FROM EMPIRICALLY OBSERVABLE CULTURAL DIVERSITY
TOWARDS AN ADVANCED TYPOLOGY OF CULTURES

MARGARITA GREBENNIKOV

The University of New South Wales
Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
Sydney NSW 2052
Australia
m.grebennikov@unsw.edu.au

Background: Discussions and Implications

The paper seeks to contribute to recently framed discourse about the "reconceptualisation" of culture and cultural diversity in relation to individuality, identity, ethnicity and community. My particular interest is in what is addressed in various ways as an "alternative" way of thinking about culture and diversity of cultures (Bath 1995; Bennett 1998; Bhahba 1994; Brah and Coombes 2000; Brah, Hickman and Mac an Ghaill; Clifford 1988; Gupta and Ferguson 1992; Keesing 1990; Modood and Werbner 1997; Papastergiadis 2003; Werbner and Modood 1997; etc.). Its primary goals are to re-evaluate such central analytic concepts in philosophical anthropology as that of culture and cultural diversity and "problematise the unity of the 'us' and the otherness of the 'other', and thus question the radical separation between the two that makes the opposition possible in the first place" (Gupta and Ferguson 1992, 14).

The social context of advanced postmodernity, the era of so-called "disorganised capitalism" (Lash and Urry 1987), has been "transformed from above, from below, and from within" (Lash and Urry 1987, 313). Such processes as globalisation, transnationalisation of networks of communication, deterritorialisation of economics and ethnicity created the conditions in which cultural diversity remains no longer the issue of only international but also internal relationships. Mass migration and a rise of new social groupings is followed by breaking down patterns of difference and increased social fragmentation, marginalisation and minoritisation

within a civil society (Bhahba 1998; Featherstone, Lash and Robertson 1995; Lash and Urry 1987). Mass migration particularly shaped the conditions for decentring self-identity and fostered the experience of displacement, which has become a starting point for understanding the parameters of belonging (Papastergiadis 1997, 273). Migration studies, in return, brought forward the social status of migrants within the dominant society and developed the tendency to "ethicise" cultural diversity (Caglar 1997, 194). The modern debates on dynamics of cultural exchange resulted in the doctrine of cultural pluralism and relativism as a dominating principle in modern anthropology and sociology and a platform for the politics of multiculturalism (Bennet 1998; Brah and Coombes 2000; Hall 1992; Modood, Beishon, and Virdee 1994; Modood and Werbner 1997; Papastergiadis 2003; Werbner and Modood 1997).

In order to appreciate the complex and contradictory ways of cultural exchange, modern cultural discourse adopted the concept of hybridity in contrast to the previous holistic notion of culture. The so called "great contemporary prophets of hybridity" (Stuart Hall, Paul Gilroy, Homi Bhabha, Gayarty Spivak) are often referred to and cited as authorising the productive side of "the hybrid strategy", which is believed to open up a space for negotiation of cultural and social ambivalence (Bhabha1998, 34; Papastergiadis 2003, 8). As hybridisation became identified with globalisation (Pieterse 1995), hybridity became understood as a reflection of a new manifestation of cultural continuity (Wicker 1997) and a new model for cultural identity (Hall 1992). In this context, an individual self-identification became considered as always hybrid, "palimpsest", rootless and in constant flux (Bauman 1997, 53). These ideas are further developed in the Communication theory of ethnic identity, which defines identity as a relational and a communication phenomenon negotiated and co-created in daily interactions (Hecht, Collier and Ribeau 1993; Jackson II 1999).

While the opposition criticises the cultural pluralists for their "culturalism" and for the addressing differences as an intrinsic property of cultures (Bennett 1998, 5-6), it becomes obvious that new paradigms provide new psychological,

anthropological and sociological insights into the process of negotiating multiple cultural attachments.

The main objectives

The logic of recent discourse on cultural exchange suggests the shift towards interpretation of an individual's self-identification in terms of culture and ethnicity. It is from this perspective identification and cultural affiliation come to be seen as matters of "plural choice" (Bhabha 1998, 30) and therefore, a process, which is always incomplete and context specific (Hall 1992). In view of this, I would suggest looking at cultural identification, culture and cultural diversity by reference to highly variable human social behaviour. Looking at how social behaviour is challenged in multicultural situations may extend the possibilities of debates letting us see how individual perceptions and interactions are influenced by the actual, imagined, or implied presence of other individuals and/or groups of different cultural backgrounds.

Mass migration resulted in the growth of the "ethnic sector" and the proportion of "others", who are generally referred to as people with different ethnic identity and cultural affinity (implying ethnic minorities, immigrants, foreigners, outsiders) apart from "the people" or "the nation". That is why, I would also suggest drawing on statistics on ethnicity of the migrant groups of population, i.e. the social groups, which in general are demonstrating the most flexible and controversial adaptive and social behaviour. By investigating ethnic variables of social behaviour we could see how new social environments can challenge the sense of belonging of the migrant respondents and thus can affect their social behaviour and cultural attachments by means of negotiating ethnic identity. Since culture provides individuals with a set of patterns, values, and orientations for living and interpreting reality, therefore every self-definition includes culture. In this context, I believe statistics on ethnicity provide an adequate support for us to observe the universal tendency of a civil society to shift towards ethnocultural complexity.

While countries collect data on ethnic and cultural diversity of population in many different ways, general social and political expectations seem to be the same

everywhere: to accommodate different characteristics of a population and, on the macro level, to appreciate social and cultural compatibility. The statement below issued by Statistics New Zealand (SNZ) points to how much practical implications of the theory on cultural diversity can matter:

> Information on ethnicity is needed by government agencies, policy makers and administrators, researchers and ethnic or cultural associations to study the size, location, characteristics and other aspects of the different groups. The data is used ... in the planning of services directed at the special needs of ethnic groups in areas such as health, education and social welfare; the allocation of funds from government agencies to ethnic groups; and the measurement and assessment of the economic and social well-being of various groups. (SNZ 1996)

In this situation an adequate understanding of cultural and ethnic differences along with a new instrument for the measurement of cultural diversity are in demand.

Theoretical framework

Culture is a system of shared social meanings, values and attitudes expressed through behaviour. Anthropologists and sociologists see individual behaviour as part of an adaptation process where solving life's day-to-day problems occurs (Manganaro 1990). In terms of social psychology, the individual level of analysis means studying how individuals function in a culturally plural context. In other words, it means the study of the variable behaviour of individuals among various cultural groups: a subject, which became central to the practice of cross-cultural psychology (Jackson II 1999; Prentice and Miller 1999; Smith 1993). So, individual behaviour is apparently a key-dimension of the social and cultural diversity of population. However, this statement logically leads to a dialectical contradiction: unique individual spiritual and physical being seems to be an ultimate source for

diversity in the human world in principle, but not all products of an individual's self-expression acquire socially significant status.

Then, logically an inquiry into diversity of cultures with reference to social behaviour logically runs into a question about unit of investigation. In regard to this question, I believe that the most adequate answer to it might be found within a community-based approach. Having been used in anthropology and socio-ecology, this approach states that human social behaviour varies in relation to demography and ecology that inevitably reflect on the community as "the fundamental unit of human organisation" (Foley 2001, 175; Runciman 2001). Just as biologically selective processes affect the degree of diversity within any species that allows a species in nature to continue as such, so socially and psychologically selective processes limit the degree of variety in the behaviour of the individuals within a social group that allows the group to continue as such and become socially organised and recognised.

This view, which would place an emphasis upon specific human collectives and their particular qualities, has been developed by the classics of cultural anthropology. According to this view, culture emerges, develops out of the group's adaptation needs in specific environment, and serves the group's functional and social cohesion. If so, then the quantitative measurement of cultures relates to the quantity of group ways of adaptation (Malinowski 1944) worked out by specific ethnic groups, i.e. the quantity of ethnic groups. The principal differences between ethnic groups are rooted in variable adaptive behaviour. The human needs in general are alike everywhere and human mechanisms of adaptation work universally throughout the world, but the human potential for the satisfaction of needs is realised differently in specific ethnic communities. Analogues to species in nature, ethnic communities, which E. B. Tylor often calls "organic communities", appear to be the most viable and balanced social units, compact and complete enough to create and preserve behavioural patterns, culture and social institutions and so to grow into a larger scale society. The logic of this point further requires that the diversity of cultures comes to be just a reflection of natural dialectics of the discreteness and continuity of human species, i.e. the reflection of the natural

multiplicity of human collectives or, more precisely, ethnic communities. Moreover, however many ethnic communities there are, the same number of types of adaptation and the same number of cultural systems may exist. The fact that ethnicity generates the form of segregation in human species and produces variables in behaviour, allows Stuart Hall to insist that all individuals are always ethnically located.

Each ethnic group works out its own adaptive behaviour in relation to a specific environmental setting. Patterning of behaviour plays a crucial role in the group's solidarity and culture. Behaviour patterns (1) provide the group with the utmost adaptation effect and save the group's forces allowing it to acquire maximum knowledge from the outside and simultaneously stick to its cultural values; (2) neutralise individual behavioural alterations by fixing the repeated behaviour and holding the group back from disintegration; and (3) compensate the loss of entropy and stimulate the group to produce cultural traditions in order to identify, reflect, and systemise its experience and relationships. Behaviour patterns reflect the group's essential needs, stimuli and interests and form the group's unique genius, temperament, talents, taste, habits, ideas, feelings, manners, and, finally, determine the group's life-style and historic fate (Gumilev 1990).

So, while comparing *different* cultures we actually compare *ethnic* cultures. This is where the notion of type meets the objectives of the comparative study of cultures. The objective is to determine differences and resemblances between cultures. Though there are no widely accepted definitions of types, the classical sociologists defined types by reference to "individualising" procedures (Weber 1980) and usually associated types with objects such as variables. Therefore, types fit very well cultural pluralism, which William James (1928, 317) called "the philosophy of humanism" since it sees the world as "more like a federal republic than like an empire or a kingdom" (1928, 321). Applied to cultural diversity, the type enables us to identify on a sociocultural continuum some qualitative units with their distinctive characteristics as variations within the human species. These qualitative units can be compared with species in nature. Just as the species in nature emerge in the course of organic evolution as the physical variations of organisms determined by

adaptation, so, analogous to biological populations, distinctive groups within the human species, i.e. ethnic groups, come to life each with a unique combination of genotypically (inborn limits) and phenotypically (changeable and acquired) behavioural qualities. So, approaching cultural diversity by reference to ethnic variables of social behaviour leads us indeed to the interpretation of cultural diversity as ethnic diversity of cultures or more precisely, as ethnic types of culture (Ivanova 1994).

Ethnicity as a statistical variable

Looking at cultural diversity through the statistics on ethnicity creates the possibility of seeing how multiethnic and multicultural social environment affects individuals' self-definition by way of negotiating group belonging and cultural affiliation. Table 1 illustrates complex ethnic and cultural profiles of countries having a long-term migration history and the heterogeneous population. The table illustrates the ethno-social complexity of populations by two key-factors: first, net migration rate, which indicates the contribution of migration to the overall level of population change; second, the number of ethnic groups (apart from the dominant population) officially recognised as part of ethno-social compositions.

Table 1. Ethnic diversity of population 2004

Country	Net migration rate	Number of officially recognised ethnic groups
Australia	3.98/1000	3
Argentina	0.61/1000	4
Brazil	-0.03/1000	4
Canada	5.96/1000	3
Germany	2.18/1000	3
Hong Kong	5.24/1000	2
India	-0.07/1000	4
New Zealand	4.05/1000	5
Singapore	11.53/1000	4

| UK | 2.19/1000 | 9 |
| USA | 3.41/1000 | 6 |

Source: Data is adapted from The World Factbook, http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/index.html (accessed August, 2004).

Notes: Net migration rate includes the figure for an excess of persons entering the country, which is referred to as net immigration (e.g., 3.56 migrants/1,000 population) and an excess of persons leaving the country as net emigration (e.g., -9.26 migrants/1,000 population) (The World Factbook).

While the term of ethnicity remains weakly theorised and there are no internationally recognised standards of classifications for ethnic groups, I find it very productive to stick to practical definitions and criteria applied to ethnicity by official statistical agencies. In official statistics, ethnicity is a variable that is collected to define and measure groups of like people, i.e. ethnicity is the group identity. I believe that official statistics are a particularly relevant source for the inquiry into cultural diversity, for they represent many if not all dimensions of the process of individual identification and cultural affiliation. For practical purpose, I am, therefore, restricted to understanding cultural differences as based on ethnic identity.

As demographic profiles of the countries with a high migration rate become more complex, its measurement became yet more complicated. For example, the New Zealand Standard Classification of Ethnicity (NZSCE) considers up to 231 individual ethnic groups and breaks two largest categories such as "Other European" and "Other Pacific Island Groups" down into 39 and 38 ethnic groups respectively (SNZ 1996). By comparison, the Australian Standard Classification of Cultural and Ethnic Groups (ASCCEG) considers 189 ethnic groups and breaks its European category down into seven ethnic groups and its Pacific Island category into three ethnic groups.

Since countries collect data on ethnic-related variables in many different ways, Table 2 outlines the variables, which some traditional immigration countries use in collecting data to measure the ethno-cultural diversity of their population.

Table 2. Ethnic indicators of diversity of population

Country	Ancestry	Race	Birthplace	Nationality/Citizenship	Language	Cultural Affiliation	Religion
Australia	A[a]		A	A	A		
Brazil		A	A	A			
Canada	A	A			A		
India			A	A	A		A
New Zealand			A		A	A	
Singapore	A	A					
South Africa		A	A	A	A		
UK		A	A	A		A	
USA	A	A	A	A	A		

Source: Data is adapted from The World Factbook, http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/index.html (accessed August, 2004).

[a] Applicable.

Whereas the criteria of ethnic affiliation vary widely from country to country, special value would lie in such a statistics collection based on a self-perceived ethnic group affiliation, i.e. "a self assessed response to a direct question" (ABS 2000) like "Which ethnic group do you belong to? Mark the box or boxes which apply to you." (SNZ 2001) or "What is this person's race? Mark one or more races to indicate what this person considers himself/herself to be." (US Census Bureau 2000). A self-perception approach entitles individuals to determine the affinity one feels for a particular ethnic group(s) and groups to be defined "in their own right" (SNZ 2001). Statistics New Zealand (SNZ) employs this particular approach in determining which ethnic identification makes its data on ethnicity yet more precious for our inquiry.

The SNZ's ethnic group approach to measuring ethnicity appreciates an individual's feeling about a particular group in a particular country, where an individual currently or/and permanently lives, and helps escape a possible confusion of ethnicity with the country of birth, ancestry, nationality or race.

As Smith and Bond (1993, 36) remark, there are no agreed answers to the question of how much difference there must be between individuals before we could say that they belong to different cultures. Likewise, it might seem that there is not always a direct connection between reported ethnicities and the ethnic groups, which are believed to compose the ethnic sector. The Dutch community in New Zealand may be a good example for such a statement. The 1996 Census indicates the Dutch community is over 47,000, i.e. the largest European group in the Ethnic sector. However, the Census also indicates that it is based mainly on a sort of sentimental attachment to the Dutch language that looks rather like a symbolic criterion of communal integrity. Among the New Zealand-born Dutch people a link between the Dutch language and ethnic identification appears to be getting stronger if it is compared with post-war Dutch migrants who had almost completely shifted to English.

Nevertheless, marginal responses indicate that ethnic demarcations are regarded as meaningful in maintaining a positive sense of self-esteem and, therefore, informative in regard to social behaviour. It is from this perspective that the phenomenon of "multiple ethnicity" revealed in the Census of population appears to be particularly symptomatic. Multiple ethnicity is measured by "multiple responses" to the Census question about ethnicity, when respondents are given a choice to indicate more than one ethnic group to which they feel they belong. Table 3 shows some examples of the people who gave more than one response to such questions.

Table 3. Multiple ethnicity

	Question indicator	Respondents (%) who gave more than one response	Year of count
Canada	Ethnic origin	39.7	1996
New Zealand	Ethnic group	5	1991
New Zealand	Ethnic group	15	1996
New Zealand	Ethnic group	9	2001
United Kingdom	Cultural background	1.8	2000
USA	Race	2.4	2000

Source: Data is adapted from US Census Bureau, Profile of General Demographic Characteristics, Table DP-1, Census 2000, http://www.census.gov/Press-Release/www/2001/tables/dp_us_2000.PDF (accessed August 2004); SNZ 2001, International Concepts and Classifications http://www.stats.govt.nz/domino/external/web/aboutsnz.nsf/ (accessed February 30, 2003); The World Factbook, http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/index.html (accessed August, 2004).SNZ 2001, Measuring Ethnicity in the New Zealand Population Census http://www.stats.govt.nz/domino/external/web/aboutsnz.nsf/ (accessed February 30, 2003); Department of Internal Affairs 1999, Ethnic Diversity in New Zealand: A Statistical Profile (Thomson 1999).

The New Zealand Censuses reveals a great deal of multiple ethnicity among all major and minor groups of population. For example, in 1996, 13 percent of those who gave one of their ethnic groups as "New Zealand European or Päkehä", 40 percent of all those who gave one of their ethnic groups as "New Zealand Mäori", and 44 percent of all those who made up the Ethnic Sector reported two or more ethnic identities (Thomson 1999, 20). Moreover, while in the 1991 and 1996 Censuses three ethnic multiple responses were captured as the maximum, in the

2001 Census up to six ethnic responses were received, among which more than three ethnic responses were received from over 10,000 people.

Statistical data may help distinguish at least five reasons for reporting as well as for explaining the phenomenon of multiple ethnicity.

The first one relates to the length of residence of the respondents in a specific social and ecological context, i.e. in a specific country. Table 4 allows us to compare three sections of data: first, the numbers of New Zealand respondents who reported their length of residence as 30 years and more; second, the numbers of respondents who reported their New Zealand origins; third, the numbers of respondents who reported more than one ethnicity.

Table 4. New Zealand Ethnic Sector: Length of Residence and Multiple Ethnicity

Ethnic groups	Respondents (%) who reported length of residence 30 years and more	Respondents (%) who reported New Zealand origin	Respondents (%) who reported more than one ethnicity
Dutch	27	47	52
German	9	42	57
South Slav	12	42	54
Italian	13	58	68
Polish	22	43	62
Greek	24	54	57
Other European	13	47	48
Filipino	n/a	20	19
Cambodian	n/a	15	5
Vietnamese	2	17	9
Other SE Asian	less 1	15	17

Chinese	3	27	21
Indian	4	34	23
Korean	n/a	4	4
Japanese	less 1	13	15
Sri Lankan	less 1	11	30
Other Asian	less 1	25	20
Middle Eastern	1	27	23
African	2	24	40
Latin American	1	23	49

Source: Department of Internal Affairs 1999. Data is adapted from the Figures 1.3, 31.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 in Ethnic Diversity in New Zealand: A Statistical Profile (Thomson 1999).

The data suggests that the groups of migrant population with a remarkably longer duration of residency or with New Zealand origin (for example, European ethnic groups) indicated in general a greater percentage of multiple ethnicity than the groups with a relatively shorter duration of residency (for example, most of Asian ethnic groups). The migrants who have been in the country for some time are those who are more likely to report multiple ethnicity than recent arrivals. In New Zealand 30 percent of the 1996 Census population making up the Ethnic sector came to the country in 1991-1996; they include 11 percent of arrivals in 1995, 7 percent in 1994, 5 percent in 1993, 3 percent in 1992, and 3 percent in 1991 (Thomson 1999, 11).

Moreover, the growth of the Ethnic sector in ethnically heterogeneous societies can create such multicultural situations when social and cultural boundaries occur in the course of interactions and when the need for self-awareness and identification is felt. These situations may increase the interest of people in their cultural and ethnic origins and thus intensify attention to the question

of identity. The increasing interest in ethnic identity registered by the Censuses among the dominant population makes official statistics extend their concern about ethnicity measurement to the dominant groups as well. For example, to describe the dominant group the NZSCE has used several different terms such as "European" (1986 Census), "New Zealand European" (1991 and 2001 Censuses), and "NZ European or Päkehä" (1996 Census). In spite of these terms, 20,313 respondents in 1986, 55,000 respondents in 1996, and 80,000 respondents in 2001 wrote in their ethnicity as a "New Zealander", "White New Zealander", and "Päkehä" (SNZ). The category "Kiwi" was written in and attracted 5,483 responses in 1996 and keeps growing in numbers (Treliving 2001, 13). Evidently, the perspectives of the majority groups in ethnically heterogeneous societies, like New Zealand, are also the subjects of revision.

So, just as a second reason for reporting multiple ethnicity relates to the rapidly growing Ethnic sector in general, a third reason obviously relates to a recent increase in the number of immigrants in countries usually experiencing a large amount of migration. A growth of the Ethnic sector practically at the same time in such countries as New Zealand and Australia is mainly determined by immigration from Asia. Thus, in 1901 only 1.2 percent of the Australian population were born in Asia, in 1996 this figure increased to 5.9 percent, in 1999 to 6.6 percent. In New Zealand, Chinese is the largest ethnic group and had over 81,000 people in 1996, nearly twice as many as in 1991 (Thomson 1999, 11-12). Altogether, the proportion of New Zealand resident population born overseas increased between the 1991 and 2001 Censuses from 15.8 percent to 19.5 percent; 27.5 percent of those born overseas have lived in the country for less than five years (SNZ 2001, 2001 Census Snapshot 14).

Language is usually considered as one of the important factors in performing an "act of identity" (see Table 2) and therefore, as an ethnocultural indicator of diversity of population. Multilingual behaviour may be a reason number four for reporting as well as for explaining multiple ethnicity in multi-ethnic nations with a high proportion of multilingual people. For example, 14.2 percent of Australians were registered in 2001 as born overseas in non-English speaking countries; 15

percent of them could speak a language other than English (HREOC 2001, 5). In New Zealand, where there is a high level of multiple ethnicity, the number of multilingual people increased by 20 percent between 1996 and 2001 Censuses or nearly 1 in 6 (SNZ 2001, Cultural Diversity).

At a personal level, multilingual behaviour means speaking two or more languages and therefore might cause reporting two or more identities. Table 5 contains percentages, which are compared to show apparent relations between multilingual behaviour and multiple ethnicity.

Table 5. New Zealand Ethnic Sector: Languages Spoken and Multiple Ethnicity

Ethnic groups	Respondents (%) who reported English and other languages spoken	Respondents (%) who reported more than one ethnicity
Dutch	52	52
German	53	57
South Slav	56	54
Italian	39	68
Polish	51	62
Greek	59	57
Other European	49	48
Filipino	65	19
Cambodian	57	5
Vietnamese	54	9
Other SE Asian	62	17
Chinese	54	21
Indian	56	23

Margarita Grebennikov

Korean	45	4
Japanese	51	15
Sri Lankan	61	30
Other Asian	52	20
Middle Eastern	49	23
African	34	40
Latin American	64	49

Source: Department of Internal Affairs 1999. Data is adapted from the Figures 1.3, 9.1 in Ethnic Diversity in New Zealand: A Statistical Profile (Thomson 1999).

While Korean, Cambodian and Vietnamese ethnic groups show the lowest level of multiple identity, 55 percent of the Koreans, 43 percent of the Cambodians, and 46 percent of the Vietnamese people do not speak English. In comparison, the European ethnic groups show a tendency to completely switch to English (more than 30 percent) but simultaneously report a high level of multiple ethnicity. For example, the Italian people show the highest percentage (68 percent) of multiple ethnicity and the highest percentage of those who can speak only English (54 percent). The Dutch people, 43 percent of whom can speak only English and 52 percent of whom can speak yet one or more other languages, increasingly report multiple ethnicity (49 percent in 1996).

Finally, such indicators as ancestry and birthplace are used in some countries as statistical variables to measure the diversity of a population (see Table 2). The ASCCEG, for example, is entirely based on the concepts of ancestry and nationality. The statements below illustrate marginal feelings people can have about their genealogical roots.

> I am a Filipino and it will stay there even [if] I'm here in New
> Zealand, my flesh and blood [is] still a Filipino';
>
> After being in New Zealand for 60 years ... I still remember my
> youth in Croatia, and reminisce about my family history and
> remember my great heritage;
>
> I am a 3rd/4th generation Fiji Indian but my ethnicity is undoubtedly
> Indian (cited in Walker 2001, 11-14).

The statements allow us to suggest that ancestry and birthplace may have the crucial meaningfulness to the person's well-being and self-esteem. Ancestry may specifically contribute to one's adaptation/assimilation process and thus affect one's social behaviour. If such Asian ethnic groups such as Filipino, Cambodian, Vietnamese, Chinese, Indian, Korean, Japanese, Sri Lankan are compared with the other groups in the Ethnic sector of New Zealand such as the European, Middle East, African and Latin American ethnic groups, the Asian ethnic groups show a relatively lower level of multiple ethnicity. For example, China and Korea have recently become the leading countries in contribution to New Zealand's Ethnic sector, mostly in the 15-24 years age group (SNZ 2001, 2001 Census Snapshot 14), but while younger Asians in general increasingly report their belonging to more than one ethnic group, Korean, Cambodian and Vietnamese groups show the lowest level of multiple ethnicity. The 1996 Census showed 4 percent, 5 percent, and 9 percent respectively (see Table 4).

Conclusion

The problem of identity is one of the universal problems of adaptation and it is generated by the nature of the social environment when individuals are required to answer the basic question of who we are or, alternatively, what groups we belong to. Individuals derive their behaviour patterns for any situations from their lasting affiliation with particular groups. They pattern the group behaviour since it assists their social and cultural adaptation process. As Robert Plutchik (1980, 28-29) observes, "as the complexity of society increases, there is, for individuals, a

corresponding increase in the struggle with this fundamental problem of knowing the group to which each person belongs". It is obvious that the universal tendency of what Wicker calls (1997, 29) "shifting from complex culture to cultural complexity" made this "struggle" yet more intensive, of which statistics on ethnicity is a good illustration.

However, numerous researches on ethnicity show that there is no a simple link between distinctive cultural behaviour and ethnic identities (Modood, Beishon and Virdee 1994), and that reported ethnicity may not mean a group unified around this ethnicity. Nevertheless, since ethnicity is defined by statistics based on cultural criteria, any degree of ethnic commitment revealed by the Census, presumably implies certain behaviour patterns and specific culture attitudes and values engaged in respondents' social and psychological adaptation processes. Furthermore, if the respondents live in the same social and ecological environment but show different perception of ethnicity, this suggests that the respondents' ethnocultural feelings are of different intensity and differently involved in their social interactions. In other words, this suggests that a choice of this or that identity or a type of social behaviour is always context-specific and determined by an individual's capability to get the "maximisation of individual freedom and choices" (Modood, Beishon and Videe 1994, 7).

Thus, studying cultural differences by reference to variable social behaviour may contribute to solving a classic problem of measuring different cultures as well as to answering a question: to what degree tolerance towards various multicultural demands for respect could be extended. If the social behaviour of particular ethnic groups does not fit to the system of values and practices dominant in a mainstream society, then logically the accommodation of such ethnic groups and their cultures within a particular society is impossible. From this perspective, the recognition of cultural differences does not always have to mean integrating this or that culture into a specific multicultural framework.

As Goodenough (1994, 266) notices, the community-based approach to the problem of culture in complex societies can make this problem seem to disappear, for there is no culture, which is shared by all members of society. Although it is easy

to define a culture of a particular group as most anthropologists do, it turns out to be difficult to define "a national culture" or a cultural identity of a multiethnic nation. From my point of view, interpreting ethnic cultures as types of social behaviour formed in various context-specific ethnic communities allows us to observe culture at all levels of human society.

While individuals represent the very bottom level of cultural diversity, in ethnic communities an individual's identity becomes collective. The collective identity of the community accumulates the individuals' identities. Functioning in specific social and ecological environments, ethnic communities make up a level where behaviour and culture patterning occur. The whole society as an aggregation of communities is the specific social environment where general conditions and mechanisms for adaptation are produced and developed. It becomes obvious that culture in ethnically complex societies is not necessarily a monolithic entity, but a general guide for organising and interpreting activities in accordance with the social and political purposes of society. Accommodating different cultures, society sets up social links between individuals, communities, and the external world, and thus gains a prerogative to regulate the links and functions as a macro-universe or behaves, quoting Spengler (1926), as "a big social individual".

References

ABS (Australian Bureau of Statistics). *How Australia Takes a Census*. Canberra, 2000.

ABS (Australian Bureau of Statistics). *Australian Standard Classification of Cultural and Ethnic Groups*. Canberra, 2000.

Barth, F. "Other knowledge and other ways of knowing." *Journal of Anthropological Research* 51 (1995): 65-68.

Bauman, Z. 1997. "The Making and Unmaking of Strangers." In Werbner and Modood 1997, 46-57.

Bennet, D. and Bhabha, N. 'Liberalism and Minority Culture: Reflections on "Culture's in Between."' (In Bennett 1998, 37-47).

Bennett, D. ed. 1998. *Multicultural States. Rethinking difference and identity.* London, New York: Routledge, 1998.

Bhabha, N. The Location of Culture. London: Routledge, 1994.

------. "Culture's in Between." (In Bennet 1998, 29-36).

Brah, A. and Coombes, A. *Hybridity and its Discontents. Politics, science, culture.* London, New York: Routledge, 2000.

Caglar, A. S. 1997. 'Hyphenated Identities and the Limits of "Culture."' (In Modood and Werbner 1997, 169-85).

Clifford, J. The Predicament of Culture. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988.

Folye, R. A. 2001. "Evolutionary Perspectives on the Origins of Human Social Institutions." In *The Origin of Human Social Institutions*, edited by W.G. Runciman. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001, 171-95.

Goodenough, W. H. "Toward a Working Theory of Culture." In *Assessing Cultural Anthropology*, edited by Robert Borofsky. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1994, 262-75.

Gumilev, L. N. *Ethnogenesis and the Biosphere*. Moscow: Progress, 1990.

Gupta, A. and Ferguson, J. 'Beyond "Culture": Space, Identity, and the Politics of Difference.' *Cultural Anthropology* 7 (1992): 6-23.

Hall, S. "New Ethnicities". In *"Race", Culture and Difference*, edited by James Donald and Ali Rattansi. London: Sage Publications, 1992, 252-59.

Hecht, M., Collier, M. J. and Ribeau, S. *African American Communication: Ethnic Identity and Cultural Interpretation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1993.

HREOC (Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission). *Face the Facts: Some Questions and Answers about Immigration, Refugees and Indigenous Affairs*. Canberra, 2001.

Ivanova, M. "Tipi Kulturi: Dialectica Localnosti i Universalnosti (Etnologicheckie Aspekti Problemi)." PhD diss., Moscow State Pedagogical University, 1994.

Jackson II, R. L. *The Negotiation of Cultural Identity: Perceptions of European Americans and African Americans*. Westport: Praeger, 1999.

James, W. *A Pluralistic Universe. Hibbert Lectures at Manchester College on the Present Situation in Philosophy*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co, 1928.

Keesing, F. M. "Theories of Culture Revisited." *Canberra Anthropology* 13(2)(1990): 46-60.

Lash, S. and Urry, J. *The End of Organised Capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1987, 285-313.

Malinowski, B. *A Scientific Theory of Culture and Other Essays*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1944.

Manganaro, M., ed. *Modernist Anthropology. From fieldwork to text*. Princeton N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1990.

Modood, T. and Werbner, P. eds. 1997. *The Politics of Multiculturalism in the New Europe: Racism, Identity and Community*. London, New York: Zed Books Ltd, 1997.

Modood, T., Beishon, S., and Virdee, S. *Changing Ethnic Identities*. London: Policy Studies Institute, 1994.

Papastergiadis, N. "Tracing Hybridity in Theory." In Werbner and Modood 1997, 257-81.

Papastergiadis, N. ed. *Complex Entanglements. Art, Globalisation and Cultural Difference*. London: Rivers Oram Publishers Ltd, 2003.

Pieterse, J.N. "Globalisation as Hybridisation." In *Global Modernities*, edited by Mike Featerstone, Scott Lash and Roland Robertson. London: SAGE Publications, 1995, 45-68.

Plutchik, R. 1980. "A General Psychoevolutionary Theory of Emotion." In *Emotion: Theory, Research, and Experience. Volume 1. Theories of Emotion*, 1980, 3-33.

Prentice, D. and Miller, D., eds. *Cultural Divides. Understanding and Overcoming Group Conflict*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1999.

Runciman, W. G. "From Nature to Culture, from Culture to Society." In *The Origin of Human Social Institutions*, edited by W.G. Runciman. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001, 235-254.

Smith, A. *The Ethnic revival in the Modern World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Smith, P.B. and Bond, M. H. *Social Psychology Across Cultures: Analysis and Perspectives*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1993.

Spengler, O. *The Decline of the West*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1926.

Statistics New Zealand. *People and Places*. Wellington, 1997.

Statistics New Zealand. *International Concepts and Classifications*. SNZ 2001.

Statistics New Zealand. 2001 *Census Snapshot 1: Cultural Diversity*, 2002 . http://www.stats.govt.nz /domino/external/pasfull.nsf/ (accessed March 19, 2003).

Statistics New Zealand. 2001 *Census Snapshot 14: People Born Overseas*, 2002. http://www.stats .govt.nz/domino/external/pasfull.nsf/ (accessed March 25, 2003).

Statistics New Zealand. *Measuring Ethnicity in the New Zealand Population Census* 2002.

Statistics New Zealand. *Hot Off Press External Migration May 2003 Commentary*, 2003. http://www .stats.govt.nz/domino/external/pasfull.nsf/ (accessed July 4, 2003).

Statistics New Zealand. Quick Factors – *People*, 2003. http://www.stats.govt.nz/domino/external /Web/nzstories.nsf/ (accessed July 4, 2003).

The World Factbook 2004. http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/index.html (accessed Augist, 2004).

Thomson, B. *Ethnic diversity in New Zealand. A Statistical Profile*. Wellington: Department of Internal Affairs, 1999.

Treliving, V. *Comparison of the measurement of ethnicity in Australia and New Zealand*. SNZ 2001.

Tylor, E. B. *The Origins of Culture*. Gloucester MA: Peter Smith, 1970.

US Census Bureau 2000. Census 2000, *Informational Questionaries*. http://www.census.gov/dmd /www/infoquest.htm (accessed February 30, 2003).

Walker, U. *A question of ethnicity - one word, different people, many perceptions: The perspectives of groups other than Maori, Pacific peoples, and New Zealand*. SNZ 2001. http:// www.stats.govt.nz/domino/external/ web/prod_serv. nsf/ (accessed February 30, 2002).

Weber, M. *Basic Concepts in Sociology*. Secaucus, New Jersey: The Citadel Press, 1980.

Werbner, P. and Modood, T. (eds.). *Debating Cultural Hybridity. Multi-Cutltural Identities and the Politics of Anti-Racism*. London, New Jersey: Zed Books, 1997.

Wicker, H. R. "From Complex Culture to Cultural Complexity." In Werbner and Modood 1997, 29-45.

Margarita GREBENNIKOV has a PhD in Social Philosophy. Her more than 10-year university career comprises lecturing in Philosophy and Culture, and research administration in Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences. She belongs to that growing group of university research administrators and managers who came in this field from academic careers. While her latest writings shifted towards exploring multi-dimensional nature of university research administration, her main research interests remain focused on cultural diversity and typology of cultures in the postmodernity.