

Ethnic Diversity and Its Effects on Society

Dr. Vinai Kumar Mishra

Assistant Professor

Department of Social Work

Dr. Ram Monohar Lohia Avadh University, Faizabad

Introduction

Ethnicity is a broad term which includes in itself all walks of life, modes of behavior, belief, ethics, values, morals and manners, customs and traditions, religiosity, even political and economic activities. The Ethnicity is being a functional process, it provides a social bond where ascribed structures have been eroded, it is less divisive than integrating, and it facilitates a common language to mass (Allardt, 1979; Kinnear, 1990). The impact of social bounding creates a new dimension in the society to drops impression on every aspect of society and its social relationship and its cohesiveness. This cohesiveness binds the society, which is platform of development, progress, and we feeling of prosperity. Societies become more diverse since after 1960's when the migrants migrate from once place to another. Such as, migrants spread their culture from one place to another such as lifestyle, food pattern, culture, customs and beliefs etc.

Ethnicity

The term Ethnicity was implicit in anthropological use of the term "people and cultures" for a biological self-perpetuating group, sharing cultural values, communication and distinctness from other groups (Barth, 1969, 2000; Bennet, 1975; Glazer & Moyhinan, 1975; Naroll, 1964). The word 'ethnic' is derived from the Greek word ethnos (which is, in turn derived from the word ethnikos). Ethnicity is a complex phenomenon. Its meaning has changed radically throughout history, originally referring to heathens, pagans or gentiles; it acquired racial characteristics in the nineteenth century and was used in the twentieth-century. Immigrants of non-northern U.S. or western European descent were referred to as ethnic in U.S. (Eriksen, 1993). It first grew in importance in the social sciences as anthropologists tried to make sense of the emergent social and cultural formations within Africa and other parts of the world (Eade, 1996). Hence ethnic groups took on a new meaning, namely the idea of tribe, formerly used to refer to a socio-political unit whose members were related by kinship ties. This shift in meaning took place as many social scientists attempted to critique the Eurocentric discourse in which the people of the developing world were referred to as "tribes" while those in the developed world remained "people" or even "nations."

Ethnicity, a construct originally intended to discriminate between "innately" divergent groups; allegedly belonging to the same overall "race", is used to refer to groups allegedly distinguishable on the basis of "culture" (Krieger, 2001).

Ethnicity Matters

Ethnicity gives individuals a sense of not only inclusion into one group, but also exclusion from another group. The process of inclusion or exclusion in groups is determined during social interaction of individuals, which they do through the symbols. These symbols eventually appear as important factors to an individual's identity within or apart from a particular group. Ethnicity entails shared cultural traits and strong belief on a shared group history. The study of ethnicity "has helped us to understand the signaling effects of cultural idioms whereby membership in contested, ethnic symbols are made visible and thereby socially effective" (Barth, 2000). Having a sense of belonging, of historical continuity, and of identity with one's own people is basic psychological need. Ethnicity, the concept of group peoplehood refers to group communality. People classed according to common race, nation, tribe, religion, linguistic, or cultural origin or background. Ethnicity is a socially defined category based on common language, religion, nationality, history and another cultural factor.

Types of Ethnicity

Primary and secondary ethnic groups

The primary and secondary ethnic groups are distinguished where the group's culture emerged as a distinct entity. The primary ethnic groups are indigenous groups which exist in the same historical place where they have been formed. Examples are the French in France, Germans in Germany, etc., and also Native Indians in the Americas etc. Whereas the secondary ethnic groups are those which have their origin in society different from the one in which they currently exist, as for example, the Italians, Germans, etc. in Canada or the United States. Except these groups, ethnicity also exists on the basis of culture, size & duration of intimacy of these ethnic groups plays a major role and gives impression about the specific ethnicity.

Folk-Community and Nationality-Community

The folk community and nationality are types of ethnic groups and its distinction of basic principle is cultural self-awareness (Zielyk, 1975). The term "folk ideas" which is defined as, "traditional notions that a group of people have about the nature of humanity, in the world, and life in general," and "unstated premises which underlie the thought and action of a given group of people." They are "part of the un-self-unconscious, conscious culture of a people" (Alan Dundes, 1971). The folklore communities are carries their own unique identity. Under the folk communities many other vertical and horizontal communities resides like: specific folk dance community, folk music community, folk art community and so many others. Nationality groups are those which are culturally self-aware. Their member shares an image of themselves as collectively united by a distinct culture rather than by their kin or clan. An essential part of this image is a conception of history of the group as legacy.

Majority and Minority Ethnic Groups

Majority ethnic groups are those who determine the character of the society's basic institutions, especially the main political, economic, and cultural institutions. They determine the character of the norms of society as a whole, including the legal system. Their culture becomes the culture of the total society into which the minority ethnic groups assimilate. The minority groups may preserve their institutions and culture to some degree or they may influence the character of the dominant institutions in some ways, but usually, the framework for intergroup processes is provided by the institutions deriving from the culture of the majority groups.

"Young" and "old" ethnic groups

Ethnicity often is erroneously identified with immigrants, but immigrants make up only one type of ethnic groups. We can distinguish between "young" groups, i.e., those made up predominantly of the first - the immigrant - generation, and whose second generation is either small in size or young in age. The "old" groups are those already established in the larger society i.e. they have at least a high proportion of adult second and third or consecutive generations.

Theories of Ethnicity

Anthropological theories of ethnicity can be grouped into three basic categories: Primordialist theory Instrumentalist theory, and Constructivist theory. These theories broadly reflect changes of approach over the past 20 years, i.e. the shift from cultural evolution theories, to structural-functional theories. The conflict theories are postmodern theories.

Primordialist Theories

Ethnicity is fixed at birth. Ethnic identification is based on deep, 'primordial' attachments to a group or culture. This perspective was popular until the mid-1970s. Primordialism is an "Objectivist theory" or "essentialist theory" which argues that "ultimately there is some real, tangible, foundation for ethnic identification" (Isajiw, 1992). The primordialist approach is the oldest in sociology and anthropology literature. It suggests that ethnicity is something given, ascribed by birth and, deriving from the kin-and-clan-structure of human society, and hence something more or less fixed and permanent.

The two crucial factors in a primordialist perspective are highlighted in literature:

- One's ethnicity is ascribed at birth and
- One's ethnicity is more or less fixed and permanent.

Primordialist theories view human society as a conglomeration of distinct social groups. At birth a person "becomes" a member of a particular group. Ethnic identification is based on deep 'primordial' attachments to that group, established by kinship and descent. One's ethnicity is thus "fixed" and an unchangeable part of one's identity. The roots of primordialist thinking can be traced back to the *German philosophers, especially J.H. Herder*. He argued for the "atavistic power" of the blood and soil (Blut and Boden, 1925) that bound one closely with one's people (das Volk). Contemporary primordialists subdivided into two groups - those who see primordialism as a biological phenomenon (socio-biological primordialism) and those who see it as a product of culture, history, and/or foundational myths, symbols and memories (ethnosymbolism). The key point is that these primordial ties to one's group are fixed and generally do not change over the course of a person's lifetime. The ethnosymbolism perspective is a "soft" form of primordialism in the field of ethnicity and nationalism views the defining elements of ethnic identification as psychological and emotional, emerging from a person's historical and cultural background (Smith, 1939).

Instrumental Theories

Ethnicity, based on people's "historical" and "symbolic" memory, is something created and used and exploited by leaders and others in the pragmatic pursuit of their own interests. Proponents of instrumentalist theories view ethnicity as something that can be changed, constructed or even manipulated to gain specific political and economic ends. Elite theory, which argues that the leaders in a modern state (the elite) use and manipulate perceptions of ethnic

identity to further their own ends and stay in power is an approach (Cohen, 1997; Paul & Gurr, 1974). Ethnicity is created in the dynamics of elite competition within the boundaries determined by political and economic realities” and ethnic groups are to be seen as a product of political myths, created and manipulated by culture elites in their pursuit of advantages and power. Enoch Wan has founded that the “Chinese ethnicity” of this immigrant community is circumstantial, flexible, fluid and instrumental.

Constructivist Theories

Ethnic identity is not something people “possess” but something they “construct” in specific social and historical contexts to further their own interests. It is therefore fluid and subjective. Isaijw describes this group of theories like, this approach lies somewhere between. Michel Foucault emphasized on construction of the metaphor. Pierre Bourdieu notion is practice and habits as the basic factors shaping the structure of all social phenomena. The basic notion in this approach is that ethnicity is something that is being negotiated and constructed in everyday living. Ethnicity is a process which continues to unfold. Postmodern theories are concerned more with nations and nationalism than ethnicity. With the rise of the postmodern paradigm, attention shifted to the issue of group boundaries and identity.

Approaches

Four major approaches. They are:

- Ethnicity conceived as a primordial phenomenon,
- Ethnicity conceived as an epiphenomenon,
- Ethnicity conceived as a situational phenomenon,
- Ethnicity conceived as a purely subjective phenomenon.

The primordialist approach is the oldest. It argues that ethnicity is something given, ascribed at birth, deriving from the kin-and-clan-structure of human society, and hence something more or less fixed and permanent (Geertz, 1963; Isaacs, 1975; Stack, 1986). the other way around of the primordialist approach.

The epiphenomenon approach is best represented by Michael Hechter's theory of internal colonialism and cultural division of labor, and later resumed by Edna Bonacich (1972). Hechter (1978), divides the economic structure of society into two sectors, center and periphery. The periphery consists of marginal jobs where products are not unimportant to society, for example, agricultural work, but which offer little in the form of compensation as compared to the jobs in the centre. It is in this peripheral labor sector that immigrants concentrate, develop their own solidarity and maintain their culture. Ethnicity thus is something created and maintained by an uneven economic status, or a product of economic exploitation (Nagel and Olzak, 1982).

Situational approach: The juxtaposition of the two concepts, social situation and ethnicity, to yield the term situational ethnicity is attributed to Paden, 1967 symbolic ethnicity is an ethnic identity that is only relevant on specific occasions and does not significantly impact everyday life. situational ethnicity is an ethnic identity that can be either displayed or concealed, depending on its usefulness in a given situation.

Subjective approach: Subjective approach mainly consists with the subjecting feeling to carry their ethnicity within self. Like a person individually carries his/ her cultural, rituals, attitude, values, norms of behavior, social roles, meaning of objective cultural element.

Ethnic Group

The term ethnic group is explained in anthropological literature to designate a population which is largely biologically self-perpetuating and shares fundamental cultural values, realized in overt unity in cultural forms, make up a field of communication and interaction (Narroll, 1964). The ethnic group has a membership which identifies itself, and is identified by others, as constituting a category distinguishable from other categories of the same order.

Ethnic group had five main characteristics according to sociological perspective:

- Unique culture traits, such as Language, clothing, holidays or religious practices;
- A sense of community;
- A feeling of ethnocentrism;
- Ascribed membership from birth;
- Territoriality, or the tendency to occupy a distinct geographical areas

Group Think

First defined by American sociologist William H. Whyte, 1952, group think occurs when people with in a group feel it is more important to maintain the group's cohesiveness than to consider the facts realistically (Hogg & hains, 1998; jains, 1972,1982; Schafer & crichlow,1996).

Boundaries of Ethnic Group

Ethnic boundaries are matter of double boundary, a boundary from within, maintained by the socialization process, boundary from without established by the process of intergroup relations. There are two types of ethnic boundaries. In many ways, the dynamics of interethnic relations depends on the relationship between these two boundaries. One within the ethnic group (internal) and second without the ethnic group (external).

The *internal boundaries* are the area of self-inclusion in the group. They overlap with the process of self-identity. They articulate with the feelings of sympathy and loyalty toward members of the same ethnic group.

The *external boundaries* are the perimeter of exclusion of membership. It is the demarcation of the space of the outsiders. Thus the external ethnic boundaries would be reflected in the reasons and rationales behind specific immigration policies, cultural policies, and others (Isajiw, 1974). The external ethnic boundaries are also the source of racial distinctions and of race, as a group phenomenon. For example, as a social phenomenon, race is a response to external categorization and exclusion and whatever internal dynamics race generates, it is always a response to external exclusion rather than to internal identity-generating forces.

In a multiethnic society in which members of different ethnic groups interact and compete with one another, the existence of *internal boundaries will inevitably produce external boundaries*. Ethnic identities are not necessarily exclusive of one another.

The boundary maintaining mechanisms must be highly effective, for the following reasons:

- The complexity is based on the existence of important, complementary cultural differences;
- These differences must be generally standardized within the ethnic group - i.e. the status cluster, or social person, of every member of a group must be highly stereotyped - so that inter-ethnic in interaction can be based on ethnic identities;
- The cultural characteristics of each ethnic group must be stable, so that the complementary differences on which the systems rest can persist in the face of close inter-ethnic contact.

Although some people do not identify with any ethnic group, others participate in social interaction with individuals in their ethnic group and feel a sense of common identity based on cultural characteristics such as language religion and politics. The concept of ethnic group as referring, to a community type group of people who share the same culture as descendants of

such people or who may not share this culture but who identify themselves with this ancestral group. Each ethnic group has its own boundaries which can be subjective or objective in dimension.

Dimension of Ethnic Group Boundaries

The *subjective dimension* of ethnic groups has been known as ethnic boundaries. These are social-psychological boundaries and refer to the fact of group-inclusion and exclusion (F. Barth, 1969). The

Objective dimensions of ethnic groups include presence of at least some community institutions or organizations, the fact of having descendants and ancestors, as focus of cultural transmission and identity formation. The fact that there is a "script" for cultural behavior, in the form of customs, rituals and preconceptions which provides the content to culture and its transmission and it manifest in overt behavior patterns.

Moral dimension of group identity involves feelings of group obligations. In general, feelings of group obligations have to do with the importance a person attaches to his or her group and the implications the group has for the person's behavior. Feelings of obligation account for the commitment a person has to his group and for the group solidarity that ensues. It constitutes the central dimension of subjective identity. So far, no theory of ethnic identity has conceptualized group obligations as constituting its core dimension.

Affective dimension or cathectic, of group identity refers to feelings of attachment to the group. Two types of such feelings can be distinguished: (1) feelings of security with, sympathy and associative preference for members of one's group as against members of other groups and (2) feelings of security and comfort with the cultural patterns of one's group as against the cultural patterns of other groups or societies

Ethnic Identity

On the individual level, ethnicity is a social-psychological process which gives *an individual a sense of belonging and identity*. It is a social phenomenon which produces a sense of identity. Ethnic identity can be defined as a manner in which person, on account of their ethnic origin, locate themselves psychologically in relation to one or more social systems, and in which they perceive others as locating them in relation to those systems. By ethnic origin is meant either that a person has been socialized in an ethnic group or that their ancestors, real or symbolic, have been members of the group. The social system may be one's ethnic community or society at large, or other ethnic communities and other societies or groups, or a combination of all these (Isajiw, 1990). It defines the social boundary of the ethnic group and develops a strategy of acquiring the resources one needs to survive. The diasporic force which emerges from identity formation becomes ethnicity.

The Indian community has become an ethnic group, sharing cultural values, communication (language), and territorial contiguity and is distinguishable from other groups (Naroll, 1964). The process of its velocity becomes a forceful power of Ethnicity. Locating oneself in relation to a community and society is not only a psychological phenomenon, but also a social phenomenon. In the sense that the internal psychological states express themselves objectively in external behavior patterns that come to be shared by others. Thus, individuals locate themselves in one or another community internally by states of mind and feelings, such as self-definitions or feelings of closeness, and externally by behavior appropriate to these states of mind and feelings. Behavior according to

cultural patterns is thus an expression of identity and can be studied as an indication of its character.

It distinguished external and internal aspects of ethnic identity.

External aspects refer to observable behavior, both cultural and social, such as (1) Speaking an ethnic language, practicing ethnic traditions, (2) Participation in ethnic personal networks, such as family and friendships, (3) Participation in ethnic institutional organizations, such as churches, schools, enterprises, media, (4) Participation in ethnic voluntary associations, such as clubs, 'societies,' youth organizations and (5) Participation in functions sponsored by ethnic organizations such as picnics, concerts, public lectures, rallies, dances.

The internal aspects of ethnic identity refer to images, ideas, attitudes, and feelings. These are interconnected with the each other behavior. But it should not be assumed that, empirically, the two types will be always dependent upon each other. Rather, they may vary independently, as for example, a third-generation person may retain a higher degree of internal than of external aspects. So it distinguishes by least three types of internal aspects of identity: (1) cognitive, (2) moral, and (3) affective.

Social Identity Theory

In social identity theory, three process are responsible for the formation of a person's identity with in a particular social group and the attitudes, concepts and behavior that go along with identification with that group (Tajfel & Turner, 1986).

Elements of Social Identity Theory

Social categorization people assign categories to others (black, white, student, teacher, and so on) to help organize information about those others; people also assign themselves to social categories to help determine how they should behave.

Identification or formation of one's social identity. A social identity is the part of one's self – concept that include the view of oneself as a member of a particular social group within the social category typically, within the group.

Social comparison people compare themselves favorably to others to improve their own self esteem. Members of the out group make handy comparisons.

Forms of Ethnic Identities

Persons will be identified by others as belonging to one or another ethnic group even if they do not actively share any cultural patterns with that ethnic group, as long as a link to their ancestors can be made. Identification by others in turn usually stimulates self-identification and may condition new forms of social organization.

Single and multiple identities A multiethnic society inevitably produces multiple ethnic identities. As a rule these identities correspond directly to the objective aspect of ethnicity, that of ancestry. Single identity is usually defined when both parents are claimed to be of the same ethnicity. In a multiethnic society, however, over the span of generations those who identify only with the general society as the primary ethnic group, e.g. Canadian or American, without any knowledge of ancestors other than those of the general society, can be said to have purely single identity (Lieberson and Waters, 1990).

Race and Nationality

The term racial groups and ethnicity or ethnic groups are being used in a confusing manner. The term refers to the genetically transmitted physical characteristics of different human groups and the term ethnicity refers to culturally acquired differences. Both the words are often misused in ordinary day to day use. In popular usage, race may mean all of humanity {the human race}, a nationality {example the German race} or even a group which is mixed in nearly all respect by socially designated difference {example the Jewish race} almost any kind of category of people may be called as a race(Horton and Hunt, 1964). The term racial group is used to describe a group which is set apart from others because of obvious physical differences. Example white, black, Sands, Asian, Americans all are considered racial groups within the United States. According to Smelser(1990),racial group is a kind of ethnic group that is set apart from others by some combination of inherited biological traits such as skin color, facial features and stature.

- Race as a concept refers only to physical characteristics, but the concept of ethnicity refers to cultural features which include religion, language, national origin, etc.
- Unlike racial characteristics ethnic differences are culturally learnt and not genetically inherited.
- Racial characteristics are mostly inherited. But no ethnic group has any inborn cultural traits, it acquires them from its environment; example the Tamilian of India and SrilankanTamilians ancestry share the same genetic heritage, yet they display very different cultural norms and values.

Nationality, under nation identity all the citizens has to shares equal status of origin, tradition, and language and capable of forming or actually constituting a nation-state. Nation constitutes one element of a larger unit at global level as well as migrated citizens enjoys this status in other countries too with their unique.This identity becomes

Ethnic Diversity

Ethnicity defines individuals who are believed to share common characteristics that differentiate them from the other collectivities in our society. An ethnic group is a collection of people distinguished by others or by themselves, primarily on the basis of cultural or nationality characteristics (Feagin and feagin, 2008).Ethnic diversity works as an identity phenomena, meaning the specific identity for self. They are ways of recognizing, identifying, and classifying other people (Brubaker et al., 2004, p. 47).

Ethnogenesis: That is emergence of new ethnic group, part of existing group splits and forms new ethnic group, members of two or more groups fuse

Social Cohesion

Social cohesion – “The glue that holds society together” UNDP, Youth at 2011 Social Innovation Camp.

The term “social cohesion” is used to refer to a situation where a group of people interact in a way that advances the interests of all those involved. They act as a community. It is a multidimensional concept involving a number of elements, including trust, equity, beliefs, acceptance of diversity, perceptions of fairness and respect. Durkheim assumes that humans are inherently egoistic, but norms, beliefs and values (collective consciousness) form the moral basis of the society, resulting in social integration and cohesion. Social cohesion is ‘the ongoing process of developing a community of shared values, shared challenges and equal opportunity within community, based on a sense of trust, feeling of expectation and reciprocity among all Canadians’ (Policy Research Initiative, 1999).Chan et.al. (2006) defined social cohesion as ‘a

state of affairs concerning both vertical and horizontal interactions among members of a society as characterized by a set of attitudes and norms that includes trust, sense of belongingness and the willingness to participate and help as well as their behavioral manifestations’.

High degree of social cohesion contributes measurably to economic growth and investment, to good governance, health and social security (Stanley, 2003; Maxwell, 1996).

Conclusion

Still ethnicity is important because it is a never ending process like eternal world. Social and personal aspect of humanity based on social and personal ceaseless things because it is important for change of existence. This is based on universal fact that functional things gets assimilate and create newness for progress and creates diversity in the world in different means. So here ethnicity is also getting fuse with the help of cohesion. That societal cohesion creates new dimensions of interpersonal and intrapersonal equations of change. For example globalization created new kind of real and virtual societal cohesiveness all around the world. It provides a place for high assimilated societies which are interchangeably access here to there in cultures which inculcate in to young generation very fast. This is the result of positive societal cohesiveness where society works towards the well being of its all members. Their sense of belongingness is high and promotes trust and offer members the opportunity of upward mobility but this is the one sided coin. At the another side these forces to conclude the ethnicity and concepts related to ethnic identity such as ethnic riots, ethnic parties, ethnic violence, ethnic marginalization, ethnic conflicts, and so on. Ethnicity explains properties like fixedness of identity, cultural homogeneity, and that shared history which is part of subjective and objective identity, makes people stuck with them. This social phenomenon has its own positives and negative sides but it is never ending process. This leads to the new roads of multifariousness due to cohesive society. Here is a need to know antecedents through new researches in various issues in the field’s of noticeable heterogenic society. Social cohesion is a valuable goal in itself and contributes to maintain long term growth. It create a scope for various coordinated policy making through civic participation that effect social outcomes in regards to societal ethnicities by coupling comprehensive upgrading to other improvements designed to break down ethnic barriers and curb.

References

- Alesina, A., & Ferrara, E. L. (2005). *Ethnic diversity and economic performance*. *Journal of economic literature*, 43(3), 762-800.
- Alesina, A., & Perotti, R. (1996). *Income distribution, political instability, and investment*. *European economic review*, 40(6), 1203-1228.
- Alesina, A., Devleeschauwer, A., Easterly, W., Kurlat, S., & Wacziarg, R. (2003). *Fractionalization*. *Journal of Economic growth*, 8(2), 155-194.
- Algan, Y., Hémet, C., & Laitin, D. (2013). *The social effects of ethnic diversity at the local level: A natural experiment with exogenous residential allocation*.
- Allardt, E. 1979. "Implications of Ethnic Revival in Modern Industrialised Society: A Comparative Study of the Linguistic Minorities in Western Europe" In *CommenttionesScientrarumSocialum*, 12. Helsinki: SocietasScientarumFennica.

- Atencio, J. J. (2009). *Ethnic Diversity and Overurbanization in the Middle East:(Originally) Benign Differences with (Hidden) Political Consequences*. Paper presented at the APSA 2009 Toronto Meeting Paper.
- Atkinson, A. B. (1998). *Social exclusion, poverty and unemployment (Vol. 4): CASEpaper*.
- Back, K. (1951). *The exertion of influence through social communication*. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 46, 9–23.
- Barth, F. (ed.) (1969) *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: the social organization of culture difference*, Boston: Little, Brown.
- Barth, F. 2000. "Boundaries & Connections" In Anthony Cohen (ed.) *Signifying Identities: Anthropological perspectives on boundaries and contested values*. London and New York :Routledge.
- Baxter, G., & Hirschman Jr, I. (1964). *An explicit inversion formula for finite-section Wiener-Hopf operators*. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 70(6), 820-823.
- Behera, D. K., & Sahu, R. H. (2009). *The role of Ethnic Groups in Social Development*. *Social and Cultural Development of Human Resources*, 184.
- Bennet, J.W. (ed.) 1975. *The New Ethnicity: Perspective from Ethnology*. St. Paul, New York: West Publishing Co.
- Berger-Schmitt, R. (2002). *Considering social cohesion in quality of life assessments: Concept and measurement Assessing Quality of Life and Living Conditions to Guide National Policy (pp. 403-428): Springer*.
- Bernard P. (1999), "Social Cohesion : A Critique", CPRN Discussion Paper N° F 09, Canadian Policy Research Networks.
- Blalock, H. M. (1967). *Toward a theory of minority-group relations*.
- Blau, P. M. (1977). *Inequality and heterogeneity*: New York: Free Press.
- Blau, Peter M. (1977) *Inequality and Heterogeneity: A Primitive Theory of Social Structure*, New York: Free Press.
- Bloemraad, I. (2006). *Becoming a citizen: Incorporating immigrants and refugees in the United States and Canada: Univ of California Press*.
- Bollen, K. A. & Hoyle, R. H. (1990). *Perceived cohesion: A conceptual and empirical examination*. *Social Forces*, 69, 2, 479–504.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1984) *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*, London: Routledge.
- Braaten, L. J. (1991). *Group cohesion: A new multi dimensional model*. *Group*, 15, 1,39–55.
- Brown, R. (2000). *Social identity theory: Past achievements, current problems and future challenges*. *European journal of social psychology*, 30(6), 745-778.
- Burt, Ronald S. (2009), 'Network Duality of Social Capital', in Viva O. Bartkus (eds) *Social Capital: Reaching out, Reaching In*, Cheltenham, UK, Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar, pp. 39-65.
- Burt, Ronald S. (2009), 'Network Duality of Social Capital', in Viva O. Bartkus (eds) *Social Capital: Reaching out, Reaching In*, Cheltenham, UK, Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar, pp. 39-65.
- Carron, A. V., Hausenblas, H. A. (1998). *Group Dynamics in Sport*, 2nd ed. Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.
- Chan J.; To H.-P.; Chan E. (2006), "Reconsidering social cohesion: developing a definition and analytical framework for empirical research", *Social Indicators Research*, 75, p. 273-302.
- Chan, J., To, H. & Chan, E. (2006) *Reconsidering social cohesion: developing a definition and analytical framework for empirical research*, *Social Indicators Research*, 75, 273-302.
- Chan, J., To, H.-P., & Chan, E. (2006). *Reconsidering social cohesion: Developing a definition and analytical framework for empirical research*. *Social indicators research*, 75(2), 273-302.

- Chandra, K. (2001). *Ethnic bargains, group instability, and social choice theory*. *Politics & Society*, 29(3), 337-362.
- Chiswick, B. R., Lee, Y. L., & Miller, P. W. (2003). *Patterns of immigrant occupational attainment in a longitudinal survey*. *International Migration*, 41(4), 47-69.
- Cho, W. K. T., & Baer, N. (2011). *Environmental determinants of racial attitudes redux: the critical decisions related to operationalizing context*. *American Politics Research*, 39(2), 414-436.
- Coenders, M., Lubbers, M., Scheepers, P., & Verkuyten, M. (2008). *More than two decades of changing ethnic attitudes in the Netherlands*. *Journal of social issues*, 64(2), 269-285.
- Coetzee, J. K. (2001). *Development: Theory, policy and practice*. Oxford University Press Southern Africa.
- Coleman, J. S. (1990). *Foundations of social capital theory*. Cambridge, Mass: Belknap.
- Coleman, J.S. (1988), 'Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital', *American Journal of Sociology*, 94, 95-120.
- Cooley, C. H. (1909/1962). *Social Organization*. New York: Schocken Books. (Original published in 1909).
- Coventry, L., Guerra, C., Mackenzie, D., & Pinkney, S. (2002). *Wealth of all nations: Identification of strategies to assist refugee young people in transition to independence*. Hobart: Australian Clearinghouse for Youth Studies.
- Desmet, K., Weber, S., & Ortuño-Ortín, I. (2009). *Linguistic diversity and redistribution*. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 7(6), 1291-1318.
- Duhaime, G., Searles, E., Usher, P. J., Myers, H., & Frechette, P. (2004). *Social cohesion and living conditions in the Canadian Arctic: From theory to measurement*. *Social indicators research*, 66(3), 295-318.
- Durkheim, E. (1897/1966). *Suicide*. New York: The Free Press (Original published in 1897).
- Easterly, W., & Levine, R. (1997). *Africa's growth tragedy: policies and ethnic divisions*. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 1203-1250.
- Eller, J. D. (1999). *From culture to ethnicity to conflict: An anthropological perspective on international ethnic conflict*: University of Michigan Press.
- Eric Oliver, J., & Wong, J. (2003). *Intergroup prejudice in multiethnic settings*. *American Journal of Political Science*, 47(4), 567-582.
- Espiritu, R. F., Pittet, J.-F., Matthay, M. A., & Goetzl, E. J. (1992). *Neuropeptides in pulmonary edema fluid of adult respiratory distress syndrome*. *Inflammation*, 16(5), 509-517.
- Fearon, J. D., & Laitin, D. D. (2000). *Violence and the social construction of ethnic identity*. *International organization*, 54(04), 845-877.
- Fieldhouse, E., & Cutts, D. (2010). *Does diversity damage social capital? A comparative study of neighbourhood diversity and social capital in the US and Britain*. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 43(02), 289-318.
- Fischer, M. J. (2003). *The relative importance of income and race in determining residential outcomes in US urban areas, 1970-2000*. *Urban Affairs Review*, 38(5), 669-696.
- Forbes, H. D. (1997). *Ethnic conflict: Commerce, culture, and the contact hypothesis*: Yale University Press.
- Freeman, R. B. (1995). *The large welfare state as a system*. *The American Economic Review*, 85(2), 16-21.
- French, J. R. P., Jr. (1956). *A formal theory of social power*. *Psychological Review*, 63, 181-194.
- Freud, S. (1921). *Group psychology and the analysis of the ego*. In J. Strachey (Ed.) (1953-1964) *Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works (Vol. 18)*. London: Hogarth Press.
- Frey B. (2008), *Happiness. A Revolution in Economics*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, England. The MIT Press.

- Frey B. S.; Stutzer A. (2002a), "What can Economists Learn from Happiness Research?", *Journal of Economic Literature*, Vol. XL, pp. 402-435.
- Friedkin, N. E. (1984). *Structural cohesion and equivalence explanations of social homogeneity. Sociological Methods & Research*, 12, 235–261.
- FUKUYAMA, F. (1995) *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity*. Free Press, New York.
- Geertz, C. (1967). *The Integrative Revolution: Primordial Sentiments and Civil Politics in the New States. Old Societies and New States*, 150.
- Gelatt, J., & Fix, M. (2007). *Federal Spending on Immigrant Families' Integration. Securing the Future: US Immigrant Integration Policy*, 61-80.
- Gerring, J., & Barresi, P. A. (2003). *Putting ordinary language to work a min-max strategy of concept formation in the social sciences. Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 15(2), 201-232.
- Gijsberts, M., & Dagevos, J. (2007). *The socio-cultural integration of ethnic minorities in the Netherlands: Identifying neighbourhood effects on multiple integration outcomes. Housing Studies*, 22(5), 805-831.
- Gijsberts, M.-J. H., Ehteld, M. A., van der Steen, J. T., Muller, M. T., Otten, R. H., Ribbe, M. W., & Deliens, L. (2011). *Spirituality at the end of life: conceptualization of measurable aspects—a systematic review. Journal of palliative medicine*, 14(7), 852-863.
- Glazer, N & D. P. Moynihan (eds.) 1975. *Ethnicity: Theory & Experience*. pp.1-26, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Granovetter, M.S. (1973), 'The strength of weak ties', *American Journal of Sociology*, 78, 1360-1380.
- Gurin, P., Nagda, B. R. A., & Lopez, G. E. (2004). *The benefits of diversity in education for democratic citizenship. Journal of social issues*, 60(1), 17-34.
- Habyarimana, J., Humphreys, M., Posner, D. N., & Weinstein, J. M. (2007). *Why does ethnic diversity undermine public goods provision? American Political Science Review*, 101(04), 709-725.
- Hall, P. 1999. *Social capital in Britain. British Journal of Political Science* 29/3, 417-461.
- Hechter, M. (1978). *Group formation and the cultural division of labor. American Journal of Sociology*, 293-318.
- Hirschman, Albert O. (1958), *The Strategy of Economic Development*, New Haven, Conn: Yale University Press.
- Hogg, M. A. (1998). *Dimensions of subjective uncertainty in social identification and minimal intergroup discrimination. British Journal of Social Psychology*, 37, 345–365.
- Hou, Y.-c. (2006). *A cross-cultural study of the perception of apology: Effect of contextual factors, exposure to the target language, interlocutor ethnicity and task language. Unpublished master's thesis, National Sun Yat-sen University, Taiwan.*
- Hulse K.; Stone W. (2007), "Social cohesion, social capital and social exclusion: a cross cultural comparison", *Policy Studies*. 28(2): p. 109-128.
- Hutchinson, J., & Smith, A. (1996). *Ethnicity Oxford: Oxford University Press*.
- Isaacs, H. R. (1975). *Idols of the tribe: Group identity and political change. Harvard University Press*.
- Isajiw, W. W. (1990). *Ethnic-Identity Retention*, Breton, R., Isajiw, WW, Kalbach, WE & Reitz, JG (Hg.), *Ethnic Identity and Equality: Varieties of Experience in a Canadian City* (34-91).
- Isajiw, Wsevolod W. 1990 "Ethnic-Identity Retention" in *Ethnic Identity and Equality: Varieties of Experience in a Canadian City*, R. Breton, et al., Toronto: University of Toronto Press, pp. 35-38.
- Janis, I. L. (1972). *Victims of Groupthink*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Jenson J. (1998), "Mapping social cohesion : The state of Canadian research", CPRN Discussion Paper N° F 03, Canadian Policy Research Networks.

- JENSON, J. (1998).** *“Mapping social cohesion,” Paper presented to the Policy Research Secretariat’s Conference on ‘Policy Research: Creating Linkages’. Ottawa.*
- JENSON, J. (2010).** *Defining and measuring social cohesion, UNRIS and Commonwealth Secretariat.*
- Jenson, J. 1998a: Mapping social cohesion. Canadian policy research networks, backgrounder speech presented At the policy research secretariat’s conference, policy research: creating linkages”, October 1, 1998, Ottawa*
- Jenson, J. 1998b: Mapping social cohesion: the state of Canadian research Canadian policy research networks, CPRN study No. F/03, Ottawa*
- Jenson, J., & famille, R. c. d. r. e. p. p. R. d. l. (1998). Mapping social cohesion: The state of Canadian research: Family Network, CPRN.*
- Johnston, R., Forrest, J., & Poulsen, M. (2002). Are there ethnic enclaves/ghettos in English cities? Urban Studies, 39(4), 591-618.*
- Jones-Correa, M. (2008). Race to the top? The politics of immigrant education in suburbia. New faces in new places: The changing geography of American immigration, 308-340.*