

Chapter-2

Theoretical Perspective

This chapter seeks to explore some of the theoretical concepts involved in the study of ethnicity and identity construction. The chapter is divided into two sections. The first section deals with the various concept of ethnicity given by various scholars and focuses on the theories of ethnicity. The next section deals with the concept of identity construction.

2.1 Concept of Ethnicity:

Although ethnicity is conceived as a clear-cut concept at first glance however, on closer analysis it is subject to different interpretation. One of the earliest compilation of articles under the heading Ethnicity states that 'ethnicity seems to be a new term' who point to the fact that the word ethnicity first appeared in the English Oxford Dictionary in 1950's (Glazer and Moynihan 1975, 1). It was American Sociologist David Reisman who first used the term ethnicity in 1953. The term 'ethnicity is derived from the much older 'ethnic', which in the English language goes back to the Middle Ages. The word 'ethnic' is derived from the Greek word 'ethnos' which means 'heathen' or 'pagan'. The term used in this sense from mid fourteenth century to mid nineteenth century. In the United States the term ethnicity generally referring to Jews, Italian Irish and other group of people considered inferior to the dominant group of British origin (Cited in Hutchinson and Smith 1996, 28).

There are numerous scholars who gave different views on ethnicity. One of the classic definitions of ethnicity is that of Max Weber-

'...those human groups that entertain a subjective belief in their common descent because of similarities of physical type or of customs or both, or because of memories of colonization and migration; this belief must be important for the propagation of group formation; conversely, it does not matter whether or not an objective blood relationship exists' (Cited in Hutchinson and Smith 1996, 35).

Abner Cohen defined ethnicity as,

‘a collective of people who share some pattern of normative behaviour and form a part of a larger population interacting with people from other collectivities within a framework of a social system’ (Cohen 1974,9).

According to Paul R. Brass, ethnicity is ‘Any group of people dissimilar from other people in terms of objective cultural criteria and containing within its membership, either in principle or in practice, the elements for complete division of labour and of reproduction forms an ethnic category’ (Brass 1991, 19.) Brass in this definition emphasised on the cultural basis such as language, dress, foods, customs and religion of ethnicity.

On the other hand Hutchison and Smith (Hutchinson and Smith 1996, 6-7) define an ethnic group or ethnicity which consist of six main features that include –

1. a collective proper name.
2. a myth of common ancestry
3. shared historical memories
4. one or more elements of common culture
5. an association with a specific ‘homeland’
6. a sense of solidarity for significant sectors of the population.

Sian Jones’s work on ethnicity is one of the works on theories concerning ethnicity. Jones outlines three major terms related to ‘ethnic’: ethnicity, ethnic identity and ethnic group. Ethnicity is defined as ‘those entire social and psychological phenomenon associated with a culturally constructed group identity’. Ethnic identity is defined as ‘that aspect of a person’s self conceptualization which results from identification with a broader group in opposition to others on the basis of perceived cultural differentiation and/or common descent’. An ethnic group is classified as ‘any group of people who set themselves apart and/or set apart by others with whom they interact or co-exist on the basis of their perceptions of cultural differentiation and/or common ancestry’ (Jones 1997, 23).

Urmila Phadnis defined ethnicity or ethnic group as a historically formed aggregate of people, having a real or imaginary association with a specific territory, a cluster of beliefs and values, connoting its distinctiveness in relation to similar groups and recognized as such by others (Phadnis 2001, 14). The merit of this definition lies in the fact that it encompasses an objective approach (emphasizing cultural marks such as race, language, descent etc.) as well as a subjective approach (emphasizing group related feelings of identity distinctiveness) into its fold.

In a classical Anthropological essay Fredrick Barth mentioned four particular points of Narrol to define ethnic group. These are:

1. is largely biological self perpetuating.
2. share fundamental cultural value, realized in overt unity in cultural forms.
3. make up a field of communication and interpretation.
4. has a membership which identifies itself and is defined by other, as constituting a category distinguishable from other categories of the same order (Barth 1969, 10-11).

The above mentioned definitions are mainly based on the idea of ancestry and cultural ties. It was in 1960 that ethnicity came into exist in Anthropological usage. Fredrik Barth's 'Ethnic group and Boundaries' (1969), is the first text-book in Anthropology on ethnicity. In that essay Fredrik Barth introduced the concept of 'boundary' to understand ethnic group. For him, it is not cultural markers or descent rather the boundary of a group that makes it distinct. He believes that "the social world was made up of distinct named groups" and argued that the identity of the group was not a "quality of the container" (i.e. an "essence" or a fixed, objective reality belonging to a cultural or ethnic group) but what emerges when a given social group interacts with other social groups. He argues '...one cannot predict from first principles which features will be emphasized and made organizationally relevant by the actors....ethnic categories provide an organizational vessel that may be given varying amounts and forms of content in different socio-cultural system (Barth 1969,15). He mainly emphasized on relationship of cultural differentiation and contact between the collectivities which differentiated 'us' from 'them'. The interaction itself highlights differences between the groups and these cultural differences result in the formation of boundaries distinguishing "us" from "them." "A group

maintains its identity,” he wrote, “when members interact with others.” Ethnicity, Barth insisted, is based on one’s perception of “us” and “them” and not on objective reality that actually exists “out there” in the real world. Markers, such as language, religion, or rituals serve to identify these subjective ethnic “boundaries.” Since these can be changed, ethnicity is not fixed but situational and subjective. He believed, the focus should be placed on the “boundaries” between groups, not on the groups themselves. It was there, at these “boundaries” that ethnicity was “constructed.” By separating ethnicity from culture, Barth made ethnicity an ever changing, socially constructed, subjective construct.

According to Smith, *ethnie* (ethnic group) as ‘a named human populations with shared ancestry myths, histories and cultures, having an association with specific territory and a sense of solidarity’ (Smith 1986, 32). By this he gives importance on the shared past and the history which binds the members of a group.

Ethnicity can be of two types- homeland societies and Diaspora communities. Ethnic groups belonging to homeland societies are the long time occupant of a particular place. They claim for a moral right to rule themselves on the basis of historical and archaeological evidences. Diaspora communities, on the other hand, are people who have migrated and settled in a foreign land either after undergoing oppression in their homeland or in search of better livelihood or for any other reason (Hutchinson & Smith 2009, 316). They do not generally claim for self rule. Instead their demand focuses on an equal status and role in public sphere with an opportunity to preserve their culture. In the present study, the term ethnicity or ethnic group is used to mean any social group which is constructed by sharing some aspects of a common culture and by a common history.

2.2 Theories of ethnicity:

A review of literature on ethnicity reveals that three predominant theories that exist on ethnicity include *Primordial*, *Instrumentalist* and *Constructionist* theories which are considered as useful tools for understanding the nature of ethnicity and the forces behind formation of ethnic identity among migrant and minority groups.

2.2.1. The Primordial Theory:

The *Primordialist* approach is the oldest among the three theories of ethnicity in sociological and anthropological literature. This theory is mainly based upon three arguments. First, ethnicity is something given or is an ascribed identity that is inherited from one's ancestors. Second, as ethnicity is an ascribed identity so ethnic boundaries are static and fixed. Third, common descent and history is the foundation for ethnic identity. So according to this theory, ethnic identity of any group is inherited from their ancestors, their ethnic boundaries are static and their common ancestry determines that group's ethnicity. Hence common biological, historical and cultural origins link people together ethnically (Isajiw, 1999, Jenkins, 1996). For 'primordial' ethnic identity is a 'subjective held sense of shared identity based on objective cultural and regional criteria' (Phadnis and Ganguly 2001, 23).

The 'primordial' theory was first introduced by the American sociologist Edward Shils in 1957. Shils in his article 'Primordial, Personal, Sacred and Civil Ties: Some particular Observations on the Relationship of Sociological Research Theory', he developed the idea of the primordial and different kinds of social bonds between members in modern society (Shils 1957, 130-145). Clifford Geertz is further developed the Primordial theory, which consider ethnicity as an irrational and deep seated attachment to kin, territory, culture and religion. He sums up his contention in the following way:

By a primordial attachment is meant that stems from the 'givens' or more precisely, as culture is inevitably involved in such matters, the assumed 'givens' of social existence: immediate contiguity and live connection mainly, but beyond them the givenness that stems from being born into a particular religious community, speaking a particular language, or even a dialect of a language, and following particular social practices. These congruities of blood, speech custom and so on, are seem to have an ineffable, and at times, overpowering coerciveness in and of themselves. One is bound to one's kinsman, one's neighbour, one's fellow believer, *ipso facto* as the result of not merely of personal attraction, tactical necessity, and common interest or incurred moral obligation but at least in great part by virtue of some unaccountable absolute importance attributed to the very tie itself (Geertz 1973, 259-60).

According to Primordialist view developed by Geertz, ethnicity has an essentialist character which ignores the effects of social, cultural and political environment; rather, it argues that the sense of belonging to an ethnic group is rooted in the 'givens' of social existence and historical experiences.

There are two variant within the framework of the Primordial theory that are *socio-biological* perspective and *culturalist* perspective. According to *socio-biological* perspective of Pierre van den Berghe (1981) ethnicity is determined by the importance of a socio-biological factor- kinship. He argued that ethnicity is an extension of kinship. Ethnic identity develops and persists due to the common ancestral bonds of group members. The implication of this perspective is that ethnicity will never perish because kinship always exists.

The second perspective *culturalist* emphasize of a common culture in the determination of membership of an ethnic group. For this view, a common culture (a common language, religion) determines the genesis of ethnic identity even in the absence of common ancestor. Different racial groups of people originating from the same country can form an ethnic group and develop an ethnic identity if they have a shared language or religion, it is not necessary to have a common biological bonds.

2.2.2. The Instrumentalist Theory:

The *Instrumentalist* theory does not agree with the primordial theory; it views ethnicity as an instrument or strategic tool for gaining resources and services. That's why this theory is named as 'Instrumentalist'. According to this theory ethnicity exists and persists because it is useful (Yang 2000, 46). The theory is mainly developed by Paul Brass, Abner Cohen, Glazer and Moynihan and so forth who believes that ethnicity is used by the elites of a social group to gain economic and political power. Glazer and Moynihan, who are the pioneers of this theory, state that like class and nationality, ethnicity can be used as a political mobilizing tool. Orlando Patterson asserted that 'The strength, scope, viability and bases of ethnic identity are determined by, and are used to serve, the economic and general class interests of individuals' (cited in Yang 2000, 46) . By this he wants to mean that ethnicity or identity solely to the motivation of wanting to obtain comparative advantage. Paul Brass opined that:

‘Cultural forms, values and the practices of ethnic groups become political resources for elites in competition for political power and economic advantages. They become symbols and referents for the identification of members of the group, which are called up in order to create a political identity more easily. The symbols used to create a political identity also can be shifted to adjust to political circumstances and the limitations imposed by the state authorities’ (Brass 1991, 15).

For Brass, ethnicity is used by the elites of a social group to gain state resources- which may be both political and economic. Hence for Brass, ethnicity is purely a construction as he maintains that ‘it is quite obvious that there are very few groups in the world today whose members can lay any serious claim to a known common origin, it is not actual descent that is considered essential to the definition of an ethnic group but a belief in a common descent’ (Brass 1991, 70).

2.2.3. The constructionist Theory:

The *Constructionist* theory gained prominence in the 1970s (Yang, 2000, 43). Unlike the *Primordial* and *Instrumentalist* theories, ethnicity is not viewed as innate or instrumental. Instead the *Constructionist* theory has three major arguments: First, ethnicity is a socially constructed identity which is created. Second, ethnicity is dynamic identity, which is built and rebuilt and ethnic boundaries are flexible or changeable. Third and last ethnic affiliation or identification is determined or constructed by society, affirms that ethnic identity is fluid, situationally defined, produced and reproduced in the course of social transactions, and in relation to ‘place’, time and others. That is ethnicity is adopted by ‘choice’ (Banks 1996, 185). Barth argues that ethnic boundaries are maintained when individuals maximize interactions with those within their ethnic group and minimize interactions with other ethnic groups (1969, 5). Barth also concedes that ‘ethnic groups are categories of ascription and identification by the actors themselves, and thus have the characteristics of organizing interaction between people’ (1969, 10). Geographers Peake and Ray contend that unequal power relations can lead to the construction of ethnic identities (2001, 180). Hence, “whiteness” or “dominant cultures” produce “other identities” or “minority cultures”. “Difference” does not refer to pre-given traits, heritage, traditions and experiences, rather “difference” is imagined, created and dependent on the interaction between ‘dominant cultures’ against ‘minority cultures’ (Yon 1996, 481).

Joane Nagel (cited in Yang 2000, 56) contended that ethnicity is socially constructed and reconstructed by internal forces (i.e., actions taken by ethnic groups themselves such as negotiation redefinition, reconstruction of ethnic boundaries) and external forces (i.e., social, economic, and political processes and outsiders), and that ethnicity is a dynamic, constantly changing property of individual identity and group organization.

Opponents of the *Constructionist* theory argue that it tends to ignore ancestry, a crucial element without which individuals would not be able to claim certain ethnic identities (Yang 2000, 58). Furthermore, critics also comment that inadequate attention is given to the impact of political, social and economic interests on the construction of ethnic identity. Finally, Hiebert (2000: 237) adds that because ethnic identity is viewed as flexible and variable, it is impossible to develop a systematic account of ethnic identity.

2.3 The Theoretical concept of Identity:

Just now everybody wants to talk about identity. As a key word in contemporary politics it has taken on so many different connotations that sometimes it is obvious that people are not even talking about the same thing. One thing at least is clear identity only becomes an issue when it is in crisis when something assumed to be fixed, coherent and stable is displaced by the experience of doubts and uncertainty. From this angle the eagerness to talk about identity is symptomatic of the post-modern predicament of contemporary politics (Mercer 1990, 43).

Identity and identity crisis are key concepts in the contemporary world. Identity is about how individual or group see and define themselves and how other individual or group sees and defines them. Identity is not something tangible or visible one cannot touch, smell, taste or see it. Yet many claims that its presence is so prevalent today that nearly everything has become a matter of identity. No one is free to adopt any identity they like and factors like their social class, their ethnic group and their sex are likely to influence individuals how others see them having may not be the one that others accept or recognize. Etymologically the word identity is derived from the French word *identite* and from the Latin *idem* which means 'the same'. Identity is that quality/personality, which belongs to an individual in a unique way, which distinct character. In general, it refers to who or what one is, to various meaning attached to oneself and others. Within sociology,

identity refers both to the structural features of group membership which individual internalise and to which they become committed, for example, various social roles, membership and categories, and to various characters trait that an individual displays on the basis of his/her conduct in particular social settings. Identity can be defined as follows:

1. Who or what somebody /something.
2. The characteristics, feelings or believes that distinguishes people from other: a sense of national/cultural/ personal group identity.
3. “The state or feelings of beings very similar to and able to understand someone/something (Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary, 1998)”.

In its basic sense, it can be referred to the essence (inherent and resilient) of the 'I' or 'myself' or 'ourself' that differentiates from the 'other' or 'others'. However, in its modern usage, the term refers to the 'personhood/selfhood' (Sollors 1996, xi). The personhood or the self in simple sense can be referred to the overall dynamic component of the individuality within the social realm as explained in American context. Therefore, the personhood becomes the basis of existence for the individual and its relatedness to the social circumstances and reality (Erikson 1996, 232-265). Individuals or groups have multiple identities asserting different identities in different circumstances. Therefore identity formation is a process and said to be complex and not easily defined. It is said that three main ideas are crucial in this process. First, identities are shaped by power relations; they are created in relation to outsiders. Second, identities are not unified; they fragmented, ruptured, discontinuous and contradictory. We are split among political allegiances; we have multiple identities that sometimes struggle within us. Third, identities are constantly in flux; they are always changing, not fixed products; they are productions in process. Identity changes as we move in life and adopt new cultures, new ideologies, new beliefs and new languages. Identity is a constant motion just as culture and language are which in turn helps us to create new and complex identity shaped by our cultural heritage, family, geography, religion and social identity (Banks, 1996). Identity is thus called a process.

In the literature of Sociology or others, the concept of identity has not been a key concept. Among the classical theorist of Sociology Mead and Cooley has discussed the

concept of identity. However, their discussion on identity is more a socio-psychological manner rather than a politico-sociological one. They both talked about identity while trying to understand the formation of an individual self in a collectively through the experience of meaningful interactions as part of the socialization. The most crucial point that Mead and Cooley made in their discussion on the subject was the significance of 'others' in the formation of an individual's self-identity.

Later in the literature of sociology it is found that it is not possible for an individual or group to construct an identity. Barth, in his classical work on ethnicity insisted that showing the distinctiveness of one's group or an individual's identity was not enough to assert an identity. There must be some other individual or group whom they can differentiate them and who can accept their distinctiveness only then one can establish his or her identity. Identities were therefore to be found and negotiated at the boundaries of the internal and external (cited in Jenkins 2008, 47).

It was only in the 1970s and 1980's, with the rise of 'new' social movements that the question of 'identity' acquired a political status in the western societies and academia. It was in the 1980s that the question of identity and ethnicity came to acquire the centre stage in Indian politics (Jodhka 2001, 37).

According to Stuart Hall, one can identify two different ways of thinking about 'identity'. The first defines cultural identity in terms of one, shared culture, a sort of collective 'one true self', hiding inside the many other, more superficial or artificially imposed 'selves', which people with a shared history and ancestry hold in common (Hall, 1996, 7). It was within this framework that, until recently, the question of identity was thought of in many public and academic discourses on culture. In reply to India, there is also a second, and what Jodhka (2001, 40) calls it 'open –ended view of culture' that approaches community identities not in the primordialist perspectives but as a process of what Appadurai calls, 'conscious mobilization of cultural difference' (Appadurai 1997, 87).

Hall discusses that the 'cultural identity is a subject of 'becoming' as well as of 'being''. It is more concern to the future as much as to the past that it is not something that already exists, transcending place, time, history and culture. No doubt that cultural identity must transmit from somewhere from histories but like everything there is history; they go

through a constant alteration. It is not like fixed in history or past, they are subject to continuous play of history, culture and power. Far from being grounded in a mere 'recovery' of past, which is waiting to be found and which, when found, will secure our sense of ourselves into eternity, identities are the names we give to the different ways we are positioned by, and position ourselves within, the narratives of the past. Jenkins too makes a similar point when he says, 'identity can only be understood as process. One's social identity is never a final settled matter' (Jenkins 2008, 45).

Benedict Anderson's concept of Imagine communities provides a strong foundation for understanding the nature of social identities (Anderson 1983, 8). Imagine communities are socially constructed communities of people who see themselves as a part of a larger group. These communities are imagined and are given meanings through a complex interaction of human. Anderson posits, 'communities (identity groups) are to be distinguished not by their falsity/genuine by the style in which they are imagined' (Anderson 1983, 4). It is important to mention that imagine nature of identity does not make it any less socially relevant.

Erikson's theory of identity formation is the starting point for mass research into identity formation. Erikson is described as the first psychologically oriented theorist who paid attentions to the meaning of the concept of identity (Kroger 1993, 19). Erikson was a psycho analyst and his theory evolved from psycho analytic tradition. Erikson one of the forerunners of the systematic study of identity in terms of conceptualization and he tries to develop a frame work to explain what identity means and how the sense of identity developed from childhood through adolescence on his book 'Identity and the Lifecycle, 1959' and 'Identity, Youth and Crisis, 1968' on the subject in question imply. He contend that identity at one time may refer to a conscious sense of individual identity; at another to an unconscious striving for a continuity of personal character; at third as a criterion for the silent doing of ego synthesis; and finally as a maintenance of an inner solidarity with a group ideals and identity. Erikson (1968) described how people's psychological constitution developed in interaction with both their social and biological context. Hence, the psycho social prospective on identity takes account of societal influences as well as the individual intra psychic and biological development in building the theory of how a sense of identity develops (Kroger, 1993, 17).

Identity is seen as an individual subjective experience of remaining the same person across time and various contexts. As such, once identity provides a sense of continuity between the past, present and future as well as across contexts. Though Erikson's aphesis is on individual development but social influences are also taken into account in his theoretical framework and the focus is on how individual develop and adjust within their social context.

Erikson's concern centres mostly on the psychological aspects of an individual identity formation, but he relates personal identity closely with cultural identity recognizing the dynamic impacts of the society on the individual's identity formation. Identity formation, Erikson said, "deals with a process located in the core of the individual and yet also in the core of his or her communal culture". Though his psychological definition aims at an individual identity formation and development, his definition is helpful in comprehending the essential features of group identity as it provides us with a framework to derive the patterns and characters of group identity formation. To him,

Identity formation employs a process of simultaneous reflection and observation, a process taking place on all levels of mental functioning, by which the individual judges himself (or herself) in the light of what he (or she) perceives to be the way in which others judge him (or her) in comparison to themselves and to a typology significant to them; while he (or she) judges their way of judging him or her in the light of how he or she perceives himself or herself in comparison to them and to types that have become relevant to him or her. This process is, luckily and necessarily, for the most part unconscious..... Furthermore, the process described is always changing and developing: at its best it is a process of increasing differentiation, and it becomes ever more inclusive as the individual grows aware of a widening circle of others significant to him or her from maternal person to 'humankind' (Erikson 1968, 36).

We can draw two major perspective of identity formation from Erikson's definition. First Erikson mention about process of differentiation where recognition of otherness and of one's own distinctiveness of an identity. As 'boundaries' are regard as the base for what social groups differentiate from others recognize as distinct group so the concept of Erikson is a vital in group identity formation. Secondly, the process of differentiation

involves a simultaneous reflection and observation. It calls for a judgment on the basis of and the result of its interaction with other group. Just an individual becomes aware of his or her identity in the light of others; a group becomes aware of its distinctive cultural heritage by the presence of other cultural group in its sight. This is a complex procedure in group identity. The needed emotional energy to unit itself as a group does not come only from a reflection within itself, but more from the act of judging and opposing a significant other. Thirdly, the process of identity formation is a dynamic process opened to changes.

Marcia (1980, 159) defined identity “as a self structure, an internal, self constructed, dynamic organization of drives, abilities, believes and individual histories”. Depending on how these structures are developed an individual posits him in relation to others. In his studies Erikson argues that:

“Identity formation begins where the usefulness of multiple identifications ends. It arises from the selective repudiation and mutual assimilation of childhood identification and their adsorption in a new configuration which in turned dependant on the process by which a society (often through sub societies) identifies the young individual, recognizing him somebody as somebody who had to become the way he is and who, being the way he is, is taken for granted” (Erikson, 1959, 122).

As Wright (1982, 25-71) points out, the concept identity is usually raised by means of asking “Who am I?”. In the first instance one get the impression that the vary wording of the above question denote self as the only dimension of identity. Nevertheless, identity is comprised not solely of self but is more than the private “Who am I?”. Thus one has to ask about other dimension of identity such as society, environment and culture.

2.4 The Social Dimension of Identity Formation:

Individuals acquire his or her identity from the society he/she belongs. Human beings are born in societies as soon as the newly born baby comes to the earth; he gets surrounded by individuals and institutions for example family members, peer group, school and many other social institutions. These various social institutions have played an important role on the identities of individuals as well as on groups. Markstrom –Adams (1992, 174) calls all these surrounding elements ‘social contextual factor’. He argues that ‘contextual

factors pertinent to identity formation encompass issues that close social relationships and the socio cultural milieu present to the adolescent. Identity formation is not wholly an individualistic process; rather, the social environment exerts its forms of power and influence’.

Kroger (1993) believes that the roles of culture, social class, ethnicity and historical ethos are important factors to identity formation process. With regard to the social dimension of identity formation, Hitch (1983, 118) mentions that, ‘social’ means something more than the influence of other people it cannot be limited to the effects of others on an individual. Identity also means more than a self- description in terms of qualities. Hitch further added that what may be termed ‘social identity’ is that aspect of the cognized self which refers to membership of a group or category of social significance’. The community within which the young person seeks to find themselves constitutes the social dimension of identity (Wright 1982, 81). Erikson (1959, 161) refers to this dimension of identity as ego-aspect as opposed to self-aspect of identity formation.

Ethnicity is one of the variables that mark the process of identity formation. Belonging to an ethnic group allows the members of that group to define their distinct identity by means of comparing themselves with other ethnic, religious or cultural groups. Apter’s (1983,79) argument lends support to the idea that group membership is a source of developing a self-definition in most people derives from the membership of groups, both primary and secondary groups....Extending the ‘I’ and ‘me’ terminology to a group could be said to provide a way of giving meaning to ‘me’ in terms of ‘us’.

There are various dominant factors for which the process of identity formation for people who are members of ethnic and minority groups acquires a complex nature. In this regard Marksrtom-Adams (1992, 176) says that the main characteristics of such complexity are colour, linguistic distinction, behavioural differences, physical features and social stereotypes. But in the recent years culture conflict is seen between majority and minority cultural values in the process of identity formation is more significant. It is important to note that ‘sorting through the two sets of values and selecting those to incorporate into one’s identity may for some minority individual have deferred a no-win scenario. That is, adopting an identity consistent with values of the dominant culture may

result in exclusion from one's minority group'. It is well familiar in case of migrants; even though they are settled due to contextual conditions pursue different avenues in their identity development from their ancestors and peers in the host society. In this regard, Weinrich brings to the attention the issue of dual socialization of migrant people. His findings show that the children of migrants in Britain are exposed to a distinctive kind of dual socialization. He observes that:

'During primary socialization within their homes they form their early identification with their parents and other members of their own ethnic community. Subsequently, during secondary socialization at school, representing a different culture, and within the wider community, they form further identification with significant others embodying values and aspirants of the subordinate community. Elements of the latter identification will be incompatible with the earlier, home based, ethnic ones, so that these earlier identification become conflicted. Thus by adolescence second generation boys and girls will tend to have conflicted. Thus, by adolescence, second generation boys and girls will tend to have conflicted identification with people of their own ethnicity' (Weinreich, 1986, 304).

In one article Weinreich (1983, p.157) analyses culture conflict which derives from differences between the values held by different ethnic groups. He argues that those who grow up experiencing two distinct and diverse cultural values are likely to adopt several aspects of two these two different sets of values. Internalizing parts of two different value systems means that the identification of children and youth cannot be confined to one ethnic group and its cultural values. A duality of worldviews, values based on diverse sets of a cultural belongingness that conflict with each other may also be interpreted as cultural discontinuity.