

Socialization leads to identity formation sociology



What is socialisation? Socialization is the procedure in which human existences interact with each other separately and in groups. It is the procedure by which 1 learns the traditions, imposts and accepted behaviors in any given society. It is non a erstwhile procedure, but it is a womb-to-tomb procedure that provides persons with accomplishments, values and attitudes that are necessary for interacting with the society. Human existences need societal experiences to larn their civilization and survive in the society. They are non born with values and accomplishments. They learn from what they see, hear and experience throughout their life. They have the capableness to larn and absorb from what they see around them. Socialization is non a merely a simple term that can be seen at face value. It has many beds, and each bed is different from the other and leads to different procedures and state of affairss. Socialization has three beds ; primary, secondary and third. Primary is what we learn from our household and when we are immature, secondary is what we learn in school, and Tertiary is what we learn throughout our lives.

We now know what socialisation means, but what is individuality? Identity is what makes an person who he truly is and what his intent in life is. It is what makes an single definable and recognizable. It is who you are and where you come from and what makes you alone from every other human being. It gives an person a sense of being. Identity can be defined as individualism, personality, peculiarity or uniqueness that makes an single base out. Like socialisation, individuality excessively can non be seen at face value. Identity has many beds to itself, and as we walk through life, each new bed keeps blossoming in forepart of us.

Now, since we know what socialisation and individuality both average, we can convey them together and associate them to reply our inquiry – ‘ does socialisation lead to individuality formation? ‘ Well, I think yes, socialisation does take to identity formation as we discover who we truly are and where we fit in, merely in the thick of people and in our interaction with them. Once we start interacting with the society, we learn so much about ourselves every bit good as about others (persons or societies) , their civilization, imposts, behavior, etc. We learn that we are similar to some people, and different from others. Socialization makes an single more confident. The more people we talk to, the more subjects we talk about, and this in bend widens our range. Besides, we make ourselves more seeable to society and hence people recognize us. Thus socialisation helps in edifice 1s individuality. Today ‘ s universe is all about power and individuality. If one has an individuality every bit good as the right attitude, he can accomplish whatever he wants. Socializing besides leads to better networking. Better networking means more connexions and more connexions means higher chances at work or elsewhere every bit good. Hence socialisation leads to a encouragement in 1s calling or endowment and therefore helps in individuality formation.

The more we interact with people, the more we discover ourselves and organize opinions approximately ourselves every bit good as others. One is merely able to detect his true ego when he interacts with others and reacts in certain ways that are different from others. Everyone has a different and alone reaction to a certain state of affairs. This singularity is what gives an single his individuality. For illustration, if we see Phillip Zimbardo ‘ s Stanford

Prison Study Experiment (Zimbardo, 1971) , that was undertaken to analyze the behavioral and psychological effects of going a captive or prison guard, we observe that the captives started to lose their individuality, and did n't see it as an experiment, but as a existent prison run by psychologist. They forgot that they were really merely college pupils and non really captives. The captives really gave up their freedom and forgot their rights and autonomies. The state of affairs was such that it made them experience that manner. The environment was so realistic that they really believed they were captives and therefore behaved in rebellion. It is the captives who created in the guards a sadistic urge. The guards were compelled to move in ways that were wholly opposite from what they were experiencing indoors. But few of the guards were really barbarous, and felt no guilt or repent while making their occupation. They had wholly lost themselves and started acting in the function that was assigned to them, i. e. the function of a prison guard. The captives every bit good as the guards lost their true individuality and became what the state of affairs required them to be. The fresh prison modus operandi, the ' privilege cell ' for the obedient 1s and the ' hole ' for those who were punished, the apparels they were made to have on, the nutrient they were made to eat, the figure given to them by which they were now addressed, made them lose their true individuality and go person else. Therefore, from this experiment we learn that state of affairss affect us more than we think. What the voluntaries in this experiment experienced was the ' power of the state of affairs ' and non anything to make with their personality. Prisons are establishments which attempt to rid persons of their old individuality, and this can be clearly seen in Zimbardo ' s prison experiment.

Another illustration is The Clark Doll Experiment (Clark, 1939) that was carried out by Dr. Kenneth Clark and his married woman, where they asked black kids to take between a black doll and a white doll. Most of the kids said the white doll was nicer, prettier and the 1 they preferred playing with, whereas the black doll was the ' bad doll ' . All these kids were aged from 6 to 9 merely and were already so damaged by racism at such a immature age. This racism was due to the school segregation between white and black childs. It was falsifying their heads, doing them to hold stereotypes and hate themselves. When asked the last inquiry of the experiment-' which doll looks like you? ' the kids hesitated and answered. They wanted to take the white doll, but reluctantly pick the black 1. Therefore, bias, favoritism and segregation caused black kids to develop a sense of lower status and ego hatred. These kids were embarrassed of who they truly were, and hated themselves for being black. They wanted to be white like the other childs. Therefore, they lost their individuality at such a immature age and in fact were ashamed of who they really were. They preferred being person else.

Therefore, socialisation does take to individuality formation, and this individuality formation starts at a immature age itself. Even before kids learn the basic do ' s and don'ts. So, it is really of import to maintain kids off from bad influences and state of affairss that can do them organize bad opinions and thoughts about themselves.

Now, reasoning against the gesture, ' socialization leads to identity formation ' , I would wholly differ upon this statement. Identity is who we are and where we come from. We form our individuality by how we behave, how our household has brought us up, what instruction we get, where our

involvements lie, etc. It is what we do and how we behave as persons that form our individuality and do us who we genuinely are. Socialization has nil to make with individuality formation. Socialization will non pour cognition or endowments into an person ; it will non construct 1s individuality. It is of import because we get to cognize more people, and acquire to widen our base. But it does n't organize who we are. It is ' we ' ourselves who from who we are, non the people around us.

Primary and Tertiary socialisation may take to individuality formation, but I can confidently state that Secondary socialisation does non take to identity formation. This can be proved by Paul Willis ' s ' Learning to Labor: How Working Class Kids Get Working Class Jobs ' (Willis, 1977) . In this survey, we see that it is the household that gives the kids their individuality and even schooling could non alter this individuality. This is because the school did non learn them what they really required in life and what they need to populate life the manner their society lives it. It is the pupils who distance themselves from the school civilization and demands, and develop their ain counterculture. They are immune to the schooling, and reject what the school offers to them. Willis finds that they are non less gifted, but they do develop an hostility towards the " work difficult move frontward " outlook of modern instruction, and develop what Willis footings as " antagonistic school civilization " (Willis, 1977) . Therefore, these kids do non organize a different individuality that their school wants them to go. They stick to what their household has taught them and what their household requires them to be. Their household requires them to be laborers, who earn their life by difficult work and labor, non by sitting on a desk and sign language

documents. Therefore, these kids reject the instruction and school civilization that schooling is supposed to implant in a pupil, and prefer populating life the manner their household has been making so, non because they want to, but because it is their responsibility, it is who they are and where they belong.