

Running Head: "RACE" AND SPACE IN THE SMALL TOWN CONTEXT OF MOKOPANE

Questioning Informal Segregation: "Race" and Space in the Small Town Context of Mokopane

Sahba Shaker

Department of Psychology, University of Cape Town

Supervisor: Professor Don Foster

Department of Psychology, University of Cape Town

Word Count:

Abstract: 162 words

Main Body: 9970 words

ABSTRACT

South Africa is a melting pot and a meeting place for a multitude of 'races', representing an optimal arena for understanding the psychology of contact and desegregation. This study focuses on the construction of racial and spatial identity, through continued informal segregation, within the small town setting of Mokopane. Drawing on 34 open-ended interviews, segregation is explored in everyday interactions and spaces. Located within a discursive framework, critical discourse analysis, supplemented by a further rhetorical analysis, was employed. Participants' discursive constructions overwhelmingly demonstrate that segregation persists within the micro-ecology of contact. Discourses were used to construct racial isolation as a natural and normal phenomenon, exposing the superficial quality of inter-racial contact. These discourses can be seen, through rhetorical strategies, to justify and reproduce racist ideas. It is argued that informal segregation in Mokopane, acts as a regulator of hostile and hidden racism. This study ultimately demonstrates the need for a discursive-rhetorical orientation and a more 'embodied' turn in our construction of segregation.

Key Words: micro-ecology of contact; segregation; racial isolation; race relations; inter-group relations; spatial identity

South Africa is a melting pot and a meeting place for a multitude of 'races', representing an optimal arena for understanding the psychology of contact and desegregation. More than a decade after the demise of Apartheid, the promise of transformation and reconciliation still lingers. Although Apartheid's official political structures and legalities have been abandoned, South Africa remains a deeply divided society. Racial isolation persists to invade wider, but especially more private spaces (Durrheim & Dixon, 2004).

South Africa represents a good site for work on racial and spatial identities given its past history and present struggle with issues of reconciliation and transformation. Although much research is emerging from South Africa aiming to confront the challenges of integration, more emphasis has again been placed on macro-processes¹ of institutional change. More intimate, micro-considerations, have not received the same amount of attention. Small towns offer a unique area for future explorations, since small towns themselves are micro-ecological settings. Questions of 'race'² and space are mostly unexplored in this context. It remains unclear how people living in such close proximity retain racial boundaries. Assuming a discursive psychological framework, this study will question the persistence of inter-group division.

THEORETICAL OVERVIEW AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Investigations into desegregation and its consequences on social and psychological change, is a subject much supported by psychological literature. The following review will sketch the background of previous research on contact and desegregation and identify the need for a shift in empirical focus. The scope of this review is centred on the limitations of traditional research on the contact hypothesis, emphasising its unrealistic characteristics, while calling for a new emphasis on the micro-ecology of segregation.

Past Investigations: Revisiting the Contact Hypothesis

Empirical investigations on racial segregation primarily emanate from the USA. Initiated by the end of legal segregation policies in the 1960s and 1970s, much empirical research has demonstrated the persistence of racial isolation, despite political transformation. Research has also focused on identifying the apparent consequences of enduring racial divisions, which filter into the organisation of cities. Such consequences therefore prevent the advancement of most African-Americans, producing the alleged 'underclass' (Massey & Fischer, 2000). The

measurement of attitudes towards desegregation marked some of the first social psychological research in this area (Clark, 1953), and remains a popular subject of study. However Dixon and Durrheim (2003), additionally supported by Schrieff, Tredoux, Dixon and Finchilescu (2005), maintain that these conclusions are primarily descriptive, calling for more explanatory forms of research. More *active* research on the ‘underlining’ motivations and processes sustaining ongoing racial separation is a needed step towards gaining a wider understanding.

However, traditional work on desegregation also adopted an alternative direction of enquiry. Gordon Allport’s (1954) *contact hypothesis* was most significant in the consideration of the consequences of the inevitability of interracial contact. In short, the contact hypothesis maintains that continued isolation of groups enhances the development of negative attitudes and stereotypes, while increased contact reduces prejudice. Specifically, when two conditions are met – both groups being of equal status and sharing a common goal – will the possibility of a reduction in prejudice emerge. A range of research emanating from the contact hypothesis has produced inconsistent results and a host of limitations (Dixon, 2001; Foster & Finchilescu, 1986). Although the theory cannot be entirely discredited, revision is necessary. In a synthesis of past research, Pettigrew (1998) argues that such optimal conditions are insufficient, since inter-group contact should rather be viewed as a slowly-evolving process and possibly unsuitable for real-world situations. Additionally, Pettigrew and Tropp’s (2000) meta-analysis, combining the results of over 200 studies, concluded that contact *can* reduce prejudice, but only under optimal conditions, while absence of these conditions can actually perpetuate prejudice and division.

Dixon, Durrheim and Tredoux (2005), although supporting the basic assumptions of the contact hypothesis, maintain that it is in need of a ‘reality check’. Past empirical studies have mostly been conducted under ideal or unrealistic conditions, specifically in laboratory or experimental work. Inter-racial contact in reality is much more complex. Therefore, indicating a neglect of direct studies of contact and segregation in real-life settings, presenting a problem of ecological validity (Tredoux, Dixon, Underwood, Nunez & Finchilescu, 2005).

The Micro-Ecology of Racial Division

While recognising the presentation of racial division at various scales of society, most research has been conducted at a macro-sociological level. However, researchers have neglected to explore segregation in everyday interactions and spaces (Dixon, Tredoux & Clack, 2005). Some

research, arising directly after the end of the segregation period in the USA, assumed this micro-ecological position, investigating what Goldberg (1998) describes as the 'daily experience' of "race". For instance, in an analysis of racial integration on public transit busses in New Orleans, Davis, Seibert and Breed (1966) observed limited contact or 'mixing' between racial groups, while Kaplan and Fugate's (1972) comparative study on racial contact and avoidance in American supermarkets, revealed a range of racial factors which characterised interaction. However in general, avoidance of inter-racial interactions was preferable. Parker's (1968) observational research on racial integration patterns in a Chicago Baptist church, demonstrated an encouraging propensity towards informal interracial conversations, however seating arrangements were almost automatically racialised, illustrating subtle processes of re-segregation. Similarly, the development of re-segregation patterns was further exemplified by the exploration of eating arrangements in multiracial schools (Schofield & Sagar, 1977), where students voluntarily arranged themselves according to racial and gender lines.

The American situation, which Goldberg (1998) refers to as 'the new segregation', can easily be paralleled to that of South Africa. In consequence of changing institutional and political processes in South Africa, Durrheim and Dixon (2005b) explored the spatial patterns of racial contact at Scottburgh holiday resort in Kwazulu-Natal. The previous 'Whites only beach', now permitted Black, Indian, Coloured and White holiday goers, however interracial contact between groups was scarce. Informal segregation persisted and manifested itself in more discrete, 'bodily' divisions, again embodying the process of preferred segregation. Since most micro-processes of segregation are a direct result of wider political or cultural happenings, one must recognise that micro-ecological processes are not entirely detached from macro-processes (Dixon, Durrheim & Tredoux, 2005; Foster, 2005). Everyday, more ordinary interactions however, have been neglected by social psychologists and require further investigation.

Bodily Representations of Segregation:

Therefore, one may conclude that the micro-ecology of segregation has remained a neglected dimension of research and that the greatest shortcoming of the contact hypothesis is its disregard of spatial dimensions (Dixon, 2001; Dixon, Tredoux & Clack, 2005). There remains a need to explore the lived experience of segregation in terms of bodily 'positioning', as Foster (2005) explains:

Various kinds of spaces either enable or constrain particular action. Places have specific meanings for people; they resonate with symbolic and emotional significance. We all carry with us various senses of 'place identity' (p.498).

The Durban beach studies described above demonstrate how various meanings of 'contact' may surface from body-space-time configurations. For example, Whites typically regarded the presence of Black people as an 'invasion' of their space, choosing then to leave the area, while Blacks embraced this opportunity for contact, perceiving the White people as 'running away' (Durrheim & Dixon, 2004, 2005b). The continued patterns of informal segregation, persistent with bodily separation, have been further established by two more recent studies among university students, which have proved to be some of the few studies conducted in natural settings. The observations of Schrieff et al. (2005) on spatial patterns of racial segregation in university dining halls, exemplified the subtle processes functioning to help regulate contact. Similarly, Tredoux et al. (2005) utilised time-lag digital photography technologies to observe spatial and temporal dimensions of segregation in informal seating arrangements at the University of Cape Town. This study revealed mixing of 'race' groups in forced situations (when there is no space), while voluntary segregation was practised when in the presence of space. These findings suggest that persistent racialised categories associate with bodily and spatial arrangements to create different comfort-zone places.

'Race' and Space

The underlying reasons and meanings behind this assumed 'new segregation' have yet to be uncovered. Finchilescu (2005) proposes that meta-stereotypes may offer a medium for understanding this continued segregation. Meta-stereotypes can be understood as how we perceive *others* to view us. This experience of being judged or stereotyped may produce anxiety in contact situations. This process causes us to withdraw to our 'comfort areas' and ultimately hinders inter-racial contact. Schrieff et al. (2005) additionally explain that people are more comfortable in certain places, synonymous with the idea of 'knowing ones place'. Spatiality is therefore intertwined with relations of power that hold these 'positionings' in place. For example, 'shared' campus space may actually be 'owned' by White males, while others regulate

their space in direct accordance with this claim. Richard Ballard's (2004) work explores this camouflaged segregation and racist thinking in Black squatter communities in relation to White suburban Durban communities. Ballard's research found that the perceived 'threat' of destabilisation of individual and collective identities is identifiable when various racial communities live in such close proximity. Dixon, Durrheim and Tredoux (2005) describe how Festinger, Schachter and Black's (1959) classic work on social pressures in informal groups, uncovers spatial factors that function to facilitate group formation, while neglecting to acknowledge their role in shaping inter-group meanings and perceptions. This area of positioning in 'bodily space' (Foster, 1997) remains a neglected subject of research. Further exploration into the meaning and reasoning behind continued racial categorisation is needed.

Durrheim (2005), using descriptive and discursive methods, illustrated the importance of historical occurrences of racialised spatial division, which help shape negative racial attitudes. Consequentially, Durrheim suggests that reintegration could potentially reverse these effects. However, Christopher (2001b) has observed that the post-Apartheid city almost mirrors that of the 'old' apartheid city. Further research using this socio-spatial framework is thus needed to uncover the informal mechanisms that sustain persistent segregation. As Foster (2005) describes:

The spatial distribution of housing and communities in cities and towns, remains relatively unchanged...from this perspective it would appear that racialized isolation and separation is being reproduced (p.495).

Methodological Shift: Racial Discourse and the Lived Experience of Segregation

While working towards an explanation of racial isolation in everyday situations, several authors have argued in favour of methodological improvement (Dixon & Durrheim, 2003; Durrheim & Dixon, 2005a, 2005b; Foster, 2005; Scherief et al., 2005; Tredoux et al., 2005). Tredoux et al. (2005) introduced the use of new methods to enhance observational research of informal segregation, drawing on new computer and photographic technologies. Although these innovative approaches to data collection, developed in response to the assumed 'spatial turn' in segregation research, are significant, the need for a 'linguistic turn' is of equal importance. A range of methods, inclusive of discourse, narrative, conversational and rhetorical analyses as well as archival studies are needed, if new research is to engage in producing a greater sense of

meaning (Foster, 2005). As Foster (1997, 2000) describes, space embodies both material and discursive elements; specifically, boundaries of segregation can be as much physical as they are symbolic. Therefore these spatialised conceptions of identity, in terms of race, go further than geographical positioning, and must be explored using discursive practices.

Durrheim's and Dixon (2005a, 2005b) influential beach studies demonstrate the importance of using linguistic techniques in constructing the realities of contact and desegregation. Illustrating that language in fact 'does things'. It constructs laws and signs that inform and create these boundaries, and hence discursive methods must be utilised to enrich our understanding and limit the consequences of these mechanisms (Foster, 2000). Traditional empirical studies restrict knowledge of the lived experience. Research must evolve its methods to gain a deeper appreciation and understanding of these internal workings, by listening to the voices of individuals and groups (Durrheim & Dixon, 2005a). However, the discursive methodological approach remains neglected. Future research should therefore aim to fully exploit the discursive method, embracing the value of the lived experience.

Rational: Rethinking Psychological Focus

A. J. Christopher's (2001a) *Atlas of a Changing South Africa* presents a visual account of the separation enforced upon South Africa. The deconstruction of Apartheid's spatial divisions, both in wider institutional separations and the more 'personal' Apartheid, is an on-going process. Some may argue that the 'race question' in South Africa has been saturated. However, despite the magnitude of research, racial segregation remains persistent, assuming the structure of a 'new segregation', which is more voluntary and informal in its workings. This review has argued in favour of both a perspective and methodological shift. The present study will therefore operate within the framework of the micro-ecology of contact, arguing that race relations are shaped by both bodily practices and in language. This study aims to explore how everyday processes and interactions maintain and regulate racial boundaries within a small town context, working under the general hypothesis of a continued pattern of informal segregation.

METHODOLOGY

The Context of Segregation: Mokopane

The town of *Mokopane*, in the Limpopo Province, is the chosen area of investigation. However, the actual definition of a small town is indefinite. For the purpose of this study, a small town will be defined according to its population and geographic dimension. With a population³ of approximately 30 000, Mokopane has been grouped within the category of small towns (Mogalakwena municipality, 2008). Historically the town's main industry has been agricultural, however currently the mining industry has taken precedence. As one of the oldest towns in the old Northern Transvaal, Mokopane, formerly known as *Potgietersrus*⁴, was founded on a series of conflicts between the local communities and the voortrekkers (Du Plooy, 1995). The three main "race" groups in the town being, Black, White and Indian.

Geographical studies, having produced large amounts of work on residential desegregation in post-apartheid cities, demonstrate the deeply racist and conservative history of the area. Polokwane, for example, formally known as Pietersburg, a larger city in close proximity to Mokopane, has been used in these investigations (Donaldson & van der Merwe, 1999; Kotze & Donaldson, 1998). The townspeople themselves refer to Mokopane as "conservative", "political", "historically racialised" and a "right-winged community". As Tracy describes, "A very interesting mix, you have the White and Black, and then serious class systems. You have the rural sector, in both Black and White...also a lot of cultural differences between African tribes and misunderstandings."

Data Collection and Procedure

The analysis presented here is based on interviews conducted with multiple residents of Mokopane over a three week period, during the 3rd and 20th of June 2008. Overall, the design falls within an in-depth case-study approach. As a pilot study, the first two days of data collection were primarily ground work, attempting to understand the general layout and background of the town. An informal interview with the communications officer in the municipality was conducted to gain basic contextual information. The town's local museum, *Arend Dieperink Museum*, offered further background on Mokopane.

The primary source of data collection was open-ended interviews. A more structured interview may have limited the flow and freedom of the participants, while open-ended interviews, as argued by Wetherall and Potter (1992), offer a powerful approach in eliciting personal experience. The flexibility of the open-ended interview acts as a facilitator for innovation and discovery in research (Parker, 2005). However, interviews also took shape in a funnel sequence of questions, as labelled by Rosenthal and Rosnow (2008), beginning with very general questions to more direct enquiries. An interview schedule was used as a rough guide (see Appendix A).

The length of the interview varied considerably, ranging from fifteen minutes to one hour. It often depended on how interested or resistant the participants were. Specifically, elderly, Afrikaans females consistently shared very little information, while other residents, usually 'foreigners', such as individuals from Cape Town or Venda, and Afrikaans males were much more vocal. It was additionally very difficult to penetrate the Indian community, with elderly Indian men being particularly resistant. The interviews were conducted on a one-to-one basis. The interviewees were given preference as to the setting of the interviews, usually conducted in the participant's office or home. Informed consent was obtained (see Appendix B) and all interviews were recorded and transcribed.

Participants

A total 34 people participated in the study. This exploration did not strive to uncover universal, absolute truths and hence generalisability and representativity were not principal objectives. However, the overall sample represented a mixture of gender, age, 'race' and language groups, specifically, Indian (n=6), Black (n=8), White (n=19) and 'Other' (n=1), therefore allowing for greater expression of the multiple realities of Mokopane (refer to Appendix C for further sample breakdown). All participants have been given pseudonyms.

Working within an interpretive paradigm, participants were recruited through purposive or judgemental and snowball sampling. In an attempt to sample a broad range of people, a few core organisations were initially contacted, specifically: the Anglo-Platinum mine, SAPS, the local high school and primary school, real estate agent, religious council, hospital and local hotel. Interviews were arranged accordingly. Subsequently, participants facilitated contact with other organisations and residents in the town, such as friends, family, church members, and co-

workers. Although the used sample may present a bias towards White and Afrikaans-speaking individuals, the above sample was not chosen according to racial and gender preference, but was rather representative of participants' 'positioning' in the town. Therefore, the evident racial slant may illustrate the ongoing power relations within Mokopane. In particular, private organisations, were predominantly White, while in government organisations, excluding schools, more Black participants were recruited. Furthermore, females were also less representative in more executive positions, suggestive of additional patriarchal patterns in the town.

Data Analysis

A discursive psychological approach was employed, which included a critical discourse analysis, supplemented by a further rhetorical analysis. Discourse analysis operates within a specific ideological paradigm that deconstructs the function and consequences of language, unlocking the meanings and intensions embedded in the text (Werth, 1999). Responding to a call towards a methodological shift, discourse analysis is therefore particularly useful for understanding how racist explanations are constructed, maintained and even justified. However, here one should also observe that this methodological approach does not offer a fixed strategy, but rather a general set of guidelines for textual analysis (Parker, 1992; Potter & Wetherell, 1987).

A combination of two approaches to discourse analysis was used. These included Potter and Wetherell's (1987, 1994) discursive strategy, emphasising the variability and function of discourse, as well as a Parkerian approach directed towards a critical orientation, which facilitated an examination of power, ideology and institutional influence. Parker's (1992, 2005) critical discourse analysis allows for an exploration that moves beyond the descriptive and towards a performative understanding of language. Furthermore, underlining the significance of argumentation in social life, this analysis will integrate Billig's (1987, 1991) rhetorical approach to social psychology. This focus on rhetoric and meaning of racial expressions, as argued by Durrheim and Dixon (2004), is therefore particularly useful in uncovering latent meanings and positions in discourse.

The Reflexive Researcher

It can be argued that participants' discursive constructions were persuaded by my own identity and positioning. Parker (2005) maintains that the relationship between the 'researcher' and the

'researched' is an inherently unequal. Historically, the researcher holds a power position over the 'subject' of research, therefore locating oneself within institutional constraints helps counteract the power positioning. Locating myself within the discourses revealed the centrality of my 'Indian' and 'American' identity, rather than my role as a psychology student or researcher. For example, participants related American comparisons, such as the separation of Jewish residential areas or 'Southern American attitudes' or 'the yanks', possibly signifying my assumed role as an 'outsider.' References made to 'my culture' or my 'understanding' of Indian practices, may also be indicative of a tendency towards classification and racialisation. In only five of the interviews was my ethnicity actually directly questioned. Otherwise, it was considered as a given fact. Therefore, one must assess how participants of varying backgrounds expressed themselves in accordance with my assumed cultural identity. Further analysis of interviews with Afrikaans males in particular, revealed my hesitance in posing questions and sometimes I even conceded to racist statements that they made. The situation may be representative of a wider power struggle extending beyond the research relationship into past Apartheid practices of White supremacy and patriarchy: Afrikaans males imposing their authority over a female person of colour, who subsequently adopted the subordinate role.

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Continued Informal Segregation

It has been assumed that explorations into the 'remapping of the Apartheid city' may provide further insight into new patterns of segregation (Dixon, Tredoux & Clack, 2005). Despite evident restructuring of the town, participants' discursive constructions of change and racial interaction in Mokopane, overwhelmingly demonstrated a pattern of continued informal segregation. In line with previous research, 30 of the 34 townspeople across gender and racial divides, constructed a picture of regulated contact. Marguerite, an elderly Afrikaans lady, remarked, "I mean my next door neighbour is a Black guy... but I don't know anything. I am not interested. I want to do my own thing and don't want other people to interfere with what I do... I don't even know the surname of my neighbour. I don't know where they work. I don't know anything about them."

Aligned with Parker's (1992) notion of the historical location of discourses, participants commonly referred to the divisions of the 'old Apartheid city' and specifically to the removal of

the Group Area's act, as expressed by Mblauko and Richard respectively, "People were not mixing from different races... but presently everyone has the right to go anywhere", "People are free to go – even at night – they are free to go up and down. No one can restrict them." Similarly referring to the residential changes in Mokopane, Pierre explains:

Well it was segregated, you had your White, Indian residential areas, your Black, you know... Ya, I mean in terms of politics, I mean definitely, integration in terms of housing areas and all that, definitely... a lot more people coming in and out, which wasn't the case always.

However, the intimacy of such contact is once again questioned. Suzaan's account of cross-racial interaction, "we stay together, but not live together", aptly demonstrates that although formal processes of desegregation are ongoing, it appears that contact again emerges at a superficial level. Drawing on an Us-Them/We-They distinction, Stephan explains racial dynamics as "we do our thing and they do theirs", while Grace employs a more direct approach, "Blacks here, Whites there". The depiction of the town runs in close comparison with that of Goldberg's (1998) portrayal of the 'new segregation', a society with no legal constraints to interaction, yet persistent in its tendency towards racial isolation.

Interviewees' depiction of racial interactions in the town seems to resonate with that of former president Verwoerd's⁵ (1960) description of Apartheid as a policy of 'good neighbourliness'. Johannes freely admits, "No, really no, we stay together and we greet each other, but not house friends, no." This illustrates both a lack of intimate contact and desire to embrace the possibility of friendship, as reiterated by David, "No, no, we are no, eat together, or game together, it is only in the street when we see each other and talk." The 'changing' situation appears to be "tolerated", "something that you have to get used to" that "people have come to learn to deal with". Much emphasis has been placed in traditional social psychological literature on the importance of contact in finding a 'resolution' to prejudice (Dixon, Durrheim & Tredoux, 2005). However, the transformation attempts in Mokopane demonstrate how change in social organisations does not necessarily result in a change of attitudes, as affirmed by Fatimah's statement, "Ya, you won't change the attitude too much, but we all live where we want to live."

Talk of ‘Change’

In line with ‘race’ and space theory (Ballard, 2004; Foster, 1997), spatialised dimensions emerged within discourse related to the ongoing ‘transformation’ in Mokopane. Textual constructions of space, across interviews, primarily converge on the representation of the town as a ‘farming community’ or ‘bushy area’. Afrikaans males were particularly vocal and consistent in their description of ‘Potties’, the abbreviated term for Potgietersrus, as being the ‘bush veld’. The notion of *place identity* therefore resonates within these descriptions. Similar to Durrheim’s (2005) description of the historical importance of spatiality, Dixon (1997) maintains that racial identity is implanted within physical locations. The collective history of the Afrikaner, the *volk*, is intrinsic to the idea of the *boer* or the farmer (Dubow, 1992), interlocked within the spatial significance of the bush veld. Therefore, descriptions of the town as the ‘bush’ or farm, are synonymous with constructions of Afrikaner Nationalism. Johannes, for example, recalls a nostalgic narrative of the voortrekkers and Paul Kruger. Here, we are again reminded of the symbolic and emotional attachment to space (Foster, 2005). The old Northern Transvaal, for example, symbolises the history of the Afrikaner, as the voortrekker. In contrast, a more negative undertone can be depicted in the descriptions given by English-speaking and certain African participants. Statements such as, “Ya it’s a funny town... ‘platteland se dorp,’” may serve as a possible challenge to the primacy of the *volk* identity.

Spatial positioning in the town may not be inadvertent, but rather similar to Schreiff’s et al. (2005) description of White spatial dominance. Mokopane, or rather Potties, is referred to as “their town”, the “farming town”, as Nozipo expressed, “Ya this actually is an Afrikaans town”. Although Afrikaners are in the minority, White supremacy appears to still linger. Similarly, in a local high school, the notion of special entitlement re-emerges. *Potgietersrus Hoër Skool*, originally only an Afrikaans medium school, maintains similar spatial positioning. Described as ‘their school’, the English-speaking students still appear to assume a subordinate position. As Iraj explains, “The school is doing us a big favour by accommodating us.” Malise’s description of the racial spacing in the school, again eludes to a construction of White authority: “The English people will always stand together... and all the Afrikaans kids were just scattered around the place... that grass square there, is where they do their thing.” It is therefore not just a school, a neutral geographic location. Here, the physical becomes ideological.

In all interviews, emphasis was placed on Mokopane's gradual shift from a farming to a mining town. However, inconsistencies lay in participants' explanation of the change. African and Indian participants were encouraged by the mines' influence, as in Mbaluk's statement, "development is happening in this area... since the mines came in." In contrast, Afrikaans residents displayed more disapproving accounts, constructing a new category of people – "the mining people". "The mining people are other kinds of people... they live for today", "not to offend the miners, but there is a certain culture that comes with the mine", Deidree and Wilhelm's descriptions not only construct an 'othering' identity, but perceive "the miner" as a threat, a disruption to the current social order, as reiterated by Piet:

We are in a normal society... in between all of them [townspeople], together in a very nice and quiet situation. But now there are people moving in from the outside. They work on the mine... new people come in with very dangerous ways of thinking, new ideas, new ways of seeing freedom... that can be a problem in this town or this town can be strong enough to change those people to our view.

Classification itself arises almost habitually in all interviews. Most participants routinely engaged in classification practices, either passive, assuming an Us/Them/We/They dimension, or more direct classification. Participants were not hesitant to use traditional racial labels, Blacks, Whites, Indians, which is possibly representative of the lack of transformation. The creation of a new category of "miners", further illustrates this entrenched tendency towards classification.

Discourses also demonstrated a more passive resistance to change. Across interviews, hope for future change was directed at the "new generation", and the belief was expressed that racism will "change with time" or "die out". Therefore, there seems to be no active resistance or desire to instigate change, typified by Grace's words: "no one seems to care, they are ignoring it." Even among the female 'foreigners' whose discourse advocate a need for transformation, there existed a "what can *I* do" attitude. Also, indicating a lack of female empowerment, a "who am I" mindset was detectable, echoing the patriarchal values of Apartheid (Dubow, 1992).

Covert Racism

Contrary to previous research, racial isolation in Mokopane moves beyond informal segregation to what can be described as hidden or covert racism. Offering maybe a more honest description,

a Methodist minister described Mokopane as “not a happy town, quite dark”. Christian admitted to heightened racial tensions:

I think that when there is integration, it is still on a very superficial level. I can see it in the church... Let me say this, informally speaking, you hear a lot about hate for Blacks... you can hear it in the language, because there is this thing that somehow we are superior.

Most African and Indian discourses reaffirmed the idea of masked racism: “most of it is just swept underneath the carpet.” Andries, aligned with Goffman’s (1971) theatrical theory of identity, describes how townspeople perform opposing public and private roles, “So there are those people that can be friendly at work with you because you provide something for them, but when they get home, they are different.” Working within Parker’s (1992) critical approach, Mirriam and Nozipho’s accounts uncover further political dimensions:

M: People are scared to practise racial discrimination publicly. But they do it in maybe a civil way, like hidden, but it is still there...they do something to show you that they are just pretending to like them.

N: They used to say that language, the K-word, but now because they are afraid of the constitution, ya... as far as I know they say it privately, it is not dropped.

It appears that Apartheid’s previous ideologies have not yet been dissolved, but still linger within state institutions that assume so-called ‘non-racial’ policies. Therefore, more covert mechanisms, such as informal segregation or hidden racism, seem to arise and re-establish the status-quo. Despite structural changes, it appears that “the character of the town has stayed the same”, as in Tracy and Grace’s declaration, “I often say to people that you stay in Mokopane in the Limpopo province, you are still living in the Northern Transvaal (*laugh*). Nothing has changed!”, “I refuse to call it Mokopane, because I feel that it is still Potties.”

Replicating the ‘pro-new South African’ discourse, identified by Steyn and Foster (2008), the English-speaking townsmen argue in support of transformation, deviating from the average conservative ‘White talk’. The English-speaking White participants assumed the ‘outsider’ or ‘othering’ role in the town, as Rose explains, “... then the few English-speaking people that don’t really fit in anywhere.” Tracy and Jenny, describe the town’s muddled conception of White

identity: “Being White you find that the vast majority of White people presume that because you are White, you are a racist and understand them”, “... they will accept us, because it is better than accepting Blacks, and if you must really push it take the English, at least they are White.” They recall multiple narratives of overt racist experiences: being asked whether they have “Kaffir neighbours”; people refusing to sit next to “a Kaffir and eat”; criticism of all the “Swart kinders” at their children’s birthday. William, an Englishman married to a Sotho lady, describes the town as “Still living in the 50s, extremely racial, extremely small-minded and blinkered... The Afrikaner community are even anti-English... I find them rude, pig-headed and a bad blot on the South African people.”

The prospect of racial contact is almost characterised by fear and tension. Uncertainty of the consequences of integration, the Indian community, for example, feared “... the AVB at one stage. The Afrikaners will take over again, and Potties is a strong hold.” Johannes provides the most striking account of Afrikaner apprehension:

J: ...Among the traditional White Afrikaans people, who are the daemons of the world.

I: Is that how you see it?

J: I think a lot of people think they should get rid of all the White South Africans, I mean those generation people, if you give them so much time, they will kill us all!

Therefore, in the absence of the ‘optimal conditions’ of racial contact (Pettigrew, 1998; Pettigrew & Troop, 2000), racial interaction is frequented by hostility, even violence. Metaphorical descriptions of racial conflict clearly describe the nature of inter-racial relations in Mokopane: “And when people don’t discuss issues and hide it under the mattress, it sometimes burns up and explodes”, “...people don’t have the guts anymore, or it will be war, seriously. It is like a mine, silent until you step on it.” Re-segregation thus ‘diffuses’ racial tension, adopting a peace-keeping function. Therefore it can be argued that informal segregation acts as a regulator of hostile and hidden racism.

Illustrations of ‘Racial Migration’

In recounting the story of the town, participants often disclosed brief narratives of ‘incidents’ of hostile racial encounters. The most frequently recurring narrative in the interviews, related to the

racial integration of a local primary school, *Potgietersrus Laër Skool*, in 1995. The current principal of the school, Stephan, recalls the story:

Ag, all these years it was a school for the White's only, Afrikaans school with an English side as well. Then in 1996, Black parents put their children here. Ag, this was a total mess that year, the Black parents put their children into the English side and the White parents didn't like it. They were scared the school would be totally Black, and they started to move their children out. The more Black children moved in, the more White children moved out.

Attempts at integration at the school appear to exemplify the underlying racial tensions, "there was lots of intimidation", and thus it was only triggered by forced contact. However, the Afrikaans community seemed to underplay the severity of the situation, whereas Tracy mentions how "the Boeramag were running around the school with guns in their hands."

Indian and Black interviewees also offered contrasting descriptions of the incident. As a Black male, Richard was almost nostalgic and proud: "There was a primary [school] here, that primary was only for white, ne, until the people of this area do a big march for that school to take all races of children. Indeed we have done it!" From an Indian perspective, a more direct, almost 'objective' description surfaced from Jasmine:

The Black people perceived, well they saw the schools with so many facilities and they wanted their children to go to their schools, and they came in droves... the Afrikaner got angry and the reason was that it was too much to accept hordes of people, but partially it was... ya. You know the Black parents came to the school and said you must take our children or otherwise... and on the other hand there were White parents that said we will not take them, you know, this is what we are prepared to do, stand and fight.

This 'incident' of contact seems to parallel that of the Durban beach studies (Dixon & Durrhiem, 2003), where contact results in patterns of re-segregation. "I don't know, think it is politics. At first, it was only Whites and when the Black students came, they ran away", Andiswa's description duplicates the pattern, Black 'invasion' and White persons 'running away'. However, the difference between the two occurrences is that at the Laër skool, contact was first met with

conflict, the ‘resolution’ being a process of re-segregation. The Christelik Volksaad Oos-Skool (CVO), an ‘all-White school’, was established as a result, offering an alternative for Afrikaans children.

Interestingly, similar patterns of ‘racial migration’ seem to be reproduced in other racialised communities. In an interview with an Afrikaans and Indian primary school teacher, a similar situation with the new Indian primary school was narrated. Referring to the formation of Mokopane English-Medium Primary School (MEPS), Helda and Jasmin engage in a dual dialogue:

C: That is when you people, also this school [Akasis Primary] started to be flopped as well, anyway...

S: Yes. Let me tell you what happened: the Black learners from the townships moved into the town schools. They are second, actually third-language English speakers.

C: It is the same that happened at the Laër Skool, you know.

S: In Mokopane, there are, Akasia school, was an open school for all learners, lots of Indian and Black learners, no White learners. So they didn’t have the problem that Laër Skool had, but what actually happened was that you had a minimum of 50 children in the classroom and the facilities were being stretched...

C: Well that is what *actually* happened with the CVO skool, with the Afrikaans you know, it is also a smaller class, private education.

Although, MEPS is now a secular school, it also initially encouraged a specific religious practice, Islam. Therefore, a similar pattern of contact and re-segregation appears to emerge between the Black and Indian students, however lacking direct conflict.

Similar patterns of ‘preferred’ segregation were uncovered in other social organisations in the town. Initial integration of the hospitals was again characterised by violence, and later re-segregation, ‘Blacks invading’ and ‘Whites running away’. Jenny describes:

The hospitals and schools were beautiful places, but with the change came the Black people. And the AWB actually camped outside the hospital to keep Black people out, they dragged Black women out of the maternity ward... so suddenly the hospital was

inundated with a multitude of Black people, and those who could choose, just stopped coming and the GP's moved out.

Leon, however, who now owns a private practice in town, offers a more masked account, arguing that “the service is so bad now a day... I avoid the hospital. I don't go there. I resigned everything. I don't go.” In the school and hospital examples, both of which are government institutions, it seems as though the White community had no alternative but to leave, possibly re-establishing a sense of ‘social order’ by forming private institutions. However, occurrences of injustice in the magistrate court indicate that ‘White control’ *can* continue to position itself within government institutions, as in community service practices: “If it is a Black person, they will be given duties to sweep the yard, clean toilets. But if it is a White person, they will be doing office work.”

In contrast, continued segregation in restaurants and bars are facilitated with more direct efforts. William recalls his first encounter at a local bar:

We went to a bar and ordered a couple of beers and there was a 50% discount. And I said to the guy, ‘Oh is this happy hour?’, and he said, ‘No, it's because you are White’. I said, ‘What?’ He said, ‘Ya, we put high prices to keep the black people out...’ He didn't even try to hide it.

Miriam, Grace and Richard, for example, are aware of the bar policies, but argue that “you just don't feel comfortable; not that there is a sign that you do not enter...I choose not to enter”. Here Finchilesu's (2005) notion of meta-stereotypes takes shape – that the experience of being judged in social situations produces anxiety. In turn, this social discomfort prompts persons to revert to their *own* comfort areas, in this case, a ‘Black bar, Las Vegas bar’.

Ideological Dilemmas

Participants' discursive constructions, however, are not isolated texts. They exist within a socio-cultural context. It can be argued that discourse exists within larger ideologies contained in a political arena (Parker, 1992). Justifications of segregation or racist ideas in Mokopane are deeply entrenched in a highly religious, specifically Christian discourse. Christian ideology offers almost a divine justification for racial division, as Suzaan states, “I think God made us.

There is a reason for making this and making this. I think he wants to stick to this and not just mix everything around.” Dubow (1992) illustrates how Christian nationalism lies at the centre of Apartheid philosophy, viewing the Afrikaner as ‘God’s chosen people’.

‘Older generation’ Afrikaans discourses tend to reproduce these religious justifications for division.

But the Indian community, you know, have their own religion, and the Black community have their own religion and they can be friends, but not intimate friends, because you can not have a very good relationship if you don’t have the same religion... The Indian group, you know they vow to Ala, and Ala is not the same as Jesus Christ... and the Black people pray which is high, which they don’t know... they just know it is somebody that they cannot see.

Deirdria’s dialogue not only represents a lack of religious understanding or acknowledgement of Black Christian beliefs, but clearly illustrates how supposed Christian philosophy validates continued racial isolation. Here one may move even further into a colonial discourse, viewing White as moral and Christian, and Black as heathen and savage (Bulhan, 1985). In contrast, Pierre, refers to the CVO and the Afrikaanse-Protestantse-Kerk (APK)⁶ as “segregation under the auspices of religion”. He seems to attack traditional justifications for racial division, but again from a biblical standpoint, “From a religious point of view, I don’t know how you can support being a Christian and do the things they do... you say brotherly love and then you deny one fraction, it doesn’t make sense.”

Racist ideas do not seem to exist at a purely individual level. Seemly personal beliefs emanate from wider ideologies (Parker, 2005). Apartheid was not only a political tool of oppression, endorsing racial division, but was founded on a Christian ideology and patriarchal system (Dubow, 1992). Again it appears that Apartheid ideologies infiltrate institutions; specifically, schools, the church, and even government organisations. Supposed ‘illegal’ beliefs have not been disband, but have instead employ subtle means to replace themselves within institutions, therefore reinforcing the social order.

Rhetorical Constructions of ‘Race’

Wetherell and Potter (1992) argue that discourses are not purely ideological, but also adopt a rhetorical function. In this way, ‘race talk’ can be considered as rhetorically constructed to create a particular reality, seemingly factual and stable, by use of various discursive devices. Drawing from ancient Greek rhetorical tradition, Billig (1987) maintains that language is a method of persuasion, actively constructed against an ‘other’. Discourse, regarding racial interactions in the town, commonly took shape in the form of an argumentative practice. In all interviews, some form of argumentative dialectic emerged. In particular, three dominate rhetorical strategies can be located, labelled as: ‘idealise’, ‘normalise’ and ‘defence’.

Idealise

A strategy that constructs an idyllic portrait of the town, is employed in accounting for the ‘absence’ of any ‘problems’ or contention within Mokopane. Although more heightened among elderly, Afrikaans and Sepedi men, participants in general exercised this ‘no problem’ argument, constructing a harmonious, non-threatening portrait of the town. When asked about the change, a repeated response among interviewees was that of “no problems”. The “no problems” discourse took shape in two forms. The first, included a long description of the town, followed by a “no problems” statement. The second, offered very short statements followed by a “ya, no problems”, diverting direct questions. As in Celeste’s dialogue:

C: I don’t experience any problems...

I: Do you think there is conflict in the town?

C: I haven’t got ay problems with anyone.

I: So have things stayed the same over the past few years?

C: I think so. No Problems.

Falling within the broad category of *epideictic* rhetoric⁷, social dilemmas, such as prejudice, are constructed to create an unquestionable social reality (Billig, 1987). Therefore, any counter arguments presented would seem illogical.

Normalise

This is a process in which a phenomenon is described as normal and natural, functioning to close off the argument. Billig (1991) argues that customs and practices emerge as uncontroversial and undisputed, when identified as natural or normal. Nearly all participants lead to the eventual conclusion that racial ‘groupings’ are an innate and unchangeable tendency: “I think naturally you socialise with people that are the same as you”, “I think it is a natural thing for a person to like his own community or group.” Racial divisions described as, “it is natural” or “that is normal”, were duplicated in multiple discourses, creating a factual representation of segregation.

Even as a young, highly-educated male, Pierre describes segregation as a “sort of human condition, a human flaw... but it is like an ingrained, primal need. I don’t know. That like leads to some way to discriminate against other groups.” Therefore, across the interviews, rhetorical work was oriented towards the regulation of the status quo. Rhetorical practices commonly functioned to legitimatise and normalise racial division, *again* working to construct an idyllic portrayal of the town.

The town is very nice, because you know, different societies live together on a very normal bases... I do not find any problems. Ya, there is some mingling of races and so on, but normally they live separate, because I can take you with my bakkie and say here are the people, not in a negative way... You know what the best thing is? That it bothers nobody [Piet].

Even among the supposed ‘new generation’, students are described as ‘happy’ within normal racial groupings, “The White learners form a group, and also the Indians and the Blacks, they are not friends. They are in school, there is no problem, but everyone goes on their own...and enjoy it.” Not only does this discourse illustrate a pattern of segregation, but emphasises the apparent normality, or ‘taken for grantedness’ as described by Billig (1987). In an interview conducted with two Grade 12 learners, White and Indian, ‘racial migration’ is again portrayed as a natural tendency. Concerning racialised tension or conflict, Malise and Iraj explain:

M: Let me be honest, in our school there is a bit, it is not like there is war, but there is. Not like there is hatred, but it is, like you go and do your thing.

I: It is just separate; we stay out of each other's way. I know the Indians have a certain section of the school.

M: I think it is natural, like that you want to mix with your group, the people with the same race, beliefs...

I: ... An Indian just feels for another Indian.

However, here Malise's contradictory statement about the 'war' or racialised hatred in the school, alludes to a wider conflicting reality of racial relations between the learners. The learners' dialogue continued to represent a muddled account of the inter-race relationships in the school, beginning with the traditional "no problems", "that's natural" argument and concluding with more of a direct description of racial hatred.

I: I think the Black girls don't like the White boys.

M: Because the White boys are racist toward the Black girls.

I: I think the Black people feel superior, I think, over the White people, because they are up now and everything is their right...

M: I must say, Black girls have been racist towards me.

However, the presentation of racial segregation as a natural human experience, can be understood beyond rhetorical workings, in the context of what Barker (1981) refers to as 'the new racism'. This theory proposes that, for better or for worse, *it is* a human condition to be bound to one's community, aware of 'outside' differences. Maintaining that it is human instinct to preserve one's culture and defend one's territory. Focusing on British attitudes towards immigration, Barker further identifies an emotional connection with the nation, as not just a place, but a national home. Thus the notion of *place identity* again re-emerges, however the Mokopane or South African situation is not completely comparable to the case of British immigration. Although the Afrikaners may consider the 'bush veld' to be their national home, it can be argued that *it is* the Africans' national home.

Defence

A strategy of defence took shape in two forms: avoiding racist accusations and providing justification for previous practices. Firstly, in the White interviews, particularly, people tended to

speaking about racial prejudice while attempting to simultaneously avoid labelling themselves as racist. Billig (1987) identifies this rhetorical technique as *prolepsis*, where one deflects individual criticism, while acknowledging the problem. Participants commonly referred to that “tiny group of people that are like that” when discussing racial tension in Mokopane. Evidence of resistance to change or continued racism were frequently deflected to the older, ‘conservative generation’ as in Nerina’s description, or Gerhart’s account of “Some older people in their 70s and 80s that still talk about... they regret all the changes”. Alternatively, Johannes averted individual criticism by use of a ‘third-person’ dialogue. In referring to the taxi rank by his house, he argues that “this Black guy is very upset, he says that we cannot live in a place with a lot of baboons”, or concerning crime, “I have a talented garden operator... four totsis attacked and stabbed him... He was also a bit of a racist for a day or two.”

However in some cases, it seemed not only that the individual was deflecting self-blame, but the town itself was being protected. Therefore, the person was not only trying to avoid a racist label or negative identity, but the actual town’s identity was defended, “it is the history”, “Potties has always been a political town”. Standard rhetorical arguments of self-distancing, magnanimity, victimisation (Billig, 1991) can thus be identified as the core rhetorical techniques used in the defence strategy.

Similar to post-structuralist thinking, argumentative practices create a certain version of reality. Analysts of rhetoric highlight how racist discourses intend to undermine both transformation processes and Black people, in an effort to justify prejudiced positions (Edwards & Potter, 1992). Therefore, the rhetorical work present in the townspersons’ racist discourses can be compared to that of Wetherell and Potter’s (1992) study on White and Maori New Zealanders, and to Durrheim and Dixon’s (2005b) Durban beach studies. Echoing the “I’m not racist, but...” defence (Billig, 1991; Potter & Wetherell, 1987), neither White or Black residents directly attributed the incident as a racist clash, but rather as a cultural difference. Referring to the establishment of the CVO skool, for example, “That was the story, the idea was not to kick the Blacks out, but it is the story about culture, bringing these children up in an Afrikaans-speaking, Christian environment.” Similarly, when talking about change, White townspeople refer to the “deterioration of government services”, “the pathetic library”, in deflecting direct criticism. Again, assuming an almost objective observer function, Tanya explains how the deterioration of the ‘red school’ [Potgietersrus Laër Skool] allows for the justification of ‘White fear’, “so

conflict, anger, resentment is there. And sadly, because things deteriorate, they can validate it. The Afrikaner can say: you see what happens when the Black man takes over. So they validate all the time to their kids that Apartheid values were correct – that their land and heritage was stolen away, and that they built this town.”

Drawing on Moscovici’s theory of social representations, involving anchoring and objectification, Billig (1987; 1992) suggests that rhetorical constructions are comprised of contradictions within what is deemed as common sense. Argumentative practices exist *within* a text, culture or ideology. Within a society, one can always find both contradictions and socially-shared themes, constituting an internalised dialogue. This is represented by Pierre’s conflicting Afrikaner identity, operating against the traditional Apartheid ideology, “The Afrikaans culture has almost mutated or evolved, almost non-existent... because if you ask me what cultural activities we have, it’s none... that shit is gone... I like to call it the alternative Afrikaans, different from the norms, free thinking.” Here his defence strategy rests in a newly-assumed Afrikaner identity, possibly to protect himself from a negative, stereotypical conception of the ‘boer’, confirming his “free thinking”, non-racist attitude.

Colonisation of the mind

Frantz Fanon’s *Black Skin, White Masks* (1986), uses a psychoanalytic framework to describe what Hook (2005) calls the ‘identity trauma’ of blackness. The title, *Black Skin, White Masks*, itself alludes to the general conclusion of his investigation, in that the underlying ‘pathology’ of the Black man is his desire to be White. Emerging from earlier exposure to colonial racist values, it is argued that these social inequalities, merged in an oppressive environment, cause cultural trauma, resulting in internalised feelings of inferiority (Hook, 2005). Although the realities behind the apparent *mark of oppression* have been questioned (Foster, 1993), the discourses of Black people clearly illustrate that these inferiority dilemmas have not yet dissipated.

Assuming a libratory function, Grace, who recently moved to Mokopane, was very vocal in her criticism about the presence of Black apathy and White dominance: “Hmm, slow-minded people, they are not really active, you know. Easily dominated and they’re, very, very, scared of White people... What bothers me the most, is that they don’t seem to care about it... they are intimidated. To them, White is purer than Black.” By adopting an almost detached role, Grace does not include herself in this description, seemingly criticising “those black people”, while

constructing her own superiority. In contrast, Kayvan, a Muslim African living in the 'Indian area', incorporates himself into his appeal, "What I have realised among our African community, is that they still feel inferior towards the Afrikaans people... I always tell the people to look, feel proud of who you are and one thing is for sure, that God has never created junks, but junks is what we think we are." These discourses assume a liberatory function; also demonstrating how voicing the lived experience is itself is a liberating endeavour (Parker, 2005).

An adoption of White culture emerges as a reoccurring theme. Meaning has already been attached to Black bodies and experiences, constructed as abject and inferior (Oliver, 2004). As in Nozipho's case, she explains, "the Whites here know me very well. I can communicate with them. They treat me like a person", only because she can speak Afrikaans. Sometimes referring to a "coconut kind of a person... Black on the outside, but White on the inside." In a more direct account, Tracy describes:

What happened when the Europeans moved in? We made the Black man feel inferior... where they have to integrate with White people on White man's terms, in what used to be White man's land... they expect Black people to dress and talk like them. The Afrikaner thinks he knows the Black man because he can speak the language. But, despises what he sees and the Black man looks at him and can't understand why. I respect your culture as a Black man, I even try to dress and speak like you, but still, you look down on me.

Although analysis uncovers much evidence of a continued racial hierarchy, this subject moves beyond the scope of this study and merits a separate in-depth exploration.

A Shared Tendency: Cross-Cultural Divisions

Continued patterns of segregation, however, are not restricted to cross-racial division, but seep into internal division. Although Black-White dimensions of prejudice and spatial separation have been the core focus of this study, it is clear that racial segregation extends beyond the traditional Black-White divide. Multiple levels of prejudice and segregation are presented in Mokopane, between the English and Afrikaans, the Indebele and the Sepedi, South African Indians and the 'native' Indians and Pakistanis and the Indian and the Black residents.

Kayvan, for example, describes how "tribalism plays a major role among ourselves [African communities]". Internal contention between African communities emerges as a central

theme among Black discourse. “Like myself, I speak Venda and I don’t feel welcome,” Mirriam’s statement represents one of the “tribal” divisions in the area. Mirriam continues to explain how segregation among the varying African communities again emerges as a peace-keeping solution:

People who are speaking Shangani, they are staying in an area called Samanzi. It is a bit far from the others speaking Sotho and Indebele. They do live together, but there was a problem, with those speaking Shangani.

Sometimes, more directly racist statements are made. As Nozipho describes, “the Indebele are selfish and self-centred and they are not book-reading people.” Similarly, tension within the Indian community surfaced. Vahid explains that “we can notice a little gap between the two, they come from Pakistan and we speak mostly English... Some groups of Indians call other Indians names and things, sometimes derogatory.” In both White and Black interviews, the Indian community emerged as misunderstood and isolated, as “quite another ball game altogether.” As a minority in the town, Indians possibly assume the identity of the ‘other’. Furthermore, the subject of xenophobia arose as an auxiliary pattern of division. However, xenophobia itself encompassed too broad a question to fall within the scope of this study.

Although a separate analysis is needed to fully explore these internal divisions, one can identify these patterns of segregation in two directions. Firstly, Barker’s (1981) theory of ‘new racism’ again surfaces, maintaining that internal divisions further demonstrate the innate preference for ones ‘own kind’. In contrast, it can be argued that Apartheid ideologies have ingrained a tendency towards of racialisation and segregation. Through socialisation processes (Edwards & Potter, 1992), South Africans have internalised the social values of Apartheid. As illustrated by Vahid’s explanation of interracial marriages, “those of us born in South Africa... for a long time have been kept away from other race groups. It is more difficult for us. But those that have come from India, they find it very, very easy to get married to African people.” Hobsbawm (1983) maintains that in Africa, there is no ‘pure’ culture left, since people were forced to succumb to the rule of the colonial empire. Therefore, it can be argued that South Africa is now left with a body of paradoxical ideologies and cultural constructions.

CONCLUSION

Despite efforts for reconciliation and transformation, this case-study clearly demonstrates a pattern of continued informal segregation. In line with previous research, discursive constructions demonstrate that racial isolation and prejudice have diffused in more intimate areas of contact. However, further examination of ideological and rhetorical functions of 'race talk' uncovered more heightened and hidden racial hostilities in Mokopane. One can identify the underlying argument as resting in the notion of place identity and more specifically, spatial entitlement. The struggle to dismantle the physical and ideological legacy of Apartheid is therefore ongoing.

We are reminded that 'racism is rooted in the social and structural rather than the personal and psychological' (Wetherell & Potter, 1992, p.217). It is not to say that the individual is evil or bad-hearted, but rather that the collective constructs of the town cultivate an environment that breeds racist ideas. Many of the townspeople were experienced as friendly, well-meaning people, however discourses constituted the historically and culturally-embedded differences and divisions in Mokopane.

The purpose of this study was to explore the everyday processes of continued segregation, however discourses revealed the need for additional directions of investigation. Internal conflicts and divisions between the White and specifically Indian and African communities were briefly considered, yet still require a more detailed examination. The subject of xenophobia in particular opens an alternative avenue for future investigation. Additional research on more specific micro-ecological aspects of small towns, particularly schools, should also prove to enhance our understanding of regulated contact.

Although this study was limited to a small, case-specific investigation, it serves as another important addition in the analysis of the micro-ecology of segregation. As a pilot study, sampling techniques should also be refined to encompass a wider range of participants. A further limitation of this study was the lack of a working definition of a small town. Although understood as a micro-ecological setting, one can question the conception of a small town on a micro-analytical scale. Responding to the call towards a methodological shift, this study embraced a discursive approach. However it neglected to fully explore the socio-spatial practices of segregation. Although bodily and spatial aspects of segregation were discussed, future studies should exercise more systematic efforts to measure spatial changes in small towns. This

combined linguistic and socio-spatial analysis will undoubtedly broaden our understanding of the assumed 'new segregation'.

ENDNOTES

¹ A macro-sociological level of analysis encompasses multi-dimensional aspects of segregation, often pertaining to wide-scale investigations of large institutions or cities. Macro-processes of segregation also incorporate larger social issues, economic inequalities and education, as contributory factors of racial isolation. Whereas the micro-ecology of segregation involves more intimate contact involving everyday spaces and interactions (Durrheim & Dixon, 2005b).

² ‘Race’ is understood as a social construction of difference, rather than a natural category (Potter & Wetherell, 1987).

³ Mokopane falls within the Mogalakwene municipality district, incorporating many neighbouring villages. The municipal Integrated Development Planning (IDP) review indicates that estimates for Mogalakwena’s population size varies, however an estimate of 30 000 people reside in the town of Mokopane, excluding the neighbouring ‘townships’ of Mahwelereng and Sekgakapeng.

⁴ The town of Potgietersrus was officially named after the voortrekker leader, Piet Potgieter, to commemorate his death at the Makapans cave. In 2002 the town of Potgietersrus was renamed Mokopane. ‘Mokopane’ was the chief of the Kekana’s; a tribe responsible for Potgieter’s death. Therefore, the nature of the name change may signify the subtle hostilities among the Africans and Afrikaners.

⁵ In 1958, H. F. Verwoerd becomes president and proposes the formation of separate Black states, ‘Bantustans’. He refers to Apartheid as ‘a policy of good neighbourliness’.

⁶ The APK separated from the Nederduits Gereformeerde (NG) Kerk in 1987, retaining a ‘White-only’ policy .

⁷ Billig (1987) identifies the three main branches of rhetoric: forensic rhetoric, deliberative rhetoric and epideictic rhetoric. Epideictic rhetoric involves discussion on values, ethics and morality, as well as individual character.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many thanks to all who participated in the study.

To Don for those ‘critical’ insights, the support and encouragement and the never-ending reference to further literature.

To my family, you know who you are, thank you!

And to Phil and Lindsey jun. Phil, a huge thanks for the much-needed editing help, and to the both of you, for the tea, ‘Juanita’ moments, and bearing though the hours of transcription... yours in persecution.

REFERENCES

- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Ballard, R. (2004). Middle class neighbourhoods or “African kraals”? The impact of informal settlements and vagrants on post-apartheid white identity. *Urban Forum* 15, 48-78.
- Barker, M. (1981). *The new racism*. London: Junction books.
- Billig, M. (1987). *Arguing and thinking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Billig, M. (1991). *Ideology and opinions*. London: Sage Publications.
- Bulhan, H. A. (1985). *Frantz Fanon and the psychology of oppression*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Clark, K. B. (1953). Desegregation: an appraisal of the evidence. *Journal of Social Issues*, 9, 1-77.
- Christopher, A. J. (2001a). *Atlas of a changing South Africa*. London: Routledge.
- Christopher, A. J. (2001b). Urban segregation in post-apartheid South Africa. *Urban Studies*, 38, 449-446.
- Davis, M., Seibert, R., & Breed, W. (1966). Interracial seating patterns on New Orleans public transit. *Social Problems*, 13, 298-306.
- Dixon, J. A. (1997). Discourse and racial partition in the ‘new’ South Africa. In A. Levett, A. Kottler, E. Burman & I. Parker (Eds.), *Culture, power and difference* (pp.16-30). London: Zed Books.

- Dixon, J. (2001). Contact and boundaries: 'locating' the social psychology of inter-group relations. *Theory and Psychology, 11*, 587-608.
- Dixon, J. A., & Durrheim, K. (2003). Contact and the ecology of racial division: some varieties of informal segregation. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 42*, 1-23.
- Dixon, J., Tredoux, C., & Clack, B. (2005). On the micro-ecology of racial division: a neglected dimension of segregation. *South African Journal of Psychology, 35*, 395-411.
- Dixon, J., Durrheim, K., & Tredoux, C. (2005). Beyond the optimal contact strategy. *American Psychologist, 59*, 697-711.
- Donaldson, S. E., & van der Merwe, I. J. (1999). Urban transformation and social change in Pietersburg during transition. *Society in Transition, 30*, 69-83.
- Du Plooy, J. (1995). *Potgietersrus gedenkalbum*. Unpublished Report.
- Dubow, S. (1992). Afrikaner nationalism, apartheid and the conceptualization of race. *Journal of African History, 33*, 209-237.
- Durrheim, K. (2005). Socio-spatial practices and racial representations in a changing South Africa. *South African Journal of Psychology, 35*, 444-459.
- Durrheim, K., & Dixon, J. (2004). Attitudes in the fiber of everyday life. *American Psychologist, 59*, 626-636.
- Durrheim, K., & Dixon, J. (2005a). Studying talk and embodied practices: towards a psychology of materiality of "race relations". *Journal of Community and Applied Psychology, 15*, 446-460.
- Durrheim, K., & Dixon, J. (2005b). *Racial encounter*. London: Routledge.

- Edwards, D., & Potter, J. (1992). *Discursive psychology*. London: Sage.
- Fanon, F. (1986). *Black skin, white masks*. London: Pluto Press.
- Festinger, L., Schachter, S., & Black, K. (1959). *Social pressure in informal groups*. London: Tavistock.
- Finchileesu, G. (2005). Meta-stereotypes may hinder inter-racial contact. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 35, 460-472.
- Foster, D. (1993). The mark of oppression? Racism and psychology reconsidered. In L. Nicholas (Ed.), *Psychology and oppression* (pp. 128-141). Johannesburg: Skotaville.
- Foster, D. H. (1997). Space, place and race. *Journal of Community and Health Sciences*, 4, 1-10.
- Foster, D. (2000). Race, space and civil society. In F. Cochrane & B. Klein (Eds.), *Sameness and difference: problems and potentials in South African civil society* (pp.57-78). Washington, D.C.: Council for Research in Values and Philosophy.
- Foster, D. (2005). Racialisation and the micro-ecology of contact. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 35, 49-504.
- Foster, D. H., & Finchilescu, G. (1986). Contact in a non-contact society. In M. Hewstone & R. Brown (Eds.), *Contact and conflict in inter-group encounters* (pp. 119-136). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Goffman, E. (1971). *The presentation of the self in everyday life*. London: Penguin Press.
- Goldberg, T. (1998). The new segregation. *Race and Society*, 1, 15-32.

- Hobsbawm, E. (1983). Introduction. In E. Hobsbawm & T. Ranger (Eds.), *The invention of tradition* (pp. 1-14). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hook, D. (2005). A critical psychology of the postcolonial. *Theory and Psychology*, 15, 475-503.
- Kaplan, P. F., & Fugate, D. (1972). Pilot study of racial interaction in public place: Northern and Southern settings compared. *International Journal of Group Tensions*, 2, 63-79.
- Kotze, N. J., & Donaldson, S. E. (1998). Residential desegregation in South African cities: a comparative study of Bloemfontein and Pietersburg. *Urban Studies*, 35, 467-477.
- Massey, D. S., & Fischer, M. J. (2000). How segregation concentrates poverty. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 23, 67-691.
- Mogalakwane Municipality. (2008). *Integrated Development Planning review*. Unpublished Report.
- Oliver, K. (2004). *The colonization of the psychic space*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Parker, I. (1992). *Discourse dynamics*. London: Routledge.
- Parker, I. (2005). *Qualitative psychology*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Parker, J. H. (1968). The interaction of Negroes and Whites in an integrated church setting. *Social Forces*, 46, 359-366.
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Inter-group contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 49, 65-85.

- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. (2000). Does inter-group contact reduce prejudice? In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination* (pp. 93-114). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1994). Analyzing discourse. In A. Bryman & R. G. Burgess (Eds.), *Analyzing qualitative data*. London: Routledge.
- Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Discourse and social psychology*. London: Sage Publications
- Rosenthal, R., & Rosnow, R. (2008). *Essentials of behavioural research*. Boston, IL: McGraw Hill.
- Schrieff, L., Tredoux, C., Dixon J., & Finchilescu, G. (2005). Patterns of racial segregation in university residence dining-halls. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 35, 433-443.
- Schofield, J. W., & Sagar, H. A. (1977). Peer interaction patterns in an integrated middle school. *Sociometry*, 40, 130-138.
- Steyn, M., & Foster, D. (2008). Repertoires for talking white: resistant whiteness in post-apartheid South Africa. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 31, 25-51.
- Tredoux, C., Dixon, J., Underwood, S., Nunez, D., & Finchilescu, G. (2005). Preserving spatial and temporal dimensions in observational data of segregation. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 35, 421-432.
- Verwoerd, H. (1960). Statement of policy in the house of assembly. In A. N. Pelzer (Ed.), *Verwoerd speaks* (pp.340-369). Johannesburg: APB Publishers.
- Werth, P. (1999). *Text worlds: representing conceptual space in discourse*. New York: Longman.

Wetherell, M., & Potter, J. (1992). *Mapping the language of racism*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

APPENDIX A

Interview guideline

‘Warm up’ discussion with each person about their **biographical background**.

- Where were you born and raised?
 - What do you do for a living and how did that come about?
1. Tell me about this town. What is happening here? What is it like to live here?
 2. Has anything changed in this town since 1994? If so, what has changed? Do people like these changes?
 3. Would you describe this town as a single community?
 4. Have relationships between groups in this town changed in the last 15 years? If so, how?
 5. Are you aware of groups in this town that dislike each other? Is there conflict in this town?
 6. Are things better or worse in this town than it was prior to 1994?
 7. Can you tell me one or two stories that would illustrate some of the things we have spoken about transformation in the above?
 8. What areas are included in your town? Please draw a red line around the town.
 - Provide interviewees with a **local municipality map** and **red marker**
 9. Do you engage in personal or informal activities with members of a different race?
 10. In the past two months how many informal/personal interactions did you have with members from a different racial group? For example, recreational activities, such as sports or dinner.
 11. Do you approve of inter-racial relationships?

APPENDIX B

Informed consent form

*Informed Consent to Participate in Research and
Authorisation for Collection, Use, and Disclosure
of Interview, Focus Group and Other Personal Data*

You are being asked to take part in a research study. This form provides you with information about the study and seeks your authorisation for the collection, use and disclosure of your cognitive performance data, as well as other information necessary for the study. The Principal Investigator (the person in charge of this research) or a representative of the Principal Investigator will also describe this study to you and answer all of your questions. Your participation is entirely voluntary. Before you decide whether or not to take part, read the information below and ask questions about anything you do not understand. By participating in this study you will not be penalised or lose any benefits to which you would otherwise be entitled.

1. Name of Participant

2. Title of Research Study

Race and Spatial Identity in South Africa

3. Principal Investigator and Telephone Number(s)

Don Foster, Ph.D.
Senior Lecturer
Department of Psychology
University of Cape Town

Sahba Shaker
Honours student
University of Cape Town
021 685 1710
083 277 1002

4. Source of Funding or Other Material Support

SANPAD

5. What is the purpose of this research study?

The main purpose of this research is to investigate continued informal segregation, specifically within the context of small/rural towns in South Africa, with emphasis on issues relating to racial and spatial identity.

6. What will be done if you take part in this research study?

In this study, you will be asked to participate in interviews or focus groups, relating your experiences or racial contact and segregation.

7. If you choose to participate in this study, how long will you be expected to participate in the research?

The interviews or focus groups will be approximately 60 to 90 minutes, participants may be asked to return for multiple sessions. If at any time during the experiment you find any of the procedures uncomfortable, you are free to discontinue your participation without penalty.

8. How many people are expected to participate in the research?

50

9. What are the possible discomforts and risks?

There are no known risks associated with participation in this study. The only possible discomfort you may experience is slight distress when relating sensitive information.

If you wish to discuss the information above or any discomforts you may experience, you may ask questions now or call the Principal Investigator listed on the front page of this form.

10a. What are the possible benefits to you?

You may benefit from this study, since it allows a means of expression, allowing you to relate your lived experiences.

10b. What are the possible benefits to others?

Information from this study may help our understanding of continued racial segregation and discord in South Africa. This research will allow us to gather information from a range of racial groups regarding their experiences of racial contact and integration, hearing these lived experiences may help us to uncover the many complexities and perceptions involved. Ultimately, the research may help improve the process of racial desegregation in South Africa.

11. If you choose to take part in this research study, will it cost you anything?

Participating in this study will not cost you anything.

12. Will you receive compensation for taking part in this research study?

You will receive no financial compensation for taking part in this study.

13a. Can you withdraw from this research study?

You are free to withdraw your consent and to stop participating in this research study at any time. If you do withdraw your consent, there will be no penalty.

If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research subject, you may phone the Psychology Department offices at 021-650-3430.

13b. If you withdraw, can information about you still be used and/or collected?

Information already collected may be used.

14. Once personal and performance information is collected, how will it be kept secret (confidential) in order to protect your privacy?

Information collected will be stored in computers with security passwords or secured filing cabinets. Only certain people have the right to review these research records. These people include the researchers for this study and certain University of Cape Town officials. Your research records will not be released without your permission unless required by law or a court order.

15. What information about you may be collected, used and shared with others?

This information gathered from your interviews or focus groups will be recorded and transcribed. Certain sections of the transcribed conversation will be used in the research report, however the information included will not identify you directly, for example, the data will not include your name.

16. How will the researcher(s) benefit from your participation in the study?

In general, presenting research results helps the career of a researcher. Therefore, the Principal Investigator and others attached to this research project may benefit if the results of this study are presented at scientific meetings or in scientific journals.

Signatures

As a representative of this study, I have explained to the participant the purpose, the procedures, the possible benefits, and the risks of this research study; and how the participant's performance and other data will be collected, used, and shared with others:

Signature of Person Obtaining Consent and Authorisation

Date

You have been informed about this study's purpose, procedures, possible benefits, and risks; and how your performance and other data will be collected, used and shared with others. You have received a copy of this form. You have been given the opportunity to ask questions before you sign, and you have been told that you can ask other questions at any time.

You voluntarily agree to participate in this study. You hereby authorise the collection, use and sharing of your performance and other data. By signing this form, you are not waiving any of your legal rights.

Signature of Person Consenting and Authorising

Date

Please indicate below if you would like to be notified of future research projects conducted by our research group:

_____ (initial) Yes, I would like to be added to your research participation pool and be notified of research projects in which I might participate in the future.

Method of contact:

Phone number: _____

E-mail address: _____

Mailing address: _____

APPENDIX C

Interview information summary

	Name	Age	“Race”	Language	Gender	Profession
1	Celeste	60	White	Afrikaans	F	Secretary (Magistrate’s office)
2	Nerina	52	White	Afrikaans	F	Manager of old-age home/service centre
3	Margeruite	61	White	Afrikaans	F	Secretary (Mine)
4	Diedre	64	White	Afrikaans	F	Museum caretaker
5	Suzaan	34	White	Afrikaans	F	SAPS
6	Helda	49	White	Afrikaans	F	Primary school teacher
7	Marlise	18	White	Afrikaans	F	Student
8	Tracy	48	White	English	F	Local real estate agent
9	Rose	45	White	English	F	Housewife
10	Jenni	42	White	English	F	Nurse/ ANC activist
11	Gerhart	57	White	Afrikaans	M	Working at APK
12	Wilhelm	44	White	Afrikaans	M	Court Magistrate
13	Johannes	63	White	Afrikaans	M	Professor, Agricultural Department
14	David	51	White	Afrikaans	M	High school principal
15	Stephan	46	White	Afrikaans	M	Primary school principal
16	Piet	66	White	Afrikaans	M	School teacher/Entrepreneur
17	Christiaan	47	White	Afrikaans	M	Methodist church minister
18	Leon	45	White	Afrikaans	M	Doctor
19	Pierre	27	White	Afrikaans	M	Advertising and communications manager (mine)
20	William	43	White	English	M	Hotel manager
21	Sena	48	“Other”	English	M	Mine Manager
22	Miriam	30	Black	Venda	F	Secretary (Magistrate’s office)
23	Andiswa	41	Black	Sotho	F	Primary school teacher
24	Nozipho	45	Black	Sotho	F	HR (SAPS)
25	Grace	32	Black	Sotho	F	Translator (Magistrate office)
26	Andries	35	Black	Sotho	M	Mining Engineer
27	Kayvan	34	Black	Sotho	M	Working at Mosque
28	Mbaluku	56	Black	Sotho	M	Deputy director, Department of Water Affairs
29	Richard	55	Black	Sotho	M	Chief of SAPS
30	Rameez	28	Indian	English	M	Entrepreneur
31	Vahid	34	Indian	English/Arabic	M	Islamic religious leader/teacher
32	Iraj	18	Indian	English	M	Student
33	Fatimah	45	Indian	English	F	Entrepreneur
34	Jasmine	48	Indian	English	F	Primary school teacher

PLAGIARISM DECLARATION

1. I know that plagiarism is wrong. Plagiarism is to use another's work and pretend that it is my own.
2. I have used the APA referencing guide for citation and referencing. Each contribution to, and quotation in this essay from the work(s) of other people has been contributed, and has been cited and referenced.
3. This essay is my own work.
4. I have not allowed, and will not allow, anyone to copy my work.

Signature: _____

Date: _____