CAMBIO

Rivista sulle trasformazioni sociali

CAMBIO

Michael Eve

[Established and Outsiders in the Migration Process]

Elias and current approaches in migration studies

The "outsiders" of Elias and Scotson's study were, among other things, immigrants: there were almost no foreigners in Winston Parva, but almost all the (adult) inhabitants of the Estate (Zone 3) came from outside - many from London, others from various parts of Britain. In contrast, the families living in "the village" (Zone 2) had been there mostly for two or three generations (Zone 2 was built in the 1880s) and were thoroughly established. The difficulties of breaking into social networks and forms of social interaction in associations, clubs, pubs and informal social circles make up a central insight of *The Established and the Outsiders*, for Elias and Scotson show convincingly how much this structural position – the fact of arriving later and thus having to participate in social circles where the rules have been established by other people and where one faces a cohesive group – counts in social divisions and in power differentials. In other words, migration forms an important part of the explanatory structure of the book, the description of social relations which are associated with attitudes and behaviour in the various parts of the town.

Of course Elias considered that the established-outsider distinction could be used to analyze a very wide variety of hierarchical relationships. In this article I want to restrict my attention to the hierarchies associated with migration. Internal migration deserves to be more widely studied by sociologists (Eve 2001) because it provides interesting test cases where the patterns found cannot be explained by citizenship disadvantages (all players being national citizens)[1] and where explanation of divisions in terms of "cultural differences" between migrants and natives at the very least requires caution. This is important because so much sociological study of migration has been study of international immigration, and it has tended to be assumed that the basic problem is one of "integration" of different "peoples".

This national-cultural framework is clear in a highly influential early text like Park and Burgess' *Introduction to the Science of Sociology* (1924). A significant part of this work is concerned with "contacts between peoples" ranging from invasions to colonization, and immigration and subsequent assimilation is seen as just one such contact. In the following passage Park and Burgess (1924: 734) draw an analogy with national minorities within European states:

> In America the problem has arisen from the voluntary migration to this country of people who have abandoned the political allegiance of the old country and are gradually acquiring the culture of the new. In both cases [in the USA and in Europe] the problem has its source in an effort to establish and maintain a political order in a community which has no common culture.

The classic framework of assimilation theory set out in Park and Burgess' book needs to be seen in this wider context: it is a framework which imagines a gradual fusion of two different peoples/nations/races each with its own culture (cf. Wimmer 2009 on the prevalence of this Herder-like identification of people and culture in both past writings and today).

It is not particularly surprising that scholars writing soon after the end of the world war sparked off at Sarajevo, which resulted in the explosion of three empires into a flush of new national states, should see peoples, races and

---

[1] In some countries internal migrants do of course suffer from legal handicaps in access to rights and services for many non-democratic regimes have tried to restrict internal mobility. At present, for example, the majority of China's 200 million or so internal migrants are "irregular" and thus barred from access to a number of rights. However, there are many other cases of internal migration where this kind of handicap does not exist.

nations as the fundamental building blocks of modern history, the real social units. Since then notions of nations, peoples and ethnic groups (let alone races) have been endlessly dissected: one might cite the influence which Barth (1969), Gellner (1983) or Hobsawm and Ranger (1983) have exercised in many disciplines. In migration studies, however, this kind of work seems to have had somewhat more tangential influence, at least on the practice of research. Although it is frequent to find brief references to, say, Barth, and assertions of an anti-essentialist perspective, in many cases what Brubaker (2004, e.g. p. 3) calls a "complacent constructivism" seems to prevail in the actual analysis. In other words, scholars may assert at the beginning of an essay that national or ethnic groups are social constructions, and then proceed as usual in their actual analysis, treating ethnic categories as unproblematic groups. In migration studies as elsewhere, the perspective persists mainly in implicit form. However, I believe that it nonetheless has many effects. For example, on the way objects of study are defined. As Gerd Baumann (2003: 151) has noted, research students tend to be given topics like «Turks in Berlin, Berbers in Paris or Sikhs in New York», as though the ethnic group in question was defined in advance and constituted the relevant ambiance for the lives of the people concerned. Or on the ways data are organized in tables; and on the relationships which are considered most worth following up - e.g., those involving co-nationals, thus displaying "community solidarity", or those involving contrasts with another ethnic group.

The same "national-cultural" perspective, embodied in a host of methodological practices constituting the object of study can be seen also in choices deciding what are interesting research questions. It is worth reflecting, for example, on the enormous quantity of attention dedicated to the question of identity - meaning the "national" identification of migrants and above all their children.

Like Brubaker (2004) and Wimmer (2009), I therefore believe that, notwithstanding declarations of the socially constructed nature of ethnic, racial and national boundaries, in actual practice scholars still tend to proceed as if there were pre-constituted ethnic groups; and so proceed as if the relationships in question should be analysed in terms of the characteristics (e.g., interests and cultural incompatibilities) of the groups - we might say, peoples - in question. In Elias' terms, a whole set of intellectual practices bear the mark of how deeply we tend to assume that national states (or even national origin at one or two removes) necessarily constitutes the pertinent unit of analysis and the key for explaining the various sociological features associated with migration (cf. Elias' criticism of the tendency to implicitly identify "society" with the nation-state, e.g. Elias 1978: 243ff.). In this context Elias and Scotson's book has an obvious importance. *The Established and the Outsiders* deals with prejudice and social closure in a context where the distinctions in question are created locally, not on the basis of pre-existing stereotypes or categories derived from hierarchical relations between nations and "peoples". The national-cultural perspective I claim still has an important part in shaping research on immigration is clearly not directly applicable in Winston Parva, where the stigmatized group are not foreigners or of a different "race" or religion or national origin – and yet the kinds of divisions are profoundly similar to those described elsewhere. As is already stated in the first edition of the book, and made still clearer in Elias' new Introduction to the second edition, one of the main objectives of the work is to contest the orthodox approach in the fields of "race relations" and "ethnic relations". It thus has a particular importance for researchers in these fields. I believe the persistence of what I have called a "national-cultural" definition of the research object in migration and ethnic studies (surprisingly consistent since at least the beginning of the last century) is due in large part to the lack of an alternative framework. Elias' attempt to combine analysis of class stratification and of migration is a clear candidate as such an alternative – although one which has not been widely used. Precisely because it does provide an alternative, it seems worthwhile to re-examine the work, drawing out some themes more explicitly, and discussing some of the problems in the reasoning.

In this essay, therefore, I will treat Elias and Scotson's book as a contribution to understanding certain relationships between migration, social divisions and local power relationships (without of course denying the potential of the idea of established and outsiders to be applied to other areas). This seems particularly important at a time when students of social stratification are becoming massively interested in migration and its long term effects on children of migrants (cf. among many works, Heath, Cheung 2007). For Elias clearly wanted the book to be also a critique of current notions of class, defined essentially in terms of position in the occupational structure. *The Established and the Outsiders* can in fact be seen as an attempt to describe inequalities arising out of migration which neither sees them in national-cultural terms nor reduces them to class inequalities as conventionally conceived.

However, before considering some of the logic of Elias and Scotson's reasoning and its implications, I wish to present some evidence regarding other cases of social divisions connected with internal migration; for this provides elements pertinent to the argument and raises some problems in Elias and Scotson's account.

Inequalities often associated with regional migration — but not always

First of all, it is therefore worth noting that the distinction between "old residents" and "newcomers" was not a peculiarity to Winston Parva: there is considerable evidence that — in some circumstances — regional migration becomes an important basis for the local class structure. A well-documented case of systematic differences in the local class structure linked to migration comes from Turin in northern Italy. Survey evidence from Turin shows major splits in the educational and occupational achievement of the *second* generation of regional migrants. The data show that these inequalities remain after controlling for the education and occupation of parents. Space restrictions do not permit presentation of the results here and so I refer to results in Ceravolo *et alii* 2001; Eve 2010 (cf. also Ceravolo 2002 and Impicciatore, Dalla Zuanna 2006 for similar results using different sources). I will only say that in Turin among the children of parents born in Southern Italy, the chances of gaining a high school diploma or university degree are far lower: among "Piedmontese-origin" interviewees, 85% had a high school diploma or university degree, as against only 45% of "Southerners". Logistic regression confirms the strong effect of "region of origin" on educational qualifications independently of the classical sociological variables of class of origin or parents' education (see Ceravolo *et alii* 2001). This had enormous effects on the occupation and social status: while the child of a local was typically in a skilled or technical job and only 9% in manual work, a third of children of Southerners were in manual jobs and only 10% in professional or managerial posts.

Of course, the division between South and North Italy is well-known abroad — and sometimes used in too facile a way as an interpretative key. So the disadvantage of children of southerners might appear not too incompatible with the "national-cultural" framework I have criticised — simply the destiny of a group arriving from a less-developed area, in rather the same way as foreign immigrants. However, detailed examination of the results - including examination of the careers of children of an earlier group of labour migrants from North-East Italy, and comparison of the results of children born in Turin or arriving at different ages - do not support this interpretation. Children of migrants from the Veneto have careers intermediate between those of locals and children of Southerners (independent of occupation and education of parents), as we would expect given the earlier date of their parents installation in Turin. And children born in Turin or arriving in the city before school age do much better in school than those arriving later (as we would expect remembering the initial difficulties of families in the early stage of migration, and the difficulties involved in changing schools). A range of other evidence supports the thesis of inequalities generated within the migration process itself and not by cultural specificities of the families of origin (Eve 2010, Ceravolo *et alii* 2001, Ramella 2003).

Results from Turin and elsewhere thus bring out marked - and lasting - divisions in the local stratification structure associated with migration, which cannot be reduced to the conventional sociological variables of families' occupation or education. However, I now wish to consider some other research results which present evidence similar to Elias and Scotson's regarding some of the mechanisms of exclusion of "newcomers", but which do not seem to have the same results. Seen together with the results showing lasting disadvantage among regional migrants, I suggest this raises some problems with Elias and Scotson's account.

As Elias and Scotson recognize, the basic problem of integrating into a network already established is one which is faced to some extent by all immigrants. Comments similar to those of Winston Parva immigrants regarding the "coldness" of people in the new place can be found scattered in many pieces of research: some of the comments of both newcomers and locals are surprisingly similar, whether or not the newcomers in question are foreigners, whether the immigrants are manual workers or more highly qualified, and whether they form part of a "mass migration" to the new town or are "individual" migrants. This backs up Elias and Scotson's thesis that the problems of "integration" into social circles in a new place are very general — classic problems of the growth of networks.

Among the various works which could be cited in this context, Bozon's (1984: 50-51 and passim) study of Villefranche-sur-Saône in South East France is particularly valuable because it is very difficult to think of "cultural differences" as being at the root of the divisions found there, since most of the migrants interviewed came from the surrounding Beaujolais region (Villefranche is indeed usually seen as the centre of the region and the archetype of the cultural traits which are supposed to typify the region). Even differences in manners of the kind discussed by Elias and Scotson (rough vs. respectable, more or less controlled or civilized, etc.) do not come out in interviews. Nor were the migrants interviewed by Bozon concentrated at the bottom of the occupational hierarchy: there was a mix of middle class and working class migrants. Yet many of these predominantly local migrants found social "integration" sufficiently difficult to adopt a weekend commuting pattern – going back to their "home" during the weekends, where they spent most of their social life.

Among the patterns which emerge we may mention the widespread use of group terms – newcomers being termed outsiders or "foreigners" (*étrangers*), and their various origins being lumped together in a way which did not reflect reality. Locals recounted standard anecdotes about the newcomers, while the latter made standard complaints about the "unfriendly" nature of the natives, sometimes relating such traits to an almost inherent cultural disposition. Newcomers commented on the gossip of locals and the fact that nothing went unnoticed, while locals referred to the lack of commitment of newcomers to the local community. Many long-term migrants to Villefranche, in spite of having lived so many years in the town, say they «don't know anyone here». As Bozon (1984: 62-5) points out, this assertion is the parallel of the phrase uttered by some locals: «I know everyone here». In neither case are the statements strictly true, but they aptly reflect the ideologies of belonging and not belonging, and identifying with the place. Anecdotes abound as to the lack of welcome from neighbours or in associations. More generally, there was a tendency among migrants to say they did not have "real friends" in the new place: real friends were either "back home" or, if in the new place, with other non-natives. Several of Bozon's interviewees describe, for example, the difficulty of participating actively in conversations where large numbers of the people mentioned are known to everyone else but not to the newcomer. A teacher who had lived in Villefranche for 25 years recounts how this kind of experience makes him feel very much a "foreigner", even though he had lived longer in Villefranche than in Lyon, where he was brought up (Bozon 1984: 63-4). All this is very similar to Elias and Scotson's immigrant interviewees, who also found themselves unable to compete with locals who had known each other for many years, or to participate in the amusement of an amateur theatrical production where everyone knew the actors and their personal characteristics, which constituted the substance of much of the enjoyment (Elias and Scotson 1994: 53). Interviewees interpreted these disappointing encounters in terms of being "cold-shouldered" (ibid, 75), or in terms of the inherent "coldness" of locals, or their prejudices. The two studies bring out the network logic which often makes full participation difficult: the conversation among people in a pub, a church or an association often rests on ties with third parties and on interactions in another ambience (from kinship to work). When such ties are lacking – as they often are for newcomers – it is difficult to participate fully and so form satisfying social ties. In Villefranche and elsewhere (cf. Bozon, Thiesse 1986), as in Winston Parva, "integration" (a word used by some of Bozon's interviewees) may take many years and may not ever be achieved. This seems to reflect the structural difficulties of gaining entry into "established" social circles (the place being accorded to a newcomer being only a subordinate one, if at all). The basis of many social relationships of leisure of X and Y seems to lie in other relationships the people in question have with M and N (who are former school-friends, kin by marriage, potentially useful work contacts, etc.). Newcomers often lack these ties rooted in the wider social relationships outside the particular ambiance of the association, pub, etc., or rooted in the past biographies of the individuals met in such ambiances.

What does not emerge, however, from Bozon's evidence is systematic social disadvantage – not just separate social circles but also social stratification – for example, differences in the school success or occupational destination of children, of the kind which emerges clearly in Turin and also in Winston Parva. Only in certain cases of internal (or international) migration does disadvantage emerge with regard to the social allocation of power and prestige through wider social institutions – so not just the local associations, church groups, etc. which Elias and Scotson give most of their attention to, but in social inequalities more generally. It is worth remembering in this context that at least in the first generation (the question of the second generation is rarely studied), internal mi-

gration tends to be associated overall with upward, not downward, social mobility (Blum, de la Gorce and Thelot 1985; Fielding 1995). This makes it necessary to re-examine the precise nature of the link between migration and local social divisions, and the account which Elias and Scotson propose of this link.

Uprooted?

One of the great strengths of Elias and Scotson's analysis is that it constantly combines description of attitudes and values, stereotypes and images of the other group and one's own group, with description of the social relations of the people concerned. A key element in the theory is the idea that members of the stigmatized Estate (Zone 3) are less cohesive, organized and solidary than residents of "the village" (Zone 2). It is this which makes the latter able to exclude residents of the Estate from all positions of power in local associations, churches, etc., and what makes it possible for them to mobilize gossip much more effectively, succeeding in propagating a negative image of the Estate and its residents, and a positive one of the "village". It is therefore of considerable importance to explain the sources of this greater cohesiveness, and Elias and Scotson see a direct connection with migration. They see the Estate's residents – all migrants from outside Winston Parva – as "uprooted" and as having thinner social networks – fewer kin living locally and less strong relations with neighbours. The term "uprooted" (e.g. Elias and Scotson 1994: 77) is probably taken over from Oscar Handlin's influential book (1951), which appears in Elias and Scotson's bibliography. Accounts of both foreign and internal migrants in the 1950s did in fact often emphasize "uprooting": no less than Handlin's account of international migration, Parsons' writings on the modern American family (e.g. Parsons 1943) stressed the importance of geographical mobility in creating a nuclear family which was relatively cut off from kin. Subsequent research has however altered these conclusions: Handlin is mostly cited nowadays to be briefly rebutted, and this aspect of Parsons' thought is also regularly seen as being refuted by empirical evidence. In fact research on international migration has consistently shown that most people migrate to a particular destination because they have kin or acquaintances there who can put them up in the initial period, tell them about job opportunities, etc. Internal migration is also surprisingly marked by ties with relatives (Bonvalet *et alii* 1999) or by full-blown chain migration (Grieco 1987). Immigrants at Winston Parva were probably not an exception. In Table VII: 72, Elias and Scotson present figures showing that interviewees of Zone 3 (the Estate) had far fewer relatives in Winston Parva than did interviewees in Zone 2, the "village". However, other information in the book suggests that many inhabitants of the Estate must have known some other residents before moving. For example, a large initial nucleus of the residents came up during the war either because their houses had been destroyed by bombing or because the factory where they worked was destroyed and transferred to Winston Parva; these people were presumably neighbours or workmates before moving. In other words, the extent of the isolation from kin or acquaintances among immigrants to Winston Parva should not be exaggerated.

At the same time, however, Elias and Scotson were surely right to see neighbourhood ties as importantly affected by migration or non-migration. The question of the effects of migration on networks of kin and friends is surprisingly under-investigated: the existence of "communities" - defined in national terms of ties with co-ethnics - seems to have blinded many researchers to the need for detailed empirical investigation of migrants' networks and the effects of geographical mobility on these. What we do know does however strongly suggest that migrants' networks are specific (even apart from ethnic composition). For, by altering the kinds of exchanges which are possible, geographical mobility has major effects on many aspects of social organization. Some ties are reinforced (for example, ties with kin who migrate to the same place, ties with colleagues in the case of middle-class migration which is part of a career), while others are weakened or transformed. Geographical mobility thus has a series of sociological consequences, on the information available through networks (with effects, for example, on knowledge of job opportunities), on the family, the domestic economy, the organization of childcare and many other fields. It is this reorganization of networks which constitutes much of the sociological significance of migration.

Take childcare. Elias and Scotson note (1994: 73) that working mothers on the Estate at Winston Parva complained of the lack of kin to help look after children; as they point out, the contrast with the "village", where there was daily interaction with grandmothers, was stark. Migration certainly does not abolish kin ties, but it does make

certain kinds of daily interaction impossible. Since older people are much less likely to move than young adults, young parents are often separated from their own parents, and this is a common complaint among both international and internal migrants (see Badino 2008 for a good account relating to regional migration to Turin). As Elias and Scotson are aware, this inevitably has effects on the forms taken by the family, by childcare and the control of the young. More in general, as Elias and Scotson stress, it is unrealistic to see a particular form of family (e.g. the mother-centred families described by Young and Willmott 1962 at Bethnal Green, or the segregated-role families described by Bott 1971) outside of the history of the relationships, a history in which migration or geographical stability has a significant role.

To return to the question of ties with neighbours, it is probably true that the very dense overlapping, multiplex (Frankenberg 1969) ties found in Winston Parva's "village", and in many other "classic" communities are the product of high rates of stability over two or three generations. Mere physical proximity is rarely the basis for a significant social relationship, and ties with neighbours seem to be important when neighbours are also, for example, kin, former school-friends, workmates, or at least related indirectly to important members of one's network. Franco Ramella (personal communication) has suggested that there tends to be a cycle in the development of neighbourhoods and that many classic descriptions of working class communities in the historical or social science literature are in fact drawn from neighbourhoods established for two or three generations without too much in-migration or out-migration[2]. Elias and Scotson (1994: 69) stress that Winston Parva's "village" is characterized by a «low degree of migratory mobility with children staying and rearing their families at the same place as their own parents»[3], and this is an important feature of their analysis. But in general, historians, anthropologists and sociologists describing this kind of "classic community" pattern have rarely noted the connection with migration or the evolution of these communal relations, describing them rather as an expression of working-class culture seen rather a-temporally (cf. Elias and Scotson 1994, ch. 4).

Elias and Scotson argue that on the Winston Parva Estate, the relative lack of ties made it difficult for neighbours to control the behaviour of children and adolescents, whereas the much denser network in the "village" made such control more effective - perhaps via the threat to "tell your mum", but no doubt also due to the fact that neighbours had an established relationship with the children or were at least known to them, making the modes of control available to adults much more varied and "softer", yet less easily defied. This focus on the lesser efficacy of informal control by neighbours due to the relative lack of overlapping ties is convincing. Other descriptions of estates with bad reputations report similar features to those described by Elias and Scotson for their Estate: suspicion of neighbours, a tendency of some families to withdraw and «keep themselves to themselves» (Elias and Scotson 1994: 73) in order to maintain their respectability and protect their children from "bad company", and conflicts with neighbours over the behaviour of children as one of the prime sources of friction.

It is worth combining this insight regarding networks and control with another. Elias and Scotson note the large numbers of children and young people (see Tables IX and X: 128). As in many other places, children and young people were particularly visible because they were often outside, rather than inside houses, associational premises, etc. but sheer numbers were also important. Elias and Scotson do not make the link with migration but a high proportion of children and adolescents is in fact a common characteristic of immigrant neighbourhoods. This may be partly due to higher fertility rates, but is also a structural characteristic of the migration process, and thus of the cycle of neighbourhoods of immigrant settlement. Mass immigration regularly produces a series of

---

[2] The "villages in the city" described by many studies of international immigration – the various Little Italies, Chinatowns and so on – might seem to contradict this notion of close ties with neighbours relying on more than one generation. However, in these cases where evidently community-like patterns of relations do in fact exist among first generation migrants, these – no less than in other cases - depend on the existence of overlapping pre-existing ties with other residents. Neighbours in such "villages in the city" are often kin and former neighbours back home, former school acquaintances and so on, and may also have work ties if the migration chain is also connected with employers or with what is conventionally termed "ethnic business".

[3] In reality, in the "village", as in many similar communities, a good many children probably did leave: it is just that many did stay. The Lynds (1937: 64) argued that Middletown was "expulsive" of people who were less willing to conform to local norms, and it is possible that the same was true of the Winston Parva "village". However a relatively low degree of out-mobility, in combination with the selective nature of out-mobility/non-mobility is perhaps an important structural characteristic of many communities.

changes in the age structure of a neighbourhood, and differences between the age structure of migrants and natives. Adult migrants are typically in their twenties and thirties (cf. White and Lindstrom 2005 for a brief review of the evidence regarding the age specificity of internal and international migrants), and for reasons of their stage in the life course, they tend to have children and/or to bring their children with them in the space of a few years. From the point of view of a neighbourhood inhabited predominantly by immigrants, the wave-like nature of most migrations tends to produce a bunching of children and then adolescents in a few years (and thus a "surge" of children of immigrant families in neighbourhoods and in schools). In contrast, locally-born families are often at a different stage of the life cycle and may have fewer children, more confined to the house.

This kind of effect on the age structure, a structural feature of mass migrations, may be of considerable importance. William Julius Wilson, in his account of the escalation of social problems, crime and conflicts in American inner cities in the 1970s and '80s, noted the importance of black migration from southern states, and claimed that «One cannot overemphasize the importance of the sudden growth of young minorities in the central cities» (Wilson 1987: 36). The kind of street culture described by Lepoutre (1997) in France was probably greatly facilitated by the numbers of young people growing up together and (especially in the case of boys) spending much time outside. And this is often a major point of conflict among local families. In their analysis of social divisions and conflicts on housing estates in Montbéliard in South East France, Beaud and Pialoux (1999: 384) found that disagreements over the control of young people was the most common kind of complaint, and that issues of the "bad upbringing" of children and noise and bad manners of young people one of the most prevalent themes of controversy regarding the neighbourhood as seen by both residents and those from outside (ibid.: 385-6).

La présence des familles immigrées et de leurs enfants dans les cites – leur poids dans les écoles primaires et les collèges de ZEP, la forte visibilité des enfants dans l'espace public (aux alentours des blocs, dans les cafés, au marché et dans les grandes surfaces, sur les places, etc.) – évoque l'ancien mode d'éducation populaire et vient rappeler aux familles françaises (qui ont cherché à se détacher de cet ancien mode d'éducation) ce avec quoi elles ont rompu pour assurer la promotion scolaire et professionnelle de leurs enfants. L' 'investissement' scolaire suppose, outre un certain nombre de conditions matérielles de travail (par exemple du calme et de l'espace pour travailler), la clôture du groupe familiale sur lui-même et la coupure par rapport à l'extérieur. Ce sont autant de conditions favorables à la construction d'un intérêt familial autour de la réussite scolaire des enfants. (Beaud and Pialoux 1999: 387-8).

This is a recognisable description of the terms of the conflicts which seem to emerge in many working class housing estates where labour migrants come to live. And a familiar description of the importance of issues around children and young people in the consolidation of group boundaries, neighbourhood reputation and the tendency of many families to withdraw into themselves or seek to move out.

Anchoring the distinction between established and outsiders

Elias and Scotson argue that the degree of social cohesion was lower on the Estate than in the "village" because networks were less dense. But if we think of young people, this may not have been true for is often not true. In many cases reported in the literature, the second generation brought up in a particular neighbourhood seem to have particularly dense local networks. The French literature on *banlieues* inhabited mainly by people with immigrant roots (e.g. Lepoutre 1997; Amrani and Beaud 2005; Beaud 2002, Beaud and Pialoux 2003) often cite interviewees who utter phrases such as "I know everyone here", and ethnographers are struck by the number of people young residents greet in the course of a short walk across the estate being studied. These studies (like the British community studies I mentioned earlier) also give clear testimony of strong loyalty to the local area, even in cases where the reputation in the media and among those living outside the estate (and among some adult residents) is decidedly unsavoury. The results of a recent survey carried out in several European countries similarly show high levels of identification with the local area among children of migrants (Crul and Schneider, forthcoming). So whatever the situation of the adults (first generation immigrants) on the Estate in Winston Parva, it seems likely that their children often had rather large and dense networks locally.

A modified version of Elias and Scotson's hypothesis of a link between migration, the local structure of social relations and reputation, needs, therefore, to take this into account. It seems likely that the social construction of a "bad neighbourhood" should not be seen in terms of the atomistic consequences of immigration, but rather in dynamics created *in loco* at a certain stage in the settlement process.

Among these processes, the kind of marginalization of adult newcomers described by Elias in pubs, clubs, churches, political clubs and so on, are certainly important. But other processes, for example regarding the new coalitions and divisions created at work and in the labour market, at school, and on street corners are perhaps more so. Young people create new sets of social relationships. In some circumstances these reproduce the division between old residents and newcomers that exists in the previous generation. But this is only in part a question of a cultural heritage transmitted by their parents, or the image of low status transmitted from parents to children. In other words, it seems necessary to shift the emphasis somewhat from an untenable view of immigrant neighbourhoods as atomistic, to one which emphasizes the specificity of the networks created by migrants first and then by migrants' children in patterns which are themselves systematically shaped by the migration process. Elias and Scotson rightly insist on the inadequacy of many analyses of prejudice which fail to analyse the pattern of social relationships which generate that prejudice. But paradoxically, when they analyze the continuation of the stigma of the Estate in the new generation, they seem to assume that young people almost passively absorb the opinions of their elders. To this degree, their analysis is surprisingly similar to the standard race relations framework they criticize which tends to assume that actors necessarily act *qua* members of one or another group (blacks, whites, etc.) assumed to be already defined as such. As Brubaker (2004) argues, this is a fundamental weakness of much work on ethnic relations. Brubaker suggests that researchers should go beyond a group-centred approach which assumes that ethnic groups are pre-formed, and investigate the relational contexts in which boundaries are re-created and consolidated (or not), an approach which seems to me very "figurational". So it seems worth thinking how social relations of young people are constructed.

For many young people on the Estate, no doubt most of their ties were with other Estate young people, but this is a question of relations constructed through their own activities, not just a question of exclusion by "village" youngsters influenced by their parents. The mere geographical location of the two zones must have influenced the social ties formed by children and then by adolescents; for, at least when they play outside, children and adolescents tend to use spaces very near their homes for play, and thus to form friendships which are very geographically tied.

Children from the three zones of Winston Parva will have mixed in school – although perhaps not at the primary school. There may have been more than one primary school, and residence may have led to a concentration of Estate and "village" youngsters in different schools, and this may have had consequences also on later friendships in secondary school. This effect of residential concentration of immigrants vs. natives is, of course, a common pattern in immigration contexts. It is, indeed, almost intrinsic to migration itself (combined with the logic of the housing market and public provision), for mass immigration tends to create pressure on housing, maybe overcrowding and the creation of new housing, which is then occupied mainly by migrants. This residential specificity of immigrants often leads to a degree of separation from natives in that some social relationships (as we have said, especially those of children and adolescents) are very local[4]. In the case of Winston Parva, migrants went to the Estate which had recently been constructed and was largely empty; in this way a considerable degree of residential segregation between old residents and newcomers was achieved (marked also by the railway line which divided the zones).

In public spaces in Winston Parva, as elsewhere, hierarchies of prestige, identities, alliances were probably constructed as much or more around ability at games, at making jokes, at ability in fighting rather than being automatically assigned via neighbourhoods. (And probably Estate children were not at a disadvantage.) In the classroom, roles and divisions must have been profoundly shaped by the school itself. In most school classrooms, the attitude to schoolwork, opposition or conformity to the demands of teachers have a crucial importance in shaping identi-

---

[4] One typical pattern is that described in Lepoutre's classic ethnography of a large housing estate outside Paris; Lepoutre (1997) refers to "staircase patriotism" to describe one important principal guiding the friendships of children and adolescents, who often grouped together on the basis of the staircase their families lived on in their block of flats.

ties and also in creating competences. Elias and Scotson do not provide systematic details of the school records or behaviour of Estate pupils as a whole, but those of one group of boys (Table XI: 130-31) was very poor. It seems likely that the divisions between young people were as much or more shaped by their respective careers in school as by gossip regarding the reputation of the Estate and the "village".

Elias and Scotson see Estate young people as reacting to their exclusion on the part of village youngsters, which in turn reflects their parents' views of the Estate and its inhabitants as people of lower worth. However, the relationships of children and young people do not passively reflect the categories of their parents, and much of their social lives is constructed in specific contexts — in school classrooms, in playgrounds, street corners and so on. In public spaces in Winston Parva, hierarchies of prestige, identities, alliances were probably constructed as much or more around ability at games, at making jokes, at ability in fighting rather than being automatically assigned via neighbourhoods. (And probably Estate children were not at a disadvantage.) In the classroom, roles and divisions must have been profoundly shaped by the school itself. In most school classrooms, the attitude to schoolwork, opposition or conformity to the demands of teachers have a crucial importance in shaping identities and also in creating competences. Elias and Scotson do not provide systematic details of the school records or behaviour of Estate pupils as a whole, but those of one group of boys (Table XI: 130-31) was very poor. It seems likely that the divisions between young people were as much or more shaped by their respective careers in school as by gossip regarding the reputation of the Estate and the "village".

The educational disadvantage of many children of international migrants — even when controlling for parents' education and occupation — is well known. The educational disadvantage of some internal migrants is less well known. However, the kind of disadvantage referred to above for Turin is probably not exceptional. Some of this association with migration may be a question of changing schools, losing friends and disorientation of pupils and parents in a new school system. In this context it is worth noting that Hagan et al. (1996) and Myers (1999), investigating the effects of geographical moves (i.e. all moves, not just those of international migration or mass internal migration) in North America, found a disadvantage for those moving during adolescence but not early childhood. Another tie between migration and school success may be that the kind of "traditional working class upbringing" referred to by Beaud and Pialoux may not favour school success. The greater autonomy enjoyed by some children (especially boys) in many migrant families, for the reasons already suggested, may not favour school success. Millet and Thin (2005) provide further evidence suggestive of this link, as does Gillian Evans (2007) in her ethnographic account of the roots of educational failure among white working class children in Britain and Annette Lareau (2011) in her very fine ethnography and interviews with thirteen American families.

In other words, if we want to properly understand either the social disadvantage or the conflicts often associated with mass migration, we have to look at the social configurations created *in loco* rather than considering two groups with different cultures (i.e., "cultures of origin") having difficulty adapting to each others' ways[5]. In Brubaker's terms (2004), we need to focus on the "niches" which make particular distinctions (say, between "Hungarians" and "Rumanians" in a Rumanian town marked by this ethnic division) socially meaningful. In his analysis of Cluj, Brubaker sees the fact that ethnic Hungarians and Rumanians tend to be in different schools as particularly significant, for this obviously forms the basis for friendships and a host of activities together. This division has an institutional basis but similar boundaries are often produced less formally or in the interstices with institutional boundaries. I suspect that the divisions between Estate and "village" may have became real for young people in this way. I suspect, for example, that the division in Winston Parva schools between rebellious and conformist pupils, between pupils who do well and pupils who do not, in large part overlapped between residence in the two zones. This is obviously not the same kind of division in separate education systems (although in some cases, of course, pupils are tracked into different schools or streams), but it is an opposition between two orientations and "cultures" which is no less real in many classrooms and no less important for the formation of friendships and other relationships. A division of this kind (which does exist in many situations where children-of-migrants and children-of-natives takes on a social reality) would have made the division between Estate and "village" a tangible one, of social importance (drawing an analogy with linguistic distinctions, making it socially *signifiant*). For it is,

---

[5] If it is culture which is at issue, it may be better to look at the forms of culture invented by a new generation in their own particular situation.

CAMBIO

after all, one which has real consequences in terms of future careers, as well as in terms of immediate interaction, the rewards gained from school or from peers.

We can scarcely ignore the fact that schools continually grade children and young people and that workplaces impose hierarchies every day in interaction between people giving and taking orders (as well as the measures of value contained in pay slips). We know, for example, that many young people on the Estate had very poor school records: with regard to some of the rowdiest, grouped together as "The Boys", Table XI: 130-31 gives details. It seems possible that the rebelliousness of these young people may have developed in large part in the interaction in school around school success or failure, and around the organization of rebellious interaction in the classroom as in relationships with others who are, say, more obedient pupils, "swots", etc. Or in relationship to different hierarchical positions at work. It is in this kind of context, where residence in a particular zone overlaps with other distinctions, that a classification of people in terms of "village" or "Estate" may become really socially charged and attain sharp meaning.

A risk of trivializing the established-outsider concept?

A great deal of attention has traditionally been focused in the debate over immigration on prejudice, resistance of natives and the stereotyping of immigrants. In the sociology of migration, relatively little "detached" (Elias 1956) from the public debate, issues over prejudice and resistance to outsiders are often seen as the central dynamic. As I have mentioned, Elias and Scotson perform a different kind of analysis of prejudice from that which is usual, inserting the resistance and the ideas regarding the outsider group (and also the established) in the overall configuration, thus setting up the question as a network question of the dilemmas of someone arriving later and having to penetrate an existing social circle with its established hierarchy of prestige and values. Much attention has also been focused in analyses of immigration on the cultural differences between groups. Here again, Elias and Scotson's analysis is different from the generic references to "culture" (often seen as imputable to nationality: cf. e.g. Cuche 2004: 103-11 for a critique). For they analyze the less-controlled, easier-going manners and standards (some) of the Estate residents with the tighter ones of the "village", and see this difference as at least partly a product of relationships between estaters and villagers and of the breakdown of informal local control, rather than being only a product of different customs prevailing in the contexts where the parents were brought up[6]. However, notwithstanding these differences from the usual approaches to prejudice and culture, it remains the case that differences in manners (the "freer" manners which at least some of the migrants would have been brought up in, and the "looser" standards of self-control) and the stereotypes regarding the Estate are important foci of the book. This leaves the risk that its results may be interpreted within the conventional schema. Some students reading *The Established and the Outsiders* seem to be left with the impression of social divisions being produced by a sort of "natural" resistance of established groups to any newcomers, as though this were a sort of natural human tendency. Others seem to incorporate it as a minor addition to the conventional approach. In particular, it may do little to shake that "complacent and clichéd constructivism" which Brubaker (2004: 3) claims is the currently dominant orthodoxy in ethnic studies. I fear that many scholars reading *The Established and the Outsiders* would not feel any necessity to change their way of working: they would feel that they themselves, or their colleagues, already undertake similar work, analysing the stereotypes of the groups concerned and various social contexts in which such stereotypes are transmitted, as well as the ways the established group bolsters its pride by contrasting itself favourably to the outsiders.

A clearer break with the conventional approach may be necessary. The best way to follow on from Elias' intellectual legacy might be to develop a broadly configurational approach to the ways migration systematically produces social divisions and social stratification, creating conditions where distinctions (between say "blacks" and "whites", estaters or villagers) become socially real. This would mean covering a wider area of issues than those treated in *The Established and the Outsiders*, going beyond the account of power focused mainly on local associations

---

[6] References to the civilizing process are rare in the book and never explicitly clarified, but the difference in manners between the two zones seems to be seen essentially in terms of different levels of civilization.

and clubs, and on gossip. In particular, with regard to the transmission of long-lasting social inequalities, involving the second generation – which are, after all, at the centre of sociological concern over ethnicity – it is necessary to investigate more how other crucial ambiances like school supplement these and make the divisions real in the stratification system. As I have indicated, Elias and Scotson open some useful paths here (for example, with regard to mechanisms of child-care, control and networks more generally), and these could be usefully developed in a more general account of how migration affects social relations.

References

Amrani Y., Beaud S. (2005), *Pays de malheur,* Paris: La découverte.

Badino A. (2008), *Tutte a casa? Donne tra migrazioni e lavoro nella Torino degli anni Sessanta*, Roma: Viella.

Barth F. (1969, ed.), *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Cultural Difference*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Baumann G. (1999), *The Multicultural Riddle: Rethinking National, Ethnic and Religious Identities*, New York: Routledge; trad. it. *L'enigma multiculturale*, Bologna: Il Mulino 2003.

Beaud S. (2002) *80% au bac. Et après?… Les enfants de la démocratisation scolaire*, Paris: La découverte.

Beaud S., Pialoux M. (1999), *Retour sur la condition ouvrière. Enquête aux usines Peugeot de Sochaux-Montbéliard*, Paris: Fayard.

Beaud S., Pialoux M. (2003), *Violences urbaines, violences sociale. Genèse des nouvelles classes dangereuses*, Paris: Fayard.

Blum A., De la Gorce G., Thelot C. (1985), *Mobilité sociale et mobilité géographique*, in «Population», 3.

Bonvalet C., Gotman A., Grafmeyer Y. (1999, eds.), *La famille et ses proches: l'aménagement des territoires*, Paris: cahier no. 143, INED/PUF.

Bott E. (1971) ,*Family and Social Network: Roles, Norms and External Relationships in Ordinary Urban Families*, London: Tavistock.

Bozon M. (1984), *Vie quotidienne et rapports sociaux dans une petite ville de province. La mise en scène des différences*, Lyon: Presses universitaires de Lyon.

Bozon M., Thiesse A.-M. (1986), *La terre promue. Gens du pays et nouveaux habitants dans les villages du Valois*, Paris: Fondation Royaumont.

Brubaker R. (2004), *Ethnicity without Groups*, Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press.

Ceravolo F. (2002), *Essere mobili a Torino. La ricostruzione dei percorsi di mobilità di una coorte di torinesi attraverso dati censuari*, Torino: Stampatori.

Ceravolo F., Eve M., Meraviglia C. (2001) *Migrazioni e integrazione sociale: un percorso a stadi*, in M.-L. Bianco, (2001, a cura di), *L'Italia delle diseguaglianze*, Roma: Carrocci.

Crul M., Schneider J. (forthcoming, eds.), *The European Second Generation Compared. Does the integration context matter?*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Cuche D. (2004), *La notion de culture dans les sciences sociales*, 3a ed., Paris: La découverte. (trad. it. Bologna: Il Mulino, 2006)

Elias N. (1956), *Problems of Involvement and Detachment*, in «British Journal of Sociology», VII, 3.

Elias N. (1978), *Introduction to the second German edition* [*Űber den Prozess der Zivilisation*, Bern/München, Francke 1969], translated in English as Appendix I, *The Civilizing Process*, vol. 1, Oxford: Blackwell.

Elias N., Scotson J. (1994), *The Established and the Outsiders. A Sociological Enquiry into Community Problems*, 2nd ed., London: Sage [first edition, London: Cass 1965].

Evans G. (2007), *Educational Failure and White Working Class Children in Britain*, Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Eve M. (2001), *Una sociologia degli altri, un'altra sociologia. La tradizione di studio dell'immigrazione*, in «Quaderni Storici», 106.

Eve M. (2009), *Conceptualizing 'The Migration Process': Some Network Aspects of the Question*, paper given at the conference on «Migration and social theory», SMMS, Università di Trento, 12-13 June.

Eve M. (2010), *Integrating Via Networks: Foreigners and Others* in «Ethnic and Racial Studies», 33, 7, July.

Fielding T. (1995), *Migration and Middle-class Formation in England and Wales, 1981-91*, in T. Butler, M. Savage (1995, eds.), *Social Change and the Middle Classes*, London: UCL Press.

Frankenberg R. (1969), *Communities in Britain. Social life in town and country*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Gellner E. (1983), *Nations and Nationalism*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Grieco M. (1987), *Keeping it in the Family. Social Networks and Employment Search*, London: Tavistock.

Hagan J., MacMillan R., Wheaton B. (1996), *New Kid in Town*, «American Sociological Review», 61, 3.

Handlin O. (1951), *The Uprooted*, Boston: Little, Brown.

Heath A., Cheung S. (2007, eds.), *Unequal Chances. Ethnic Minorities in Western Labour Markets*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hobsbawm E., Ranger T. (1983, eds.), *The Invention of Tradition*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Impicciatore R., Dalla Zuanna G. (2006), *A Difficult Social Mobility. Internal Migrations and Educational Attainments of Migrants from Southern to Northern Italy*, in «Genus», 63 (3-4).

Lareau A. (2011), *Unequal Childhoods. Class, Race and Family Life* (2nd ed.), Berkeley: University of California Press.

Lepoutre D. (1997), *Coeur de banlieue. Codes, rites et langages*, Paris: O. Jacob.

Lynd R., Lynd H. (1937), *Middletown in Transition. A study in cultural conflicts*, New York: Harcourt Brace.

Millet M., Thin D. (2005), *Ruptures scolaires: l'école à l'épreuve de la question sociale*, Paris: PUF.

Myers S. (1999), *Childhood Migration and Social Integration in Adulthood*, in «Journal of Marriage and the Family», 61, 3.

Park R., Burgess E. (1924), *Introduction to the Science of Sociology* (2nd ed.), Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Parsons T. (1943), *The Kinship System of the United States*, in *Essays in Sociological Theory*, New York: Free Press.

Ramella F. (2003), *Immigrazione e traiettorie sociali in città: Salvatore e gli altri negli anni sessanta* in A. Arru,

F. Ramella (2003, a cura di), *L'Italia delle migrazioni interne*, Roma: Donzelli.

White M., Lindstrom D. (2005), *Internal Migration*, in D. Poston, M. Micklin (2005, eds.) *Handbook of Population*, New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum.

Wilson W. (1987), *The Truly Disadvantaged. The Inner City, the Underclass and Public Policy*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wimmer A. (2009), *Herder's Heritage and the Boundary-Making Approach: Studying Ethnicity in Immigrant Societies*, in «Sociological Theory» 27:244-270.

Young M., Willmott P. (1962), *Family and Kinship in East London*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.