Exploring Identity Formation From Enlightenment Liberalism To Postcolonial Theory

Dr. Gaurav Pandey[1*], Dr. Khemeshwar Netam [2], Vikas singh [3]

[1*]Assistant professor at Govt. Mahendra Karma Girls college, Dantewada, e-mail- imgaurav1390@gmail.com
[2]Assiatant Professor at Govt. Mahendra Karma Girls College, Dantewada, e-mail – khemeshwarnetam179@gmail.com
[3]Research Scholar at Department of Sociology, BHU, Varanasi. e-mail- vikassinghbholu@gmail.com

This paper presents an interdisciplinary exploration of identity as a multifaceted construct shaped by social affiliations, spatial contexts, and power dynamics. Drawing from foundational theories such as Henri Tajfel's *Social Identity Theory*, Harold Proshansky's *Place Identity Theory*, and John Locke's liberal framework of political identity, the study examines how individuals negotiate self-concept through group membership, environmental attachment, and sociopolitical structures. The analysis integrates C. Wright Mills's *Power Elite* theory, Steven Lukes's *Three Dimensions of Power*, and Michel Foucault's discourse on *disciplinary power*, illustrating how authority is maintained not only through institutional hierarchies but also via ideology, surveillance, and cultural norms. The discussion further extends to colonial and postcolonial dynamics using the "Power Sphere Theory," highlighting how modern imperialism operates through economic dependency, cultural assimilation, and soft power rather than direct control. James Marcia's *Identity Status Theory* complements this analysis by mapping individual psychological trajectories of identity formation across stages of exploration and commitment. Finally, the phenomenon of ethnocentrism is examined as both a barrier to intercultural understanding and a byproduct of rigid group identity constructs. By synthesizing these diverse theoretical perspectives, the paper offers a comprehensive lens through which to understand identity as a socially, politically, and spatially situated phenomenon, with implications for education, governance, migration, and intergroup relations in a globalized world.

Key words – Power sphere theory, Social Identity, culture, colonialism

The **Power Sphere Theory** isn't a widely recognized or standardized in mainstream political science, sociology, or psychology. However, depending on the context, people sometimes use **"power sphere"** to describe **different zones or levels of power** in society, politics, or organizational structures.

Since the term can be **interpreted in multiple ways**, below are **three major frameworks** where "spheres of power" or "power structures" are often discussed — and it may be one of these you're referring to:

The concept of **Power Sphere Theory** refers to the idea that power is distributed across distinct but overlapping domains or "spheres" within a society. These spheres can include political, economic, military, cultural, and interpersonal domains, each with its own mechanisms for maintaining and exercising control.

Sociologist **C. Wright Mills (1956)** introduced the notion of a **"power elite"**, identifying three dominant spheres in American society: the political, military, and economic institutions. According to Mills, these elite groups are interconnected and collectively shape major national decisions, forming a concentrated structure of power.

In the field of international relations, **Joseph Nye (2004)** distinguishes between **hard power** (coercive power such as military force or economic sanctions), **soft power** (the ability to shape preferences through appeal and attraction), and **smart power** (a strategic combination of the two). These power types can be viewed as distinct spheres through which nations exert influence globally.

Additionally, **Steven Lukes (2005)** outlines **three dimensions of power** that operate across various spheres: decision-making power, agenda-setting power, and ideological power. The third dimension, in particular, shows how power functions subtly by shaping desires and beliefs, often through the cultural or ideological sphere.

Together, these frameworks suggest that power is **multi-dimensional** and operates across **institutional, cultural, and personal** spheres. Recognizing these overlapping power domains helps explain how authority is maintained not only through force or policy but also through **norms, values, and ideology** embedded in everyday life.

Theories of power have evolved significantly in modern political thought. **Michel Foucault**, **C. Wright Mills**, and **Steven Lukes** offer distinct but intersecting perspectives on the structure and exercise of power across social and political spheres.

1. C. Wright Mills – The Power Elite (1956)
Mills conceptualized power as concentrated in a **triad of institutions**—the political, military, and corporate spheres—controlled by a small, interconnected ruling class known as the **power elite**. These elites dominate decision-making processes at the national level, rendering democratic processes superficial (Mills, 1956). For Mills, power is **top-down**, institutional, and visible, located in formal hierarchies and elite networks.

2. Steven Lukes – Three Dimensions of Power (2005)

Lukes expanded the concept of power by introducing **three dimensions**:
- **First Dimension:** Observable decision-making (who wins in conflicts).
- **Second Dimension:** Control over the agenda and what issues are kept off the table.
- **Third Dimension:** Ideological power — shaping people's desires, beliefs, and perceptions (Lukes, 2005).

Luke's theory is **multi-layered** and moves from **overt to covert forms of power**, highlighting how power can operate **without conflict or awareness**, often within the ideological and cultural spheres.

3. Michel Foucault – Power/Knowledge and Disciplinary Power
Foucault rejected the traditional view of power as something held or possessed by elites. Instead, he viewed power as **diffuse, relational, and embedded in discourse, institutions, and knowledge systems** (Foucault, 1977). Power is not merely repressive but also **productive**, shaping subjectivity, norms, and truth. His concept of **"biopower"** explains how modern states regulate populations through subtle forms of surveillance and normalization.
Foucault's perspective differs from Mills and Lukes by emphasizing the **everyday, decentralized, and micro-level operations of power**—especially through **disciplines**, **institutions**, and **language**.

Power Sphere Theory of Colonialism
The Power Sphere Theory, frequently framed in geopolitical discussions as a "sphere of influence," describes the capacity of a dominant state or entity to exert considerable influence over a foreign territory or region without direct political control. This framework illustrates how colonial and postcolonial dominance is often sustained through economic dependency, cultural assimilation, political manipulation, and, at times, a military presence, rather than through formal occupation or annexation.(Nye, 2004; Said, 1978).

Elements of the Theory
The theory suggests that a dominant power, often a nation-state, sustains hegemony over a specific geographical sphere of influence, leading to asymmetrical power dynamics between the dominant and subordinate regions (Wallerstein, 2004). This influence typically results in the exploitation of natural resources, manipulation of political systems, and the subjugation of cultural identities, benefiting the hegemon while undermining local autonomy and development. (Young, 2001).

Mechanisms of Influence
1. Economic Dependence
Through trade imbalances, debt, and control over investments, the dominant power can shape the economic structures of the subordinate territory, leading to long-term dependency (Frank, 1969; Amin, 1976).

2. Cultural Assimilation
Cultural influence is exerted through media, language, education, and religion, promoting the internalization of the values and norms of the dominant culture—a phenomenon often termed cultural imperialism (Said, 1978).

3. Political Manipulation
The dominant state may exert indirect influence over the local government, pushing it to align policies and decisions with external interests, frequently disguised as development aid or diplomatic partnerships (Chomsky, 1999).

4. Military Presence
While direct occupation may not take place, the establishment of military bases or alliances can act as a mechanism to enforce or reinforce the influence of the dominant power when deemed necessary (Harvey, 2003)

Historical and Contemporary Examples
- European colonialism in Africa and Asia exemplifies how colonial powers exerted control over territories not only through trade monopolies but also by employing administrative advisors, often without directly governing every region (Young, 2001).
- During the Cold War, both the United States and the Soviet Union established extensive spheres of influence, asserting control over client states through a combination of ideological, economic, and military strategies (Gaddis, 2005).
- In the postcolonial era, many former colonies found themselves economically and culturally bound to their colonial rulers, a situation commonly referred to as neo-colonialism (Fanon, 1963).
Today, modern geopolitical strategies employed by powers such as the United States, China, and Russia continue to reflect similar paradigms through global finance, diplomatic influence, and regional security alliances (Nye, 2004; Harvey, 2003).

Social Identity Theory (SIT), Originally formulated by Henri Tajfel and further refined by John Turner, provides a sophisticated psychological framework for understanding how individuals develop their identity through group membership. This theory posits that a significant portion of an individual's self-concept stems from their perceived affiliation with social categories, which profoundly affects their attitudes, behaviors, and interactions with other groups (Tajfel & Turner, 1979).

Key Components of Social Identity Theory
1. Social Categorization
 Individuals simplify the complexities of their social environment by categorizing themselves and others into various groups based on attributes such as ethnicity, religion, occupation, and age. This categorization not only facilitates the definition of social roles but also establishes the expectations that shape one's social identity. Furthermore, it creates a framework for individuals to assess themselves and those around them, helping to clarify personal and social identities within a broader societal context (Tajfel & Turner, 1979).

2. Social Identification
After categorization, individuals engage in social identification, actively aligning themselves with their respective groups. This involves internalizing the norms, values, and behaviors associated with the group, fostering a deep emotional attachment and loyalty. As individuals identify with their group, these collective norms and values become integral to their self-concept, thus influencing their beliefs and actions (Turner et al., 1987). This internalization not only strengthens individual connections to the group but also enhances solidarity among its members.

3. Social Comparison
An essential component of SIT is social comparison, where individuals evaluate their own group (the in-group) against other groups (out-groups). This evaluative process aims to reinforce or enhance self-esteem and often manifests as in-group favoritism—showing preference and support for one's own group—alongside out-group discrimination, which involves harboring negative biases toward those outside the group. Such comparisons can occur even when group distinctions are trivial or arbitrary, highlighting the powerful influence of perceived group membership on interpersonal dynamics and social relationships (Tajfel, 1982).
By elucidating these mechanisms, Social Identity Theory offers valuable insights into the complexities of human behavior within a social context, emphasizing the critical role that group affiliation plays in shaping individual identity and societal interactions.

Implications of Social Identity Theory
SIT provides insight into the psychological roots of **prejudice and discrimination**, demonstrating that **mere categorization** into groups can trigger bias and stereotyping, even in the absence of direct conflict (Tajfel, 1982). Through the **Minimal Group Paradigm**, Tajfel showed that individuals exhibit in-group bias even when group distinctions are meaningless or randomly assigned.
This theory also explains phenomena such as **ethnocentrism**, **nationalism**, and **intergroup conflict**, emphasizing how identity-based group divisions can lead to sustained hostilities (Hogg & Abrams, 1988).

Applications of Social Identity Theory
• **Organizational Behavior**: SIT is used to understand team dynamics and workplace loyalty (Haslam, 2001).
• **Education**: It explains student group behavior and peer influence.
• **Politics**: The theory helps analyze **national identity**, **partisan affiliation**, and voting behavior.
• **Marketing**: It explains consumer attachment to **brand communities** and identity-based branding (Bhattacharya & Sen, 2003).

The Role of Self-Identity Groups
Belonging to a **self-identity group** satisfies multiple psychological needs:
• **Belonging**: Group membership provides a sense of social inclusion and emotional connection, fulfilling the basic human need for belongingness (Baumeister & Leary, 1995).
• **Self-Esteem**: Individuals gain pride and self-worth from identifying with valued groups, boosting confidence and perceived social status (Tajfel & Turner, 1979).
• **Purpose and Meaning**: Groups offer shared beliefs and collective goals, which help guide decision-making and life direction (Ashforth & Mael, 1989).
• **Security and Support**: Identity groups can provide practical and emotional support, particularly during periods of stress or crisis.
• **Differentiation**: Group identity allows individuals to define themselves in contrast to others, helping to establish personal uniqueness within social structures (Hogg, 2000).

According to Social Identity Theory, individuals derive meaning, self-esteem, and social orientation from the groups they belong to. These groups significantly influence how individuals **see themselves**, **relate to others**, and **interact in social contexts**, often leading to **in-group solidarity** and **out-group bias** (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Turner et al., 1987).

Understanding Identity Through Social and Spatial Lenses: A Comparative Analysis of Tajfel's Social Identity Theory and Proshansky's Place Identity Theory

The complex formation of identity constitutes an intricate amalgamation of sociocultural relationships and environmental influences. Two seminal theories—Tajfel's Social Identity Theory and Proshansky's Place Identity Theory—offer distinct yet complementary frameworks for examining how individuals cultivate their self-concept.

Tajfel's Social Identity Theory (1979)

Central to Tajfel and Turner's Social Identity Theory (SIT) is the premise that a significant portion of an individual's identity is derived from their affiliations with social groups—such as those based on nationality, religion, or political ideology (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). This theory elucidates three core psychological processes that inform the dynamics of social identity formation:

1. Social Categorization – This cognitive process involves the classification of individuals (including oneself) into various groups, setting the stage for social dynamics framed as "us" versus "them."

2. Social Identification – Individuals internalize the norms and values of their in-group, which fosters a profound sense of belonging and contributes to the reinforcement of self-esteem.

3. Social Comparison – Individuals evaluate their in-group in relation to out-groups, which can incite in-group favoritism and potentially lead to prejudice and discrimination, even in the absence of material competition (Tajfel, 1982; Turner et al., 1987).

SIT serves as a pivotal theoretical framework for elucidating a variety of social phenomena, including prejudice, stereotyping, nationalism, and intergroup conflict, thereby highlighting the capacity for mere categorization to elicit entrenched biases.

Proshansky's Place Identity Theory (1978)

Conversely, Proshansky's Place Identity Theory emphasizes the significant role of physical environments in shaping personal identity. Proshansky posits that place identity constitutes a critical "substructure of self-identity," characterized by cognitive, emotional, and symbolic attachments to specific physical spaces. These attachments emerge through lived experiences and play a pivotal role in an individual's self-definition (Proshansky, 1978).

Key components of this theory include:

Environmental Anchors : Homes, neighborhoods, and natural environments serve as stabilizing forces, providing continuity and meaning that shape individuals' interactions with their surroundings.

Place-Linked Memory : Significant life events associated with particular locations contribute to the formation of emotional and autobiographical memories, which assist in the construction of one's narrative identity.

Impact of Loss : The disruption or loss of meaningful places—due to migration, urbanization, or natural disasters—can lead to profound identity confusion or psychological distress, as individuals confront the absence of these vital connections (Proshansky et al., 1983).

This theoretical framework has established a foundational role in the discipline of environmental psychology, offering critical insights into urban planning, migration studies, and the psychological implications of post-disaster recovery (Hernandez et al., 2007).

Comparative Overview
Comparison: Social Identity (Tajfel) vs. Place Identity (Proshansky)

Aspect	Tajfel's Social Identity Theory (1979)	Proshansky's Place Identity (1978)
Core Idea	Identity is shaped through **group membership**	Identity is shaped through **attachment to physical places**
Type of Identity	**Social identity** (we vs. they)	**Place identity** (me in this place)
Influences on Identity	Belonging to **social groups** (e.g., caste, nation, religion)	Emotional and symbolic attachment to **places** (e.g., hometown)

Aspect	Tajfel's Social Identity Theory (1979)	Proshansky's Place Identity (1978)
Main Process	Categorization → Identification → Comparison	Experience → Attachment → Integration into self-concept
Focus	Group dynamics, discrimination, in-group/out-group bias	Physical environment's role in shaping personal identity
Emotional Role	Pride, loyalty, or prejudice based on group status	Nostalgia, comfort, loss, or disorientation linked to places
Impacts	Explains **prejudice**, stereotyping, nationalism	Explains **place attachment**, displacement trauma, urban identity
Theoretical Contribution	Key to **intergroup behavior and social conflict**	Key to **environmental psychology** and sense of place

Complementarity and Real-World Relevance

Both theories underscore the complex and multidimensional nature of identity, emphasizing that it is influenced by social interaction and environmental context. While Tajfel's framework directs attention to the relational aspects of identity, Proshansky's lens highlights the significance of the physical spaces individuals inhabit and their effects on self-perception. The integration of insights from both frameworks is particularly pertinent in understanding phenomena such as migration, urban displacement, and cultural adaptation.

For example, when examining the experience of a tribal student transitioning from a verdant rural environment to a bustling urban university, one can observe the potential for social identity conflict. Such an individual may encounter feelings of exclusion or stereotyping, in alignment with Tajfel and Turner's findings (1979). Concurrently, this student may experience disruptions in their place identity, grappling with an emotional disconnection from their novel and unfamiliar surroundings (Proshansky et al., 1983). Recognizing and addressing both dimensions of identity is essential for informing effective educational, clinical, and urban policy interventions.

Conclusion

In synthesizing the insights derived from Tajfel's Social Identity Theory and Proshansky's Place Identity Theory, a more comprehensive understanding of identity emerges—one that acknowledges the intricate interplay between social affiliation and environmental context. Whereas SIT elucidates the significance of group membership in shaping perceptions, behaviors, and social hierarchies, Place Identity Theory underscores the lasting influence of physical spaces on emotional well-being and self-concept. Collectively, these frameworks provide valuable tools for analyzing the dynamic interactions between individuals, their environments, and the complexities of identity in historically and contextually diverse settings.

Ethnocentrism

Ethnocentrism can be described as the conviction that one's own culture—encompassing its values, norms, traditions, and way of life—is superior to those of other cultures. This belief often leads to an inclination to judge and evaluate other societies through the lens of one's cultural standards, resulting in a landscape rife with misunderstanding, prejudice, and conflict.

Understanding Ethnocentrism: An Academic Perspective

Ethnocentrism is fundamentally characterized by the inclination to evaluate other cultures from the perspective of one's own, often leading to judgments that position alternative cultural practices as inferior or deficient. This phenomenon typically exhibits several defining features:

Cultural Superiority : There exists a pronounced belief that one's own culture represents the epitome of a "correct" way of life, frequently neglecting the validity of alternative lifestyles and worldviews.
Judgmental Attitude : Individuals who hold ethnocentric views may perceive other cultures as exotic, inferior, or erroneous, consequently nurturing a dismissive approach towards cultural diversity.
Lack of Understanding or Empathy : Such a narrow perspective hampers an appreciation for a multitude of cultural practices, thereby obstructing the recognition of the diverse spectrum of human experiences.

Types of Ethnocentrism

Ethnocentrism manifests across a spectrum, revealing itself in varying degrees:
Mild Ethnocentrism : Individuals may exhibit a preference for their own cultural practices while maintaining openness to others. For example, a traveler seeking local culinary experiences while visiting foreign countries exemplifies this attitude.

Moderate Ethnocentrism : A conviction that one's culture is superior may surface, accompanied by a semblance of tolerance for other cultures. An individual may regard their native language as the finest yet acknowledge the beauty inherent in other tongues.

Extreme Ethnocentrism : This intense manifestation often results in blatant intolerance or hostility towards different cultures, potentially giving rise to racism, xenophobia, or aggressive attempts to impose cultural conformity.

Examples of Ethnocentrism in Practice

Ethnocentrism can be observed in various domains of life, influencing interpersonal interactions and societal structures:

Colonialism : Historical instances of colonialism illustrate how European colonizers sought to "civilize" indigenous populations, deeming native customs as primitive and unworthy. **Language Bias** : The assumption that all individuals should communicate in one's native language at international gatherings reflects a disregard for linguistic diversity.

Religious Superiority : Some adherents may assert that their religion represents absolute truth, thereby dismissing the beliefs of others as misguided.

Education : Curricula that disproportionately represent dominant cultures while marginalizing indigenous knowledge systems exemplify a significant ethnocentric bias.

Fashion and Etiquette : Critiquing cultural practices—such as the wearing of headscarves or the use of hands during meals—underscores a narrow-minded perspective rooted in ethnocentrism.

Consequences of Ethnocentrism

The implications of ethnocentrism are largely detrimental and extensive:

Negative Effects : It contributes to prejudice and discrimination, fosters cultural misunderstandings, and perpetuates cycles of racism and stereotyping. Throughout history, ethnocentrism has been implicated in conflicts, colonial oppression, and social fragmentation, hindering efforts toward global cooperation and peace.

Occasionally Positive Effects : While infrequent, ethnocentrism may foster a sense of cultural pride and group cohesion, thereby preserving valued traditions; however, such benefits can quickly devolve into exclusionary or hostile stances towards others.

Reducing Ethnocentrism

Mitigating ethnocentrism is essential for cultivating a more inclusive and harmonious global environment:

Cultural Education : Actively engaging in the study of diverse cultures, languages, religions, and lifestyles can broaden perspectives and enhance inclusivity.

Travel and Experience : Firsthand exposure to various cultures promotes empathy and understanding, enabling individuals to experience life through different cultural lenses.

Critical Thinking : Continually questioning stereotypes, assumptions, and inherent biases is crucial for personal development and cultural awareness.

Dialogue and Exchange : Encouraging intercultural conversations across diverse settings—including educational institutions, workplaces, and media—fosters understanding and collaboration.

Inclusive Policies : Advocating for diversity, representation, and equitable treatment within societal structures helps to reinforce a culture of acceptance.

Ethnocentrism poses a significant barrier to genuine cross-cultural understanding in our increasingly interconnected world. Research indicates that authentic intercultural connections can only flourish through mutual respect, empathy, and open-minded engagement. For those interested in further exploration, delving into academic literature on intercultural communication and social psychology can yield valuable insights and perspectives on this critical subject.

John Locke's Theory: Political Philosophy and Identity

John Locke (1632–1704), a pivotal figure of the Enlightenment, is often referred to as the "Father of Liberalism" for his foundational contributions to political philosophy, education, and the understanding of personal identity. His works have profoundly influenced contemporary democratic thought and institutions, particularly through his seminal text, *Two Treatises of Government* (Locke, 1689/1980).

Key Elements of Locke's Political Theory

1. State of Nature and Natural Rights

Locke posited that individuals are inherently free, equal, and rational within a "state of nature," governed by natural law—a moral code accessible through human reason. In this state, every person is endowed with inalienable rights to life, liberty, and property, rights that precede any governmental formation (Locke, 1689/1980).

2. Social Contract and Consent

To safeguard their natural rights, individuals enter into a social contract, collectively agreeing to establish a government. This contract hinges on the consent of the governed, where the legitimacy of the government is contingent upon its respect for natural rights. Locke asserted that, should the government breach this contract, citizens possess the right to

revolt (Locke, 1689/1980). This principle notably influenced the American Declaration of Independence and the French Revolution.

3. Government and Rule of Law
Locke underscored the importance of limited government, which must operate through established laws rather than the arbitrary will of rulers. The exercise of political power should focus on the protection of individuals' rights, ensuring that authority remains accountable to the populace.

Locke's Theory of Personal Identity
In addition to his political theories, Locke employed his philosophical acumen to examine the notion of identity in *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1690). He posited that personal identity is determined by the continuity of consciousness across time, rather than by the sameness of body or soul. This perspective laid the foundational principles for contemporary discussions in philosophy of mind, psychology, and theories concerning memory and the self (Locke, 1690/1975).

James Marcia's Identity Status Theory (1966)
Building upon Erik Erikson's psychosocial framework, particularly the stage of "identity vs. role confusion," psychologist James Marcia (1966) developed a structural model of identity formation. Marcia argued that identity is not a static endpoint but a dynamic process characterized by two key dimensions: exploration (actively questioning beliefs and roles) and commitment (making decisions about and adhering to those beliefs and roles).

The Four Identity Statuses (Marcia, 1966)

Identity Status	Exploration	Commitment	Description
1. Identity Diffusion	No	No	The person has not yet explored or committed to an identity. Often feels aimless or apathetic.
2. Identity Foreclosure	No	Yes	Commitment made without exploration. Often adopts values from parents or society without questioning.
3. Identity Moratorium	Yes	No	The person is exploring but has not yet committed. Often feels confused or in crisis.
4. Identity Achievement	Yes	Yes	After exploring options, the person makes a firm and stable commitment. Shows maturity and direction.

Theoretical Significance
Marcia's identity statuses elucidate individual variances in psychological development during adolescence and beyond. These statuses apply to various domains including career choice, religious beliefs, gender identity, and cultural affiliation (Marcia, 1966; Kroger & Marcia, 2011). Significantly, identity development is not a linear process; individuals may traverse through these statuses multiple times throughout their lives.

Locke's social contract theory asserts that individuals are born with natural rights to life, liberty, and property, maintaining that any legitimate government must derive its authority from the consent of the governed. When governments fail to safeguard these rights, people are justified in resistance or seeking replacement (Locke, 1689/1980).

Marcia's framework of identity development implies that adolescence represents a critical period of navigating between exploration and commitment. The resolution of this tension allows individuals to identify with one of the four statuses: diffusion, foreclosure, moratorium, or achievement. This model continues to be a valuable tool in developmental psychology and identity studies and educational psychology.

References
- Amin, S. (1976). *Unequal development: An essay on the social formations of peripheral capitalism*. Monthly Review Press.
- Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review, 14*(1), 20–39.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin, 117*(3), 497–529.
- Bhattacharya, C. B., & Sen, S. (2003). Consumer–company identification: A framework for understanding consumers' relationships with companies. *Journal of Marketing, 67*(2), 76–88.
- Chomsky, N. (1999). *The new military humanism: Lessons from Kosovo*. Pluto Press.
- Fanon, F. (1963). *The wretched of the earth* (R. Philcox, Trans.). Grove Press.
- Frank, A. G. (1969). *Capitalism and underdevelopment in Latin America*. Monthly Review Press.

- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. Pantheon Books.
- Gaddis, J. L. (2005). *The Cold War: A new history*. Penguin Press.
- Harvey, D. (2003). *The new imperialism*. Oxford University Press.
- Haslam, S. A. (2001). *Psychology in organizations: The social identity approach*. Sage.
- Hernandez, B., Hidalgo, M. C., Salazar-Laplace, M. E., & Hess, S. (2007). Place attachment and place identity in natives and non-natives. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 27*(4), 310–319.
- Hogg, M. A. (2000). Subjective uncertainty reduction through self-categorization: A motivational theory of social identity processes. *European Review of Social Psychology, 11*(1), 223–255.
- Hogg, M. A., & Abrams, D. (1988). *Social identifications: A social psychology of intergroup relations and group processes*. Routledge.
- Kroger, J., & Marcia, J. E. (2011). The identity statuses: Origins, meanings, and interpretations. In S. J. Schwartz, K. Luyckx, & V. L. Vignoles (Eds.), *Handbook of identity theory and research* (pp. 31–53). Springer.
- Locke, J. (1975). *An essay concerning human understanding* (P. H. Nidditch, Ed.). Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1690)
- Locke, J. (1980). *Second treatise of government* (C. B. Macpherson, Ed.). Hackett Publishing. (Original work published 1689)
- Lukes, S. (2005). *Power: A radical view* (2nd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Marcia, J. E. (1966). Development and validation of ego identity status. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 3*(5), 551–558.
- Mills, C. W. (1956). *The power elite*. Oxford University Press.
- Nye, J. S. (2004). *Soft power: The means to success in world politics*. PublicAffairs.
- Proshansky, H. M. (1978). The city and self-identity. *Environment and Behavior, 10*(2), 147–169.
- Proshansky, H. M., Fabian, A. K., & Kaminoff, R. (1983). Place-identity: Physical world socialization of the self. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 3*(1), 57–83.
- Said, E. W. (1978). *Orientalism*. Pantheon Books.
- Tajfel, H. (1982). Social psychology of intergroup relations. *Annual Review of Psychology, 33*(1), 1–39.
- Tajfel, H. (1982). Social identity and intergroup relations. Cambridge University Press.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–47). Brooks/Cole.
- Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Basil Blackwell.
- (2004). *World-systems analysis: An introduction*. Duke University Press.
- Young, R. J. C. (2001). *Postcolonialism: An historical introduction*. Blackwell Publishing.