international comparative work because ethnicity translates across contexts in ways that race does not (Brubaker 2002, 177-178; Loveman 1999; Wimmer 2013, 7-8). Specifically, they posit that race is “a subtype of ethnicity” and best understood as an “ethnosomatic” category (Wimmer 2013, 7-8). Rogers Brubaker (2002, 167) has gone further, calling into question whether race scholars are focusing on observed inequalities that can be traced to actual (racial) “groups” at all.

Our approach offers a middle ground: we reject the notion that race is a subtype of ethnicity and instead recognize that ethnicity and race are conceptually distinct categories; at the same time, we believe that the study of racial and ethnic relations in the United States requires an integrated approach that brings together these separate conceptual categories together to truly understand how privilege and oppression, inclusion and exclusion, and micro-, meso-, and macro-level forces operate under a U.S. social structure that is embedded in a system of white supremacy. We recognize the utility of examining race and ethnicity together for a more

comprehensive understanding of social stratification; and we do so without buying into the notion that race and ethnicity are two sides of the same coin, or that comparative approaches require a blurring of these conceptually distinct categories, or that, in reducing race to a subtype of ethnicity for comparative purposes, the resulting study somehow illuminates or contributes to a clearer understanding of the study of racial and ethnic relations in the United States or abroad. For these reasons, we believe that our approach can contribute to new directions in comparative race studies.

As we will demonstrate below, it is not necessary to blur the lines between race and ethnicity in order to understand how these categorizations work in settings other than the United States. In Latin America, for example, a distinction between race and ethnicity is useful. Similar to the United States, there is a divide between scholars who use an ethnicity lens versus those who use a race lens. In Latin America, this divide often breaks down along the lines of indigeneity versus blackness. Specifically, scholars who explore indigeneity often use an ethnicity lens to explore culture, language, and customs whereas scholars who consider the African diaspora tend to use a race lens to explore marginalization and discrimination. The inclusion/exclusion optic is also useful here insofar as the research on indigeneity highlights difference and the problems of cultural assimilation whereas the research on blackness highlights how black Latin Americans are unfairly excluded.

In Peru, for example, scholars who focus on indigeneity do so through

the concept of *mestizaje* – racial or cultural mixing. For example, Orlove (1998) argues that, in Peru, a person is more Indian and less *mestizo* on the basis of his or her proximity to the earth. Indians are more likely to walk with bare, muddy feet, whereas mestizos are more likely to wear leather shoes. The focus here is clearly on cultural attributes. Scholars of indigeneity in Peru often argue that Indians can be whitened through acculturation (de la Cadena 2000; Ortiz 2001). When indigenous people discard their language, clothes, and customs, they become *mestizos* and thus closer to white. In contrast, this process of acculturation is simply not available to Peruvians who are racially defined as black. The second author's research in Peru reveals that black Peruvians do not perceive blackness as something that could be erased by virtue of changes in cultural or social features. Cultural and social whitening are not possible for black Peruvians because of the centrality of skin color in definitions of blackness. This is part of a pattern in Latin America whereby *mestizaje* has fundamentally different meanings for blacks, whites, and Indians. Just as race and ethnicity scholars in the United States could engage in more fruitful investigations through more dialogue, more dialogue is needed between scholars of blackness and indigeneity in Latin America. In the Peruvian case, scholars of indigeneity would do well to take a closer look at structural racism to understand the structural barriers that block mobility among indigenous peoples. (One example of a project that does this is a recent book by Arthur Scarritt (2015).) At the same time, studies of African-descended Latin Americans also need to take into account

the extent to which community and social networks offer opportunities for black mobility. Without going into an extended discussion of the particularities of Latin America, this brief glimpse into the uses of race and ethnicity in that region should make it clear that the theorization we are proposing has utility beyond U.S. borders.

Nevertheless, the distinctions between race and ethnicity we are proposing are primarily useful in context similar to the United States. The racial context in the United States is one where Europeans created the idea of race to justify the genocide of Native Americans and the enslavement of Africans (Smedley 2007). The ethnic context in the United States is one of substantial successive waves of immigration over centuries. This specific context has produced particular ways of thinking about race and ethnicity that do not necessarily translate across countries.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The case studies demonstrate how a consideration of the ethnicity and race paradigms together foster a more complete understanding of the relationship between ethnic and racial classification, the distinct group dynamics that are constituted by such classifications, and the ways in which ethnicity and race as intersecting dimensions of identity and collectivity condition processes of inclusion and exclusion differently. Methodologically, these separate paradigms tend to consider different levels of abstraction -- the ethnicity paradigm focuses on group-level processes, such as ethnic networks or social capital that facilitate immigrant incorporation in enterprise

or foster upward mobility, whereas the race paradigm tends to underscore structural-level processes, such as institutional discrimination in lending, systemic racism in residential segregation, and draconian immigration laws that inflict legal violence upon racialized immigrants. When considered together, these paradigms provide a clearer understanding of how group and structural level processes shape ethnic and racial dynamics, and how they combine to condition inclusion and exclusion within the highly stratified American social structure. Findings reveal that inclusionary processes based on ethnicity may sometimes generate social and economic resources and support such that some ethnic groups may transcend or mediate the effects of structural racism; at the same time, exclusionary processes based on race may have devastating effects for some racial groups, such that, and regardless of the compensatory effects of social capital, racial groups cannot overcome. By considering the theoretical assumptions and empirical implications of both paradigms together, a more nuanced understanding is revealed that identifies the factors that shape inclusion and exclusion among ethnic and racial group members in the United States.

By connecting two separate threads of sociological knowledge – the ethnicity paradigm, with its focus on group dynamics and inclusion, and the race paradigm, which considers race as a structural force that conditions exclusion, our approach reveals how systems of oppression and privilege that comprise the highly stratified U.S. social structure condition the life chances of actors from multiple, and likely intersectional, dimensions of

identity and collectivity. After all, from our perspective, it is incomplete to conclude that the positioning of groups along one structural dimension (i.e. “race”) can reasonably predict their life chances, because those who identify as such are likely to vary across other salient dimensions as well (i.e., “ethnicity”). Regarding assimilation, for example, the suggestion that a specific group’s social and cultural capital or reception context can explain economic integration neglects a serious consideration of structural racism, and how racial classification, as an intersecting and interdependent social grouping combines with ethnicity to shape such outcomes. Neither ethnicity nor race, in isolation, can fully account for the life chances of group members who share ethnic and racial classifications. Ultimately, a complete explanation of racial and ethnic relations in the US and abroad requires an understanding of how distinct yet intersecting dimensions of race *and* ethnicity combine to shape the position of group members and their process of inclusion or exclusion within highly stratified societies.

References

Abrego, Leisy. 2014. *Sacrificing Families.* Palo Alto, Ca: Stanford University Press.

Alba, Richard and Victor Nee. 1997. “Rethinking Assimilation Theory for a New Era of Immigration.” *International Migration Review*, Vol. 31, No. 4, pp. 826-874.

Alba, Richard and Victor Nee. 2003. *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Alexander, Michelle. 2011. *The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness*. New York: The New Press.

Aranda, Elizabeth M. and Guillermo Rebollo-Gil. 2004. “Ethnoracism and the “sandwiched” minorities.” *American Behavioral Scientist* 47(7):910-927.

Bashi, Vilna. 1998. “Racial Categories Matter Because Racial Hierarchies Matter: A

Commentary.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies,* 21: 5: 959-969.

Bedolla Garcia, Lisa. 2005. *Fluid Borders: Latino Power, Identity, and Politics in Los Angeles.* Berkeley, Ca: University of California Press.

Bonilla Silva. 1997. “Rethinking Racism: Toward a Structural Interpretation.” *American Sociological Review,* 62: 465-480.

Bonilla Silva. 2006. *Racism without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in the United States*, Third Edition. New York:

Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.

Borjas, George J., and Stephen G. Bronars. 1989. “Consumer Discrimination and Self-Employment.” *Journal of Political Economy*, 97: 3: 581-605.

Bourgois, Philip. 2003. *In search of respect: Selling crack in El Barrio.* Cambridge University Press.

Brotherton, David and Luis Barrios. 2011. *Banished to the Homeland: Dominican Deportees and Their Stories of Exile.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Browne, Irene and Joya Misra. 2003. “The Intersection of Gender and Race in Labor Markets.” *Annual Review of Sociology,* 29: 487-513.

Brubaker, Rogers. 2002. “Ethnicity without Groups,” *European Journal of Sociology,* 43(2):163-189.

Cavalluzzo, Ken, Linda Cavalluzzo and John Wolken. 2002. Competition, Small Business Financing, and Discrimination: Evidence from a New Survey. *Journal of Business,* 75(4):641-679.

Bulter, John Sibley. 2005. *Entrepreneurship and Self-Help Among Black Americans: A Reconsideration of Race and Economics.* New York: State University of New York Press.

Chiswick, Barry R. 1978. “The Effect of Americanization on the Earnings of Foreign Born Men.” *Journal of Political Economy*, 86: 5: 897-921. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 1997. “How Much Difference is Too Much? Black Feminist Thought and the Politics of Postmodern Social Theory.” *Current Perspectives*

in Social Theory, 17: 3-37.

Comfort, Megan. 2007. “Punishment Beyond the Legal Offender.” *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 3: 1: 271–296.

Contreras, R. 2012. *The stickup kids: Race, drugs, violence, and the American dream.* Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Cornell, Stephen and Douglas Hartmann. 1998. *Ethnicity and Race: Identities in a Changing World*. Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press.

Davis, Tiffany Y. and Wendy Leo Moore. “Spanish not spoken here: Accounting for the racialization of the Spanish language in the experiences of Mexican migrants in the United States,” *Ethnicities* 14(5):676-697.

de la Cadena, Marisol. 2000. *Indigenous Mestizos: The politics of race and culture in Cuzco, Peru, 1919-1991*. Duke University Press.

Fairlie, Robert and Alicia Robb. 2004. Families, Human Capital, and Small Business: Evidence from the Characteristics of Business Owners Survey. New Haven: Yale University. IZA Discussion Paper 1296 (871).

Feagin, Joe R. 2006. *Systemic Racism: A Theory of Oppression.* New York: Routledge.

Feagin, Joe R. 2010. *The White Racial Frame: Centuries of Racial Framing and Counter-Framing.* New York: Routledge.

Feagin, Joe and Sean Elias. 2013. “Rethinking Racial Formation Theory: A Systemic Racism Critique.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 36: 6.

Feagin, Joe, Hernan Vera and Pinar Batur. 2000. *White Racism.* New York: Routledge.

Feagin, Joe and McKinney. 2003. "Diverse Perspectives on Doing Anti Racism: The Younger Generation." In *White Out*, edited by Doane and Eduardo Bonilla Silva.

Gallagher, Charles. 2003. White Reconstruction in the University. In *Privilege: A Reader*, edited by Abbey Ferber and Michael Kimmel. Colorado: Westview Press.

Giddens, Anthony. 1996. "Affluence, Poverty, and the Idea of a Post-Scarcity Society." *Development and Change*, 27: 2: 365-377.

Ochoa, Gilda. 2013. *Academic Profiling: Latinos, Asian Americans, and the Achievement Gap.* Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.

Glover, Karen. 2009. *Racial Profiling: Research, Racism, and Resistance.* Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield.

Golash-Boza, Tanya. 2014. "Forced transnationalism: transnational coping strategies and gendered stigma among Jamaican deportees." *Global Networks*, 14: 1: 63–79.

Golash-Boza, Tanya and Pierrette Hondagneu-Sotelo. 2013. "Latino Immigrant Men and the Deportation Crisis: A Gendered Racial Removal Program." *Latino Studies*, 11: 3.

Golash-Boza, Tanya. 2015. *Deported: Immigrant Policing, Disposable Labor, and Global Capitalism.* New York: New York University Press.

Gonzales, Roberto. 2011. "Learning to be illegal undocumented youth and shifting legal contexts in the transition to adulthood." *American Sociological Review* 76: 4: 602-619.

Gordon, Milton. 1964. *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Grebler, Leo, Joan W. Moore, and Ralph C. Guzman. 1970. *The Mexican American People: The Nation's Second Largest Minority.* Santa Barbara, California: La Causa Publications.

Hagan, J., & Palloni, A. 1999. Sociological Criminology and the Mythology of Hispanic Immigration and Crime. *Social Problems*, 46: 4: 617–632.

Haller, W., Portes, A., & Lynch, S. M. 2011. "Dreams Fulfilled and Shattered: Determinants of Segmented Assimilation in the Second Generation." *Social Forces*, 89: 3: 733–762.

Harvey, Adia W. 2005. "Becoming Entrepreneurs: Intersections of Race, Class, and Gender at the Black Beauty Salon." *Gender and Society,* 19: 6: 789-808.

Huntington, Samuel P. 2004. The Hispanic Challenge. Foreign Policy, March/April. http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2004/03/01/the_hispanic_challenge.

Hunter, Margaret. 2002. "Rethinking Epistemology, Methodology, and Race: or, is White Sociology Really Dead? *Race and Society,* 5: 2: 119-138.

Jimenez, Tomas. 2010. *Replenished Ethnicity: Mexican Americans, Immigration, and Identity.* Berkeley Ca: University of California Press.

Johnson, Steve A. David Schauer, and Dennis L. Soden. 2002. "Analysis of Small Business Lending in Texas." *IPED Technical Reports*, Paper 18.

Kasinitz, Philip. 1992. *Caribbean New York: Black Immigrants and the Politics*

of Race. New York, New York: Cornell University Press.

Kasinitz, Philip, John Mollenkopf, Mary Waters, and Jennifer Holdaway. 2008. *Inheriting the City: The Children of Immigrants Come of Age*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Kochhar, Rakesh, Richard Fry, and Paul Taylor. 2011. “Wealth Gaps Rise to Record Highs Between Whites, Blacks, and Hispanics.” PEW Research Center.

Lee, Jennifer. 2002. *Civility in the City: Blacks, Jews, and Koreans in Urban America.*

Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Lee, Jennifer and Frank D. Bean. 2010. *The Diversity Paradox: Immigration and the Color Line in 21st Century America*. Russell Sage Foundation, New York.

Levenstein, Margaret. 2004. African American Entrepreneurship: The View from the 1910 Census. In *Immigrant and Minority Entrepreneurship: The Continuous Rebirth of American Communities*, edited by John S. Butler and George Kozmetsky. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger Publishers.

Levitt, Peggy. 2001. Transnational Migration: Taking Stock and Future Directions. *Global Networks,* 1: 3: 195-216.

Light, Ivan H. 1972. *Ethnic Enterprise in America: Business and Welfare among Chinese, Japanese and Blacks*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Light, Ivan Hubert and Edna Bonacich. 1988. Immigrant Entrepreneurs: Koreans in Los

Angeles. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Loveman, Mara. 1999. “Is Race Essential? Comment on Bonilla-Silva.” *American Sociological Review*, 64: 891-898.

Markowitz, Peter L. 2010. “Deportation is Different.” *Journal of Constitutional Law*, 13: 5: 1299-1361.

Massey, Douglas S. 1981. “Dimensions of the New Immigration to the United States and the Prospects for Assimilation.” *Annual Review of Sociology,* 7:57-85.

Massey, Douglas. 1978. “Effects of Socioeconomic Factors on the Residential Segregation of Blacks and Spanish Americans in U.S. Urbanized Areas.” *American Sociological Review,* 44: 1015-1022.

Massey, Douglas and Nancy Denton. 1998 [1993]. *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass.* Massachusetts: Harvard University Press

Menjivar, Cecilia and Leisy Abrego. 2012. “Legal Violence: Immigration Law and the Lives of Central American Immigrants. *American Journal of Sociology* 117(5): 1380-1421.

Moore, Wendy Leo. 2007. Reproducing Racism: White Space, Elite Law Schools, and Racial Inequality. New York: Routledge.

Myrdal, Gunnar. 1944. *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy* New York: Harper and Brothers.

Neckerman, Katherine, Prudence Carter and Jennifer Lee. 1999. “Segmented Assimilation and Minority Cultures of Mobility.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies,* 22:

6: 945-965.

Ocampo, Anthony. 2014. “Are second-generation Filipinos ‘becoming’ Asian American or Latino? Historical colonialism, culture, and panethnicity.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 37(3): 425-445.

Okamoto, Dina. 2014. *Redefining Race: Asian American Panethnicity and Shifting Ethnic Boundaries.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

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

Omi, Michael and Howard Winant. 1994. *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s*. New York: Routledge

Omi, Michael and Howard Winant. 2013. “Resistance is Futile?: A Response to Feagin and Elias.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies,* 36: 6.

Orlove, Benjamin S. 1998. "Down to earth: race and substance in the Andes." *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 17: 2: 207-222.

Ortiz, Alejandro. 2001. “El Término Raza como Homonimia.” In *La Pareja y el Mito. Estudios sobre las Concepciones de la Persona y de la Pareja en los Andes Lima*, edited by Alejandro Ortiz. Lima, Peru: Fondo Editorial de la Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú.

Patillo-McCoy, Mary. 1999. *Black Picket Fences: Privilege and Peril Among the Black Middle Class Neighborhoods.* Chicago, Il: University of Chicago Press.

Perlmann, John. 2007. *Italians Then, Mexicans Now: Immigrant Origins and Second Generation Progress, 1890 to 2000.* New York: Russell Sage

Foundation.

Western, Bruce, and Becky Pettit. 2005. “Black-White Wage Inequality, Employment Rates and Incarceration.” *American Journal of Sociology*, 111: 2.

Portes, Alejandro and Richard Bach. 1985. *Latin Journey: Cuban and Mexican Immigrants in the United States.* Berkeley, California: University of California Press.

Portes, Alejandro and Ruben G. Rumbaut. 1996. *Immigrant America*, Second Edition. Berkeley, Ca.: University of California Press.

Portes, Alejandro and Ruben Rumbaut. 2001. *Legacies: The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation.* Berkeley, Ca.: University of California Press.

Portes, Alejandro and Ruben Rumbaut. 2006. *Immigrant America: A Portrait*. Berkeley, Ca.: University of California Press.

Portes, Alejandro and Min Zhou. 1992. Gaining the Upper Hand: Economic Mobility among Domestic Minorities. *Ethnic and Racial Studies,* 15: 4: 491-522.

powell, john 2008. "Structural racism: Building upon the insights of John Calmore." *North Carolina Law Review.* 86 (2007): 791.

Fairlie, Robert and Alicia Robb. 2004. “Families, Human Capital, and Small Business: Evidence from the Characteristics of Business Owners Survey.” New Haven: Yale University, Economic Growth Center Working Paper/IZA Discussion Paper 1296 (871).

Rugh, Jacob S. and Douglas S. Massey. 2010. “Racial Segregation and the American Foreclosure Crisis.” *American Sociological Review*, 75: 5: 629-651.

Sanchez, Gabriel R. 2006. “The Role of Group Consciousness in Political Participation Among Latinos in the United States.” *American Politics Research* 34(4):427-450.

Scarritt, Arthur. 2015. *Racial Spoils from Native Soils: How Neoliberalism Steals Indigenous Lands in Highland Peru*. Lexington Books.

Smedley, Audrey. 2007. *Race in North America: Origin and evolution of a worldview*. Westview Press.

Steinberg, Steven. 2007. *Race Relations: A Critique*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.

Steinbugler, Amy. 2012. *Beyond Loving: Intimate Racework in Lesbian, Gay, and Straight Interracial Relationships.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stokes, Atiya Kai. 2003. “Latino Group Consciousness and Political Participation.” *American Politics Research* 31(4):361-378.

Telles, Edward and Vilma Ortiz. 2008. *Generations of Exclusion: Mexican Americans, Assimilation, and Race.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Treitler, Vilna. 2013. *The Ethnic Project: Transforming Racial Fiction into Ethnic Factions.* Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.

Treitler, Vilna. 2015. "Social Agency and White Supremacy in Immigration Studies"

Sociology of Race and Ethnicity 1:1.

Valdez, Zulema. 2006. “Segmented Assimilation among Mexicans in the Southwest.” *The Sociological Quarterly*, 47: 397-424.

Valdez, Zulema. 2009. “Agency and Structure in Panethnic Identity

Formation: The Case of Latino Entrepreneurs," pp. 200-213 in *How the United States Racializes Latinos: White Hegemony and Its Consequences,* Jose Cobas, Jorge Duany, and Joe R. Feagin, eds. Boulder, Co: Paradigm Publishers.

Valdez, Zulema. 2011a. *The New Entrepreneurs: How Race, Class, and Gender Shape American Enterprise.* Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.

Valdez, Zulema. 2011b. "Political Participation among Latinos in the United States: The Effect of Group Identity and Consciousness," *Social Science Quarterly* 92(2):466-482.

Vallejo, Jody A. 2009. "Latina Spaces: Middle-Class Ethnic Capital and Professional Associations in the Latino Community." *City and Community*, 8: 2: 129-154.

Vallejo, Jody A. 2012. *Barrios to Burbs: The Making of the Mexican American Middle Class.* Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.

Vasquez, Jessica. 2011. *Mexican Americans Across Generations: Immigrant Families, Racial Realities.* NY: New York University Press.

Vickerman, Milton. 1999. *Crosscurrents: West Indian Immigrants and Race.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Waldinger, Roger, Howard Aldrich, Robin Ward and Associates. 2006. *Ethnic Entrepreneurs: Immigrant Business in Industrial Societies.* Newbury Park: Sage.

Waters, Mary C. 1990. *Ethnic Options: Choosing Identities in America.* Berkeley, California: University of California Press.

Waters, Mary. 1994. Ethnic and Racial Identities of Second-Generation Black Immigrants in New York City. *International Migration Review*, 28: 4: 795-820.

Waters, Mary. 2001. *Black Identities: West Indian Immigrant Dreams and American Realities* Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA.

Wilson, Kenneth and Allen W. Martin. 1982. "Ethnic Enclaves: A Comparison of Cuban and Black Economies in Miami." *American Journal of Sociology,* 88: 1:135-160.

Wimmer, Andreas. 2013. *Ethnic Boundary Making: Institutions, Power, Networks.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Yancey, William, Eugene Erikson and Richard Juliani. 1976. "Emergent Ethnicity: A Review and Reformulation." *American Sociological Review,* 41: 391-403.

Yinger, John. 1995. *Closed Doors, Opportunities Lost: The Continuing Costs of Housing Discrimination*. Russell Sage Foundation, New York, New York.

Zhou, Min. 1997. "Segmented Assimilation: Issues, Controversies, and Recent Research on the New Second Generation." *International Migration Review,* 31: 975-1019.

Zhou, Min. 1992. *New York's Chinatown: The Socioeconomic Potential of an Urban Enclave.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Zhou, Min and Carl L. Bankston III. 1998. *Growing Up American: How Vietnamese Children Adapt to Life in the United States.* Russell Sage Foundation, New York.

[i] This is not to say that scholars engaged in race research fail to consider the role of ethnicity, or that ethnicity scholars ignore the role of race; however, the way in which they understand these concepts and their effects is through the lens of their own paradigm's primary focus. That is, the salience of race in ethnicity research is often relegated to a secondary or additive role and vice versa. Likewise, individual-level characteristics associated with "values," "skills," or "resiliency," and how such attributes influence specific outcomes are readily incorporated into race or ethnicity research as offering a partial but subordinate explanation. The ethnicity paradigm's emphasis on the meso-level effect of ethnicity or the race paradigm's attention to macro-level processes associated with race is in keeping with each paradigm's organizing principles. Our cases serve to illustrate this point.