

Positioning (Concept) of Identities in Global-local Discourse and Practices

Memposisikan (Konsep) Identitas dalam Wacana dan Praktik Global-lokal

I Wayan Suyadnya¹

Department of Sociology, Brawijaya University, Malang, INDONESIA

Abstract

This paper is addressing and reconsidering the concept of identity in sociology and social anthropology, since both of these disciplines are interrelated and connected. By discussing the usefulness of concept in the field of sociology and anthropology, this paper attempts to discuss the problematic of the 'concept' and identity in both disciplines. This work is starting to review the unconsciousness of the use of concept and continuing to explore the rise of identity discourse and closing it with the term identity in a globalized world. It will show why we should defend the idea of identity in social sciences and culture.

Key words: concept, identity, discourse, identification, global/local, globalisation

ABSTRAK

Tulisan ini mengangkat dan mempertimbangkan konsep identitas dalam sosiologi dan antropologi sosial, karena kedua disiplin ilmu ini saling berkaitan dan berhubungan. Dengan mendiskusikan kegunaan konsep ini dalam sosiologi dan antropologi, tulisan ini berusaha untuk mendiskusikan problematika dari "konsep" dan identitas dari ke dua disiplin ilmu tersebut. Tulisan ini dimulai dari review tentang ketidaksadaran penggunaan konsep dan terus-menerus mengeksplorasi munculnya wacana identitas dan menutupnya dengan istilah identitas di dalam dunia yang mengglobal. Tulisan ini menunjukkan mengapa kita harus mempertahankan ide tentang identitas dalam ilmu sosial dan budaya.

Kata kunci: konsep, identitas, wacana, identifikasi, global/lokal, globalisasi

“Identity does not to explain anything; identity has to be explained”
(Martin Sökofeld 1996: 531)

This paper is an attempt to do an in depth digging on the concept of identity in general. The purpose of the word "in general" form is that digging the concept of identity is not meant as a necessity to create a limitation in ethnographic or phenomenological studies as that I have been using. But it is an effort to rebuild the concept in the theoretical realm, namely the reflexive review. In the past two decades, the concept of identity has been intensely criticized by scholars from the interdisciplinary of social/cultural science ranging from sociology, anthropology, cultural studies, and even from the study from which identity was introduced, psychology.

If it is traced back, there are at least two meeting points in the criticisms of the concept of identity. First, the tendency to negate the use of the concept of identity in the context of cross-cultural. An article written by an anthropologist Roger Rouse (1995) on the *Question of Identity. Personhood and Collectivity in Transnational Migration in the United States* and another one written by Richard Handler (1994) entitled *Is 'Identity' a Useful Cross-Cultural Concept?* are said as representation of criticisms in the debate of anthropology discipline.

¹ Correspondence: I Wayan Suyadnya. Department of Sociology, Brawijaya University, Malang, Indonesia. E-mail: iway.s@ub.ac.id

Second, criticism of Rogers Brubaker and Fredrick Cooper's *Beyond 'Identity'* (2000) and Philip Gleason's *Identifying Identity: A Semantic History* (1983) can be said to be representations of criticisms within the disciplines of sociology and linguistics, which is about different emerging notions (meaning) that lead to the firm fixation of the concept of identity on the concept of identity "in general". Both the first and second categories of writing recognize that the concept of identity is a concept born out of the "west" tradition of thought that has been introduced to the "east".

Talking about the concept of East and West is the same as talking about how culture was originally created or how the indigenous people's rationalities are debated. The debate between Marshall Sahlins and Gannanath Obeyesekere about how the rationality of indigenous people gives an overview of how these identities are formed and assumed so far. Sahlins' *How "Natives" Think: About Captain Cook For Example* (1995) and Obeyesekere's *The apotheosis of Captain Cook: European Mythmaking in the Pacific* (1997) see how the traditions and rituals of the people of Hawaii and their interactions with Captain Cook of England. Sahlins argues that the Hawaiians responded to the arrival of Cook Hawai'i in their rituals. It means that the Hawaiian culture is created by native people of Hawai'i themselves. In that context Sahlins assumes that rationality of local people is far from western mind. Meanwhile Obeyesekere rejects Sahlins' argument that gives more emphasis on mythology. For Obeyesekere, the creation of culture is determined by western culture. Here, Obeyesekere argues that the minds of western and local (east - Hawaii) are the same and they act in the context of western thought. What is expressed, both by Sahlins and Obeyesekere have shown that identity is associated with political contexts. The debate of the two authors gives an idea of how identity is understood, shaped and built with different contexts as well as how we view culture itself. This paper sees the creation of a culture is not a stand-alone process but a process that is connected by various differentiating factors.

I argue that the arguments of Rouse (1995) and Brubaker and Cooper (2000), which provide criticisms on the concept of identity, are forms of contestation argument in (re)discussing identity. From the trace done, the emergence of these two writings give this paper a very important contribution in questioning "identity". At the same time, Stuart Hall through cultural studies has also questioned the concept of identity. Stuart Hall in his two essays, *Old and New Identities, Old and New Ethnicities* (1997) and *Who Needs 'Identity'?* (2000), seek to deconstruct the concept of identity in a various range of disciplines, including the 'discipline' of cultural studies.

The position of the authors in the debate is likely to retain the concept of identity as a concept which is relevant in the current situation in social and cultural disciplines. I, through this paper, argue to which side the concept of identity should be preserved and to which should be not (but should be recognized there is a tendency that this paper ignores the concepts that become very largely unused). However, it is necessary to bear in mind that the concepts of identity are abstract and vague. Accordingly, identity needs to be made and assisted with other supporting conceptual frameworks. The main reason in putting identity concept with other concepts is to make it easier to see in real contexts as well as to eliminate the impression of the concept of identity which is regarded as a rough draft and philosophically inclined. For example, the concept of identity is often associated with the concept ethnicity, gender, race, language, religion, sexual orientation, localization/territory and politics/party.

In this paper, I opine that the concept of identity is strongly associated with the concept of self, the political implications (of practice differences) and, of course, a situation where globalisation becomes part of it. In particular, globalisation is placed as a phenomenon that forces social science researchers to revisit the existing concepts that are the irrelevant concepts, including the concept of identity. To arrive at the discussions in an effort to find the answers to the questions above, the writer will go and introduce the 'concept' itself and continue with the concept of the identity in the disciplines both of sociology and social anthropology. Since these two disciplines are closely related, this paper becomes a tendentious attempt to establish the idea that the concept of identity has important implications in the social and cultural sciences. Therefore, as stated earlier, this paper is a

contemplation, an excavation as well as a search of the study of identity and at the same time an effort to confirm the study of identity that I study in the disciplines of sociology and anthropology lately.

For those who are not too familiar with the issues of identity, we will begin by first briefly describing the meaning of 'concept' and 'identity' within the sociological and anthropological framework. Then, we will revisit the issue of identity of the points that have been discussed previously. Next, we see how globalisation forces us to continuously renew the concept of identity. This paper also explains the connection of the use of 'concept' in sociology and anthropology. Therefore, the writer will explain the main difficulties in the study of sociology and social anthropology.

'Concept' in the Sociological/Antropological Working Hierarchy

There is one question that is sometimes expressed by students who are in their last semester in general and social scientists in particular about the concepts in sociology and anthropology. The question is usually whether the concepts in sociology and social anthropology can be used within the same framework and situation. The answer that I often give is that they can be used. I, while reading an old book written by EE Evans-Pritchard (1986) *Social Anthropology*, recognize that both concepts used in sociology and anthropology are really (almost) the same. The same opinion is also found in the article written by Clifford Geertz (1983), *Blurred Genres: The Refiguration of Social Thought*. Here, it is clear that Geertz is influenced by Evans-Pritchard's thought, that the boundaries of these disciplines become blurred and unclear to each other.

In short, as long as human and culture in the disciplines are closely related, the concepts can be used. If the concept between anthropology and sociology is critically seen, it in fact becomes clear when social sciences developed in Germany have been divided into two main streams, namely sociology - leading to the issue of human relationships with the economic perspective - and ethnology - based on the analysis refers to man's relationship with cultural aspects. So, it is a bit obvious that the so-called social anthropology in Europe is actually ethnology or sociology.

Philosophically, these two disciplines tend to work on the same field, human and cultural products. However, Evans-Pritchard (1986) and Geertz (1983) warn that sociology and social anthropology (ethnology) have different methods. Sociology emphasizes on specific cultures and anthropology emphasizes on the pooling activities with the communities examined in a specified period, usually annual research, although today, there are many methods of ethnography that have been used by sociology. So it is clear that the difference is not in how the study is raised but in the methods used. The method is the one that gives birth to the concept we use today. But keep in mind that in the extent where the disciplines of sociology and anthropology are met, anthropological concepts have been much influenced by the concepts of sociology. For example, Geertz's concept of culture has at least been influenced by the concept of the culture of the German sociologist Max Weber.

Let me first introduce what is meant by 'concept'. Since sociology and anthropology have various kinds of understanding of the concept, this paper intends to deliver the understanding of the 'concept' from methodological perspective. This paper begins with a question implied in the previous paragraph, if the concepts of sociology and anthropology can be used in each of these disciplines or even both. 'Concept' is often used as a distinguishing means which has a variety of value (more than one values that can be described by a few variables or indicators) and often abstract. The concept helps us, particularly researchers, to understand the object or a thing that interests us to be investigated. In other words, 'concept' helps us to establish an understanding of what we see, describe and analysis. So, 'concept' is actually a tool to describe and analyse everything outside our world (otherness). The depiction of the concept is important because it also completes the whole thinking point of an idea in mind, for example the concept of *imagined community* (Benedict Anderson), *infra politics* (James Scott), *semantic politics* (Webb Keane), *friction* (Anna Tsing), *dubbing culture* (Tom Boelstorf) and etc.

However, in the context of scientific knowledge, 'concept' is not used arbitrarily or as simple as our understanding that is to provide a definition. 'Concept' is used in such a way through these steps and professional norms in the study. In other words, 'concept' is used to facilitate researchers to work and do what must be done further. In such a situation, it is important to distinguish between what is called 'concept' and 'definition'. 'Concept' is an abstract idea that is used to describe an event or phenomenon, and usually summed up in one word or short phrase (Singarimbun 1989). While 'definition' refers to a more specific and comprehensive explanation of the concept.

I suggest that the first step taken in the research is to understand and seek the connectedness of the concepts used before doing further research or writing. Such a procedure is essentially the ability of researchers to select, define and connect the terms in his research. However, keep in mind that analogy or metaphor is the most important element in emerging a concept. For example what is conducted by Anna Tsing to the concept of *friction*. She analogizes friction with "tire that is inherent in the asphalt/road, but the tire is still spinning because of friction". Therefore Tsing (2005) imagines what happened in a society with concept of friction - global connections in the community. The difficulties that emerge the diversity of meaning in the use of 'concept' in both disciplines should be understood as a result of the emergence of consciousness that in the community groups, there is a set of ideas or concepts that are shared or used together.

I try to explain the study which has been a principal concern of both disciplines, namely cultural and interaction. For researchers who focus their attentions on culture, 'concept' is a problem that often arises in a study of culture. For senior researchers, 'concept' in social anthropology studies becomes very simple to be mentioned, but for novice researchers, 'concept' becomes a word that often makes them trapped in susceptibility of the improper and even totally wrong selection of concepts. One example is the concept of *adat* (custom). The concept of *adat* had politically appeared because the Dutch referred it to the ground, while the concept of *adat* in Bali, based on the study by Warren (1993), refers to are more complex nature concerning religion, traditions and values of the norm.

In mid-2010, for the purposes of the dissertation research, I conducted a study on identity of Tenganese in Karangasem, Bali. I realize that what was really called *adat* in Tenganan is not solely in form of cooperation between community groups in Desa Tenganan. It is not merely *adat* (social structure) but also including religion, beliefs, rituals, and the distribution of economic power. The concept that was once considered a special concept becomes meaningless in such a situation when the writer conducted his research in Tenganan Pegringsingan. Thus, for the purposes of negating reliance on the less precise meaning, anthropologists typically use local terms (and sometimes "original", although in post-colonial perspective a concept of "original" is not appropriate) to bridge the difference in interpretation. The concept is of course built with emic perspective (native's point of views) or the perspective of the local culture (Malinowski 1922).

As a consequence, this fact has opened a debate in the context of methodology that is which method is actually the best one for understanding cultural studies. This fact has also opened a new understanding that the definition of concept in cultural study tends to have new ambiguities, especially in the use of concepts that emerges from the outside of local community (usually the concept of European or western countries). In the case of *adat*, I suggest that this is one form of difficulties in an effort to make the universality of concept in the study of social anthropology (including sociology). The concept of '*adat*' of course then becomes difficult and less appropriate if it is associated with the context of Islam, for example Muslim. In Minangkabau traditions, *adat* and Islamic conception has been so strong in forming a new meaning to *adat* of Minangkabau (Abdullah 1966; 1967, Kahn 1993, Hadler 2008). But, in Tenganan, *adat* has a central role, because *adat* has already existed, then in Tenganan Pegringsingan, *Agama Hindu* is the one that has been through adaptation process in Tenganese's a way of life or culture (*adat*). So the only venture to get out of the ambiguity of the concept is to be out of the general concept and then refer to the local concept. These are the things that have long been made by anthropologists and then followed by sociologists.

The challenge is what often leads to debate about the position of sociologists or anthropologists in a study. I stay in the assumption to maintain a tendency to think in a framework inherent to the object of research. The issue of debate on the researcher and the researched context is arguably the beginning of the debate on identity first emerged in the social sciences. I have proposed a long but unfinished discussion, in the philosophical realm such as the idea of Thomas S. Kuhn's *The Scientific Paradigm*. The debate about 'concept' would be used to help the writer analyse the two articles (Rouse and Brubakers & Cooper) that become the central issue in the debate over the concept of identity.

The Problems of (Theory) Identities

When I read a novel written by Pramoedya Ananta Toer, a famous Indonesian novelist, entitled *Earth of Mankind*, I remember an individual character named Minke, a Javanese, who is educated in a Dutch School (HBS), speaks Javanese and Dutch fluently, lives in Dutch culture, and of course gets along with European people who are considered to have higher social status. This individual called Minke shows us that identity is never singular. It always adheres and is even able to be drawn in another community's culture, in which individual is identified as part of 'I' or 'We' and not part of 'They' or 'You'. This differentiation is important to understand a study of identity. Then how can we theorize and problematize identity?

Skeggs (2008) tries to classify anything that can become problems in identity. According to Skeggs, identity becomes problems when "... (i) identity is not equally available to all and so operates as an unequal resource that only some can use, (ii) the concept of identity is generated from discourse of the self and possessive individualism that were reliant on the conversion and knowledge experience via practices of telling and representation.., and (iii) the etymology of identity is from western specific colonialist discourse..". In this context, Skeggs' explanation is almost the same with Obeyesekere's that views identity (or culture) is formed by influences from the west. However, it should be kept in mind that *native* is not always be a passive object. To understand the position of identity, an institutionalized effort, the making of identification, and how experience becomes identity positioned by a group of individuals should have been seen.

Reification or making something to be more real is a basic concept discussed in Rouse's article (1995) and becomes a principal issue in his criticism on the concept of identity. It cannot be denied that since Benedict Anderson in *Imagined Community* (1983) explains the concept of nationalism and identity in the transition era when printed capitalism was printed, there have been several social scientists (sociologists and anthropologists) who become aware that studies on identity is studies or projects about imagination or absurdity. Anderson has clearly stated how the concept of cosmopolitan emerges the concept of nation-state. Because he is part of imagination project, the concept of identity is used in contexts to understand politics of differences in the real community with vague approaches. What becomes the main focus of Rouse (1995) in his article is the emergence of understanding the views among anthropologists/ sociologists that the basic concepts of knowledge both in sociology and anthropology are used by adapting the concepts to be more real. Therefore, there is a tendency that using such concepts may lead to misunderstanding. One of the prominent examples is the concept of "tradition".

"Tradition" is a concept that is frequently used in the studies of culture, besides the concept of 'culture' itself. In some considerable length of time, the concept of tradition is strengthened by various kinds of research and classical concept of tradition even gives classification about the definition of 'culture'. I realize that anthropologists and sociologists cannot be independent from construction of knowledge. The reification of the concept of 'tradition' tends to be a kind of social construction and then becomes something favourite to be used in cultural research (Hobsbawen & Ranger 1993). To avoid reification, there are other concepts in cultural studies, one of which is the concept of identity. However, there is an effort done by some anthropologists who understand identity as something that is taken for granted. It should be comprehended that identity is something fluid, flexible, liquid, and if it can be assumed by using Blaise Pascal's law of water, identity tends to have the same

characteristics with water that it can seep through narrow slits. However, we should pay attention to Neo-Marxian's opinion that views identity as something permanent the same as when rich people (high/middle class) want fix identity as high class people or being up from middle class people.

Addressing to Neo-Marxian's thought, this article stands on the position that considers identity is something liquid and complex. The understanding that identity is a strong construction and frequently considered as core culture of a certain society have strengthened reification to become a repeated mistake. The example is a study about Picard (1996) about 'kebalian' identity of the Balinese. In the study, it is explained that Balinese understand their identity by putting three important basic components that they value, namely the religion they embrace (Hinduism, Hindu Religion), and their involvement in *adat* and art activities. A question comes to my mind, if the study is put on the framework of this concept, it is unfortunate that characteristics that adhere to me as a Balinese is only based on religion and the activeness to be involved in *adat*, and even it is not a hundred per cent, and my artistic soul is very far from expectation. Putting 'kebalian' identity of the Balinese in such a way, by concentrating on three components – *Agama Hindu*, *adat*, and A) is a view of outsiders to see it as a similarity. Then how about the marginal Balinese living in the north of Bali like Sembiran (Boon 1976, Barth 1993, Hauser-Schäubin 2004, Vickers 2012) who have been Muslims for years? Are they not part of Balinese?

In such situation, I realize that identity depends on *identification* of what is adhered by an individual to another. Through an *identification* (or *self-categorization* – in a theory of social identity) process, identity is formed (Stets & Burke 2000). At least Wittgenstein's theory of *language game* mentions that there are three things that should be paid attention to in understanding the concept of identity, that are *who* (subject) that gives the identification, *to whom* (object) and *for what* (political motives in the identification) the identification is done. With this context, identity is formed through the process of interaction and without exploration. *Postcolonial* community has rejected this understanding. According to them, identity theory is principally related to components in structured society (Stets & Burke 2000). Therefore, understanding the theory of identity is the same with understanding *roles*. Meanwhile social identity theory understands it by comprehending *categories or groups*. Accordingly, what becomes important in the study of identity is not on the tendency to understand it as something taken for granted, but as a phenomenon that needs systematic explanation, the same with other sociological or anthropological concepts.

The concept of identity, the same as concepts of tradition and culture, is not a fact that can be simply understood. However, this concept is a concept that is not freely standing. I remind you that identity is better understood as a construct in a society. Without thinking that identity is a construct, the tendency occurs is that the understanding is trapped in a not-too-deep perspective or analysis. Accordingly, following Handler's opinion (1994) that identity is born from a discourse of western intellectuals, researchers who are interested with identity issues should apply principles of circumspection in using the concept of identity in different social structure in terms of geographical dimension, time, and space, in this case is eastern discourse. In other words, the concept of identity is not homogenous or universal so it cannot be used in the analysis of other cultures. The example is the concept of Southern Balinese identity cannot be used in understanding the concept of the Northern Balinese.

So far, it seems there is a movement done as constructive efforts to lead the understanding to look for 'identity' in all cultures regardless geographical, space, and time concepts. However, it should be taken into account that I do not mean to give a view that identity is determined by geographical, space and time dimensions. What I want is there should be conscious and reflective characteristics in understanding 'identity' as part of discourse construction produced/developed by the west and introduced to the east. Identity in the tradition of western thought tends to be understood to be singular. In other words, someone has only a single identity (Handler 1994). However, based on Hermann's research (2003) in Banaban, Fiji, the concept seems to be impossible as in eastern society in particular, singular identity is almost impossible to be found. Therefore, as emphasised by Hermann, identity is not singular, but it is complex and manifold.

Identities in Discourse/Practices: How Catching the Identities in Global Flow?

I have discussed a bit about aspects of identity and how globalisation has forced the emergence of a new method in understanding identity in the previous section. What is exactly identity if it is reviewed from theoretical point of view? If it is related to another concept, namely globalisation, the relation has forced social scientists to see further on how identity is understood in globalised society. The emergence of globalisation has impacted in the review of concepts and methods that so far have been considered to be standardized in sociology and anthropology disciplines. I will give an analogy to give an understanding of how my visualization of identity in globalisation.

For me, identity is like a train locomotive. It goes following the railway, along the way, and stops in certain stations. It is not like an express train, but a train that goes more slowly. By going slowly, the train brings us to explore along the railway. When comes to the tract, we see and pay full attention to one and another station. It is what has given us a chance to carefully see in-between.

When globalisation is understood as a social process in micro scale, a big question on how to grasp identity in the condition that can be described as unstable and not dense is raised. Meyer & Geschiere (1999) explain that globalisation is a confusing and inconsistent process. The ambiguity of the concept can be seen from the equation of the concept with homogenisation. The debate on whether globalisation should be seen as a flux or fix phenomenon is confusing. The primary issue in the relation between identity and globalisation is double responsibilities of identity itself, which are firstly explaining the context of identity and globalisation and secondly explaining the identity itself. In this context, it is important to be considered that 'identity' is not a central concept, but it becomes an important analysing aid in understanding globalisation as proposed by Meyer and Geschiere (1999) "As long as globalization is regarded as an overall process of uniformization, there is no need for such a concept, but as soon as this one-sided view, identity seems to become an inevitable analytical tool in order to grasp how globalization reinforces the production of cultural differences". It has become a challenge in social sciences to see how globalisation should be understood. My position in this article is to see globalisation as a process and something liquid. To understand the concept of identity and globalisation, we should compare it with the analogy of 'catching eels' – something visible but difficult to be defined.

Even though Handler (1994) opines that identity is not a universal concept, the conception of identity, which cannot be denied, emerges from western perspective. The use of the concept of identity has developed very fast. Sököfeld (2001) mentions that in few decades ago, the concept of identity was used by a few philosophers, psychologists, and sociologists. However, in 1950s and 1970s, the concept of identity has gradually and commonly used in other social sciences including anthropology. The description gives us an understanding that identity has become an analysing aid in social sciences.

The use of identity concept from Brubaker & Cooper (2000) and the other two classical concepts namely the concept of identity and ethnicity from Fredrik Barth (1969) in his book *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries* and a concept of social identity from Richard Jenkins (2008a; 2008b) become very important in answering the above problems. Why I use the two concepts and definitions is because Barth's work which consider that identity concepts that so far have been understood as biological form and something taken for granted is monumental. It becomes an initial study of identity that is out of the previous social construction. The second article from Jenkins (2004; 2008) is using Barth's work as a basis of the thought and also one of the articles about identity from the contemporary sociological perspectives. Once again, the use of literature on traditional western thought is unavoidable. However, the use should be remembered as a form to deconstruct the hegemony of western concepts.

If it is traced deeper about the existence of theory about identity, we will be confronted with three general mainstreams in viewing the problems concerning identity. In the theory of ethnic identity, we have recognised three different point of views. Among them are views in seeing identity from primordialism, instrumentalism, and constructivism perspectives

(Eriksen 1993). Primordialism concept emphasises on the assumption that identity as ethnicity is an initial and strong form from groups affiliation, in which conflicts are considered normal and ethnic solidarity seems to be preserved if economy and government are developing. Instrumental concept assumes and sees that ethnicity is placed based on the role of ethnic entrepreneurs. The entrepreneur strengthens the importance of identity in claiming government resources, gaining more recruits of particular identity, and raising personal power. Constructivism concept suggests seeing ethnic identity in a continuous process of construction and redefinition based on some different factors. Ethnic identity emerges from a “dense web of social interactions”. Studies on constructivism fields nowadays emphasise on the relation between capitalism and ethnic nationalism.

Barth (1969), in the opening of colloquium series held in Norway, gave a view and incisive criticisms about the development of identity theory particularly those viewed from primordial and instrumental perspectives. For Barth, primordial identity theory has failed in explaining the emergence of new ethnic groups and/or the enhancement of the importance of identities in these recent years. Some scientists, similar to Barth – Pathan identity (1969), such as Jan-Petter Blom and Izikowitz – Laos identity, illustrate how development concerning the relationship between economy and nationalism does not ruin identity but it in fact emerges new ethnic categories. For instrumental identity, it is found that this theory has failed in explaining why someone has to comply with ethnic entrepreneur. Through the volume edition on ethnic groups and boundaries, Barth gives a significant contribution to the development of identity theory.

Conclusion

The idea of globalisation cannot be denied to have raised some questions and serious debates in the social sciences circle. Since the idea of globalisation was firstly proposed, the group that views globalisation as something fix has different arguments with another group that views that globalisation is something liquid. However, it cannot be denied that the different point of views in understanding globalisation has impacted on the understanding in seeing how identity is formed. We have understood that there are two kinds of theoretical stream in understanding identity and social identity theory as what is proposed by Stets & Burke (2000), that are through the observation towards categorizations or self-categorization and through roles of individuals in social groups that we frequently term as identification process. The view that I have elaborated is to see globalisation as a blurred concept, that is a mixed condition between global and local that is proposed by British sociologist, Roland Robertson, and called *glocalisation*. It becomes important to see how globalisation process in a micro scale and not contrasting what is called global and local. Instead of contrasting global and local, I predict there will be an effort to look for a comprehensive ethnographic form in understanding problems of identity. I have tried to understand identity and globalisation and given assumption that comprehensive methods are needed to understand the concept. I do not say that ethnographic method that we commonly use cannot be utilised, but I see that in understanding identity in global-local scale, it becomes important to be discussed. Anna Tsing (2005) has started a new method in investigating global ethnography in understanding problems in globalisation. However, in analysing identity, it is not given much portion.

One of the books that is recently published about *Digital Anthropology* is shocking our daydream that the development of society particularly social interaction among people in the society no longer exists in a simple situation. It involves two or three actors. However, it takes place in a massive interaction that is recorded in long period and has massive social effects. The description of social media such as facebook, twitter, flickr and other media has accelerated the revolution of the way people communicated. It means identity will be changed not in days but in seconds. In such a condition, theory identity and social identity are challenged to give explanation about it. I do not propose any new radical way in viewing identity, but I invite you to review the previous methods of how identity is formed. My main concern lies on the will to understand globalisation and then try to elaborate it with the concept of identity. An important framework from sociology and anthropology disciplines can be used here in fathoming the problem. When identity is here understood as something liquid and in one side I also understand that globalisation is a mixing process in micro scale,

space dimension in identity becomes liquid, dynamic and *multiple*. In such a context, identity becomes a signifier in the production of cultural differences.

References

- Abdullah T (1966) Adat and Islam: an examination of the conflict in Minangkabau. *Indonesia* (2):1-24.
- Abdullah T (1967) *Minangkabau 1900-1927: preliminary studies in social sciences*. Thesis, Cornell University, Ithaca.
- Anderson B (1983) *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso.
- Barth F (1969) Introduction. In: F Barth (ed). *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries*. Bergen: Universitets Forlaget. 9-38.
- Barth F (1993) *Balinese Worlds*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Boon JA (1976) *The Anthropological Romance of Bali 1597-1972: Dynamic Perspectives in Marriage & Caste, Politics & Religion*. Cambridge Studies in Cultural System. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brubaker R & Cooper F (2000) Beyond "identity". *Theory and Society* 29(1):1-47.
- Eriksen TH (1993) *Ethnicity and Nationalism, Anthropological Perspectives*. Anthropology, Culture and Societies Series. London: Pluto Press.
- Evans-Pritchard EE (1996) *Social Anthropology*. New York: The Free Press.
- Geertz C (1983) Blurred Genres: The Refiguration of Social Thought. In: C Geertz (ed). *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretative Anthropology*. New York: Basic Books. 19-35.
- Gleason P (1983) Identifying identity: a semantic history. *The Journal of American History* 69 (4):910-931.
- Hadler J (2008) *Muslim and Matriarchs: Cultural Resilience in Indonesia Through Jihad and Colonialism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Hall S (1997) Old and New Identities, Old and New Ethnicities. In: AD King (ed). *Culture, Globalization, and The World-System. Contemporary Conditions for the Representation of Identity*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 41-65.
- Hall S (2000) Who Needs 'Identity'?. In: P du Gay, J Evans & P Redman (eds). *Identity: A Reader*. London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: Sage Publications. 15-30.
- Handler R (1994) Is "Identity" a Useful Cross-Cultural Concept?. In: J Gillis (ed). *Commemorations. The Politics of National Identity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 27-40.
- Hauser-Schäublin B (2004) "Bali aga" and Islam: ethnicity, ritual practices and "old Balinese" as an anthropological construct. *Indonesia* 77:27-55.
- Hermann E (2003) Manifold identifications within differentiations: shaping of self among the relocated banabans of Fiji. *Focaal-European Journal of Anthropology* 42:77-88.
- Hobsbawn E & Renger T (eds) 1993 *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jenkins R (2008a) *Social Identity*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Jenkins R (2008b) *Rethinking Ethnicity: Arguments and Explorations*. London: Sage.
- Kahn JS (1993) *Constituting the Minangkabau: Peasants, Culture and Modernity in Colonial Indonesia*. Providence, R.I.: Berg.
- Malinowski B (1922) *Argonauts of the Western Pacific. An Account of Native Enterprise and Adventure in the Archipelagoes of Melanesian New Guinea*. London: George Routledge and Sons.
- Meyer B & Geschiere P (2003) Globalization and Identity: Dialectics of Flow and Closure. In: B Meyer & P Geschiere (eds). *Globalization and Identity: Dialectics of Flow and Closure*. Oxford, UK and Malden, USA: Blackwell Publishing. 1-15.
- Obeyesekere G (1997) *The Apotheosis of Captain Cook: European Mythmaking in the Pacific*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Rouse R (1995) Question of identity: personhood and collectivity in transnational migration to the United States. *Critique of Anthropology* 15:351-380.

- Sahlins M (1995) How "Natives" Think: about Captain Cook For Example. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Skeggs B (2008) The Problem with Identity. In: AMY Lin (ed). *Problematizing Identity: Every Struggles in Language, Culture and Education*. New York and London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Taylor and Francis Group. 11-34.
- Sökofeld M (1996) Debating self, identity and culture in Anthropology. *Current Anthropology* 40 (4):417-447.
- Sökofeld M (2001) Reconsidering identity. *Anthropos* 96:527-544.
- Strets JE & Burke PJ (2000) Identity theory and social identity theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 63 (3):224-237.
- Tsing AL (2005) *Friction: An Ethnography of Global Connection*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Vickers A (2012) *Bali: A Paradise Created*. Hongkong: Turtles.
- Warren C (1993) *Adat and Dinas: Balinese Communities in the Indonesian State*. Kuala Lumpur and New York: Oxford University Press.