Identity negotiation in the 'new' South Africa: The ideological dilemmas informing discourses of whiteness.

Carly Danielle Abramovitz

Department of Psychology

University of Cape Town

Integration

Respect me I respect you
Let us respect each other
Over the rivers of hatred
Let us build bridges of love

Understand me I understand you
Let us understand each other
Over the rivers of differences
Let us put bridges of harmony

Accept me I accept you
let us accept each other
Over the rivers of segregation
Let us put bridges of integration

by Abdi-Noor Haji Mohamed

ABSTRACT

South Africa remains a nation affected by an oppressive regime of the past and yet is presently involved in an unfolding movement towards transformation. This has inevitable consequences for the national identity and therefore for the identity of the citizens that are represented by this category. For white South Africans, a minority group with historically high status, the changes have resulted in a loss of power and the recognition of their disproportionate privilege. This study highlights the various discursive strategies adopted by a selected group of white South Africans as they articulate the ideological dilemmas they face (Billig et al., 1988). Two groups of white English-speaking South Africans (WESSAs) were studied using focus groups. The first group consisted of a collection of individuals identified as being more 'progressive' in that they were involved in community-development work. This was perceived to demonstrate their participation in the present transforming society. The second group comprised of individuals who were selected on the basis that they have more 'conservative' political views as they voted for a Christian political party in the last election. A discourse analysis was used to highlight the themes of 'talk' that arose from a discussion on South African national identity. The analysis uncovered various discursive strategies utilised by these participants which have been threaded together to provide a new 'narrative' of whiteness in post-Apartheid South Africa. From this investigation, being part of a diverse nation appears to provide a set of challenges for these white participants. The changes in the country have brought this diversity into the foreground, giving rise to a new impetus: the creation of opportunities for integration.

Keywords: ideological dilemmas; integration; South African national identity; transformation; whiteness

The social makeup of South Africa provides an interesting topic of investigation for social psychologists. This is partly due to the fact that it presents a complex and ever-changing world consisting of multiple social groupings. South Africa remains a nation affected by an oppressive regime of the past and yet is presently involved in an unfolding movement towards transformation. Since the emergence of the 'new' South Africa in 1994, the concept of a unified national identity has been brought to the attention of all South African citizens. With so many different social groupings included, this concept can be described as both diverse and indistinct. Nation-building practices have made a bid at establishing images and motifs of a colourful and culturally diverse nation, where citizens from every walk of life can lay claim to this composite national identity. With a history marked by racial segregation and intergroup conflict, the idea that South Africans can share in a unified national identity is of great importance (Eaton, 2006).

Since the initial nation-building discourses, such as Archbishop Desmond Tutu's concept of South Africa as a "Rainbow Nation" started to circulate, further political developments and policies have been implemented. As the new government has established itself, public discourses have shifted towards opinion about transformation policies such as Black Economic Empowerment (BEE) and affirmative action. National identity has somehow slipped into the background of public discourse and yet it remains a crucial underpinning of a functioning democracy and a cohesive nation (Eaton, 2006). Recently there has been a fair amount of literature investigating the notion that South Africans share a unified national identity (e.g. Distiller & Steyn, 2004). This provides an interesting point of study for social psychologists, as it is not clear whether it is conceived of equally by all groups in South Africa. By using the example of just one of the many social groupings, namely white English-speaking South Africans (WESSAs), discourses of *whiteness* can be investigated in detail in order to establish a sense of the complexities pertaining to this group.

Whiteness

Relatively recently, beginning in the early 1990s, a level of academic interest in discourses of whiteness emerged, initially in the United States and then later on in South

Africa as well (Salusbury, 2003). The topic of whiteness is associated with specific ideological and political motives. These have been to uncover the way this notion is considered as a naturalised and taken-for-granted aspect of ones identity, almost a non-race as compared to the racialized 'other' (Salusbury, 2003). A range of seminal writers in the United States began to expose how these race constructions were assimilated into the hegemonic, dominant white culture. Primary works in the field of whiteness (such as Frankenberg, 1993) demonstrated how whites understood their lives to be devoid of racial construction. Discourses of whiteness thus reflected the perpetuation of colonialist practices resulting in the naturalisation of whites' privileged and powerful position in society.

Parallels between South Africa and the United States have been drawn with respect to their culturally diverse societies, which continue to negotiate historically unequal racialized divisions (Cock & Bernstein, 2002). South Africa is different from the States in that the post-apartheid era has marked a time of transformation, challenging people's notions of racial difference due to processes such as affirmative action. The post-apartheid era has been of particular interest in discussions of whiteness as it is said that these changes in environment require a certain amount of psychological adjustment (Distiller & Steyn, 2004; Salusbury & Foster, 2004; Steyn, 2001; Steyn & Foster, 2008; Wale & Foster, 2007). A major area of adjustment on both a personal and societal level has been a shift in national identity since the democratic elections in 1994 (Distiller & Steyn, 2004).

Melissa Steyn (2001) mapped out a number of whiteness 'narratives' that were typical of a post-apartheid, post-colonialism time in South Africa. These narratives positioned whites within a 'right-wing' and racist role in the post-apartheid context. Further investigations have continued to vilify and condemn white people in South Africa (Wale & Foster, 2007; Steyn & Foster, 2008). These studies produced findings which depicted whites as perpetrators, hiding behind discourses of 'colourblindness', maintaining racial inequality. Where whiteness is concerned, it seems that it is all too easy to refer back to the hegemonic discourses established in the early nineties. Even when whites express views of non-racialism or sentiments of wanting to help the poor, these are seen to demonstrate their unwillingness to acknowledge complicity in the old

regime. There are hints at the need for an acknowledgement or a dismantling of racialized thinking yet no opportunities are provided for whites to truly reconcile the past. These works have depicted whites as hiding behind a façade of popular post-apartheid egalitarian values such as "reconciliation, equality and freedom" (Steyn & Foster, 2008, p. 28). Or, more radically, they are seen to enact complete resistance to transformation through repeated 'othering' of the black majority. From this stance any vocalisation of a changed white identity has been cauterised and classified as a device of 'saving face' that serves to perpetuate and maintain a particular image of whiteness.

There are always various ways of reading a text and any reading will be informed by the reader's perspective. Certainly, there are unsavoury admissions stemming from white voices in the country at this time, as there are from others as well. The concern is that by merely finding further evidence of colonialist and racialized discourses of whiteness, is it possible that unique voices are silenced and certain transformative aspects overlooked? Can a more open reading provide evidence for new discourses that show active negotiation with these traditional white ideological standpoints? Within the arena of whiteness, there is an assumption that the white identity is one homogenous category, yet this is not the case in the South African context. There are vast cultural and attitudinal differences, for instance, between white Afrikaners and white English-speaking South Africans (WESSAs). Even within the English-speaking population, there are further complexities (Salusbury & Foster, 2004).

WESSA identity

Much of the research done post-apartheid has found that white South African identity is linked with middle class notions of self, which act to maintain inequality in South Africa (Salusbury, 2003; Salusbury & Foster, 2004; Steyn, 2001). WESSAs provide an interesting social group to analyse due to their problematic shifting identity within a changing South Africa and their lopsided privileged minority status (Steyn, 2001). Having been a minority with exaggerated political and economic power, their minority status is rather unique as they hold a *social position* of high status (Tajfel, 1978). The WESSA identity is also different from the white Afrikaans minority identity, which has strong ethnic and cultural signifiers.

In particular, discourses of whiteness with respect to WESSAs have uncovered that they often see themselves as without an ethnic identity (Sennett & Foster, 1996). Thus, their identity is determined by what they are not (as in 'not black', 'not Afrikaans'). Their distancing from an Afrikaner identity is seen to be problematic in that they are trying to evade responsibility as beneficiaries of apartheid, which they view as resulting from 'Afrikaner politics' (Salusbury & Foster, 2004). There is also diversity within this group resulting in heterogeneity far exceeding the Afrikaner identity (Salusbury & Foster, 2004). WESSA identity is characterised by heritage from a range of ethnic groups of European decent resulting in a sense of global belonging that Steyn (2004) refers to as a diasporic quality.

There has been an attempt to find an alternative view to those constructing the 'supremacist' white narratives of earlier works. Cooper (2003) highlighted discourses associated with a left-wing political identity that challenged the notion of whiteness previously assumed in the literature. Where others demonstrated that whites were a disinterested group that is purely self-serving and individualist, he found that his sample produced accounts exemplifying their commitment to a collectivist identity and actively resisting their privilege. What this demonstrates, is that whiteness, like other ideologically positioned categories is not a fixed notion but is actively negotiated via the lived experiences of individuals. Thus, it is not a straightforward category and South African whites in particular are a complex and multifaceted group. The complexities pertaining to WESSA identity makes it an interesting one to study and thus further use of this acronym is done so with recognition of its heterogeneity. As this is only one of the many subgroups subsumed within our national identity, it is clear why this concept is so difficult to define.

Whiteness and national identity

Investigating national identity in South Africa should be of interest to social psychology as it is not a straightforward or taken-for-granted notion. The concept itself has gone through various conceptions before, during and post-apartheid. It means different things for different social subgroups. For example, white identity has shifted as whites have gone from being the beneficiaries of apartheid to being a minority group with little

political power in the 'new' South Africa. Research has shown that South African national identity is a contested and complex social construction (Eaton, 2006). Nation-building practices have been successful to an extent that people in South Africa identify with their county but this is mediated by the fact that the 'nation' is understood as being made up of many diverse subgroup identities (Eaton, 2001, 2006).

One of the critiques of research done on national identity in South Africa is that it has been done primarily using a race-relations approach, whereby differences between ethnic groups' identification with the nation and national pride were the focus (Eaton, 2002). This research typically refers to the notion of national identity without investigating *how* people understand this concept and what it means to them. Sennett and Foster (1996) studied WESSA attitudes to their national identity at the dawn of the period where the 'new' South Africa emerged in 1994. They found that WESSAs had an increased sense of multiple social identities, including a newfound sense of national identity, when compared to earlier findings by Morse, Mann, and Nel (1977) (as cited in Sennett & Foster, 1996). It has been suggested elsewhere that WESSA's lack of identity is seen to result in an emphasised talk of being 'proudly South African' (Salusbury & Foster, 2004).

Recent survey data has indicated that there is a strong sense of national pride among South African citizens and a sense of having a common national identity, which is seen across all racial groups (Foster, 2006). Here, a heightened sense of national pride is linked to the reduced reliance on racial signifiers which are being replaced by other personal and occupational aspects of identity. Surveys typically provide bland and unexplored decontextualised opinions that may not represent accurately the 'South African' voice. Social realities are constantly being negotiated and thus contested. It is more useful to acknowledge how individuals make use of rhetorical strategies, thereby actively participating in establishing and maintaining their respective identities (Reicher, 2004). For this reason using a discursive approach for studying national identity can provide a more textured account of these processes (Reicher & Hopkins, 2001). These authors urge researchers to investigate the ways in which the constructions of national identity affect people's discourse and actions. They insist on refuting the notion that

national identity is fixed, but see it as a point of argument for people to actively engage with and contest.

It is important to acknowledge the ways individuals negotiate their lived experience. Billig et al. (1988) refer to the ideological dilemmas of everyday life, something which impinges upon peoples' decision-making processes, requiring a degree of negotiation. Social psychologists have assumed that ideology results from top-down processes in which the institutional structures bestow ideologies to be adopted unquestioningly by individuals. These authors aimed to dispel this myth and encourage those interested in social phenomena to understand the dialogical nature of ideologies, which are both accepted and challenged through everyday interactions. This investigation is thus informed by the recognition of these complexities and intends to acknowledge and highlight the dilemmatic nature of the emerging discourses.

AIMS

The intention of this research was to explore the ways in which one particular social group in South Africa, namely WESSAs construct their national identity and to investigate the challenges and potentials involved in transformation. This exploration will further understanding of WESSA identity with specific reference to how WESSAs see themselves in relation to the complex category of the South African national identity. The research aimed to investigate the discourses they adopt with reference to their own subgroup, as well as to the broader national identity, and thus to provide insight into the social construction of identity in South Africa and WESSA's own negotiations as a multifaceted part of the nation. Previous research into *whiteness* discourses has established that WESSA identity is a relatively undefined concept. Whiteness discourses are seen to be riddled with colonial imagery and implicit perpetuation of racial inequality. This investigation is concerned with other kinds of discourses available to white South Africans as they face challenges offered by their whiteness and grapple with opportunities for transformation. Thus, I began this project with the hope of finding evidence for more transformative discourses emanating from this sample that would give voice to an unexplored aspect of white identity in South Africa.

METHOD

Qualitative research

For the purposes of this research, qualitative methods were used as they are considered the most appropriate way of investigating the way people make sense of their worlds (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998). The 'objects' of enquiry are thus the subjective and partial notions provided through the stories of individuals. One advantage of qualitative research is its ability to document relatively unrestricted and sometimes undiscovered areas that may have been out of reach from a more rigid quantitative perspective (Marecek, Fine & Kidder, 1997). Thus, the lived experience of the participants, which is transmitted through language, is investigated to uncover the ways people construct and give meaning to their social realities.

Discursive psychology

Discursive psychology takes interest in the formation of subject positions and individuals' negotiation of their identities. Thus using a discursive approach allows for exploration into the performative role of discourse in reinforcing ideologies, social identities and representations (Rojo, 2001). In this way, talk is able to produce and transform social realities through insight into people's ideological dilemmas and identity negotiations. Kroger and Wood (1998) discuss the 'turn' to discourse as answering a call in the discipline for more subtle and varied approaches to the traditional social psychological phenomena.

Participants

All participants were white English-speaking South Africans (WESSAs). They were selected using various strategies. The first focus group consisted of six participants obtained through convenience sampling. Three of the participants were involved in an evening Xhosa course I attended. I approached them at the end of the course, asking for help with my research. The other three were acquaintances of mine. All the participants in the first group were identified as being 'progressive' in that they were involved in community-development work. This was perceived to demonstrate their participation in the present transforming society.

The second focus group consisted of seven participants who were selected following recruitment via the placement of advertisements in local newspapers throughout the Cape Peninsula. Permission was granted from Independent Newspapers to place a small advert requesting the help of participants who voted for a Christian political party in the last election. This was intended to encourage participants who might have more conservative political views then those obtained through convenience sampling. As is the case with all qualitative research, the samples are too small to be generalised to the greater population. Nevertheless, a varied sample is still valuable and thus these participants were selected in the hope that they would have slightly different views to those in the 'progressive' group. Participants were not selected on any demographic characteristic other than for being white. Their demographic details were requested on the day of each focus group as part of the information required on the consent form. The ages and gender of all the participants are represented in Table 1.

Table 1.

Demographic characteristics of participants

Focus Group 1 (the 'progressive' group)	Gender	Age
Participant 1	Male	42
Participant 2	Male	46
Participant 3	Male	41
Participant 4	Female	23
Participant 5	Female	23
Participant 6	Female	25
		$M = 33$
Focus Group 2 (the 'conservative' group)	Gender	Age
Participant 1	Male	61
Participant 2	Male	82
Participant 3	Male	25
Participant 4	Female	71
Participant 5	Female	80
Participant 6	Female	52
Participant 7	Female	76
		$M = 64$

Data collection

Data collection was conducted using focus groups. Focus groups are seen as a valuable method of investigating complex national identities (Varas-D´ıaz & Serrano-Garc´ıa, 2003). They allow for a greater variety of individual opinions, generated out of a more realistic communicative situation than a one-on-one interview (Wodak, de Cillia, Reisigl, & Liebhart, 1999). National identity, although shared, is understood through diverse experiences and thus using focus groups helps to illuminate these complex emotional understandings (Varas-D´ıaz & Serrano-Garc´ıa, 2003). Although following a semi-structured approach, a protocol (see Appendix A) was used which included a set of guiding questions intended to direct the conversation towards the topics under investigation. Two focus groups were conducted on separate days. The protocol was used to varying degrees depending on the natural flow of the discussion and included an opening question introducing the topic of South African national identity in a subtle and non-threatening way. Most of the questions provided in the protocol were used along with other spontaneous questions or remarks that were unplanned additions developed from the context of the discussion.

Procedure

Participants were contacted during initial recruitment processes. The focus groups were conducted in a designated room of the psychology department at the University of Cape Town. On the day of the focus group, participants were requested to read and sign the consent form. At the beginning of each focus group, I explained the nature of the process and reminded the participants that the discussion would, with their permission, be recorded. Participants received payment of R100 each. The focus groups were recorded using a portable voice recorder. Recordings were transcribed in order for transcriptions to be analyzed as text. The transcription system used is described in Appendix B.

Data Analysis

Discourse analysis was the primary method of analysis used in this study. Difficult to define, it is thought of as a way of exploring the way in which social reality is made possible through discourses, which shape social interactions (Phillips & Handy, 2002).

Discourse Analysis is not merely a method. As an approach, it considers the constructive power of language, how it reflects and forms social reality. More so, discourse is seen to construct and constitute social categories in everyday talk (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). Thus, the type of analysis used in this study was concerned with the "action orientation of categorization in discourse" (Potter & Wetherell, 1987, p. 116). In this way, the assumption that social categories are conceived of equally by all individuals was dismantled. From this perspective, a category such as the concept of the 'South African national identity' can be seen to be constructed via discursive strategies. Thus, the analysis focuses on distinguishing what the various discourses are doing, and how they achieve the particular goals of the speaker. There is also an evaluative function in language as speakers choose to relay particular versions of reality according to what they deem important or valuable (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). Thus, this analysis provides evidence for the kinds of 'talk' available to WESSAs and their accounts demonstrate the 'subject matter' they deem most relevant to the discussion. In this way, participants' accounts are to be understood as speech acts that maintain or challenge social conventions.

The procedure I adopted was based on Potter and Wetherell's (1987) analytical techniques which I shaped to my own purposes. This process unfolded quite spontaneously following an initial reading of the text. The first step involved complete immersion in the data in order to decipher distinct overriding themes. This was accomplished via repeated readings of the text. Themes were extracted by investigating the ways in which the participants' accounts 'acted' to perform certain constructions of the 'nation' and the 'national identity'. These themes provided a general shape to the analysis. Following that, I embarked on further investigation into the variations between the participants and within individual accounts. Variations within accounts provide textured evidence of the dialogical ways in which people interpret and negotiate their social worlds (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). The kind of analysis undertaken in this study is not concerned with the underlying power relations or ideological underpinnings of the text. This analysis is merely investigating the kinds of 'talk' selected within the context of the South African national identity and the way in which these discourses come to shape and produce the social reality of the participants.

REFLEXIVITY

As this research has personal resonance for me, I would like to specify the role of my own subjectivity within this process and how it has affected the analysis. Following a less critical approach, I have chosen to take a compassionate stance when analysing this text. My intention from the very beginning was to highlight positive and more transformative aspects of white identity in South Africa. Having my own ideas as to how to negotiate my whiteness in this changing society, I found it incredibly inspiring to attend an evening Xhosa class filled with white people eager to communicate in the language of the 'other'. From this moment, I knew I had to give this sample a voice. Thus, it has been a very personal journey for me and I would like to make explicit the extent to which my identity impacted on this process.

As I am categorised within the WESSA identity as well, I made use of my insider access to this group throughout the process. My own whiteness brought a commonality between myself and my participants, which is relevant as I was included in the group's shared identity. For this reason, I had automatic familiarity and access to a shared language system. Thus, my interpretation was aided by an implicit understanding of contextual and cultural markers referred to in the text (Duszak, 2002; Potter & Wetherell, 1987).

However, there were differences with the degree of familiarity between the two groups. The more 'progressive' group was selected with the assumption that they would provide the kinds of transformative material I was looking for. I felt familiarity with them on a personal level because they were acquaintances and I felt aligned to their political views as well. The second more 'conservative' group I anticipated as being different from me as I did not identify with their political or religious views. Although we shared in our whiteness, I was aware of these differences. Nonetheless, I was surprised at the various opportunities for transformation they provided. This adds further evidence for how complex the WESSA identity is, but also how shared identification can aid and result in commonality beyond our differences. I hope that, following this investigation, the same can be said for our shared national identity.

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

This analysis takes the form of a sequence of a number of discourses that have been chosen for the 'narrative' quality that this particular construction conveys. From coexisting themes extracted from the participants' accounts, I created this narrative in order to offer insights into opportunities for transformation. I acknowledge up-front that this is one reading out of many and that there could have been countless other interpretations. I have highlighted this particular version in order to offer a fresh perspective on *whiteness* in the South African context that I believe has not yet been articulated in the literature. I am hoping to demonstrate that these participants are grappling with the changes in South Africa, and therefore the shifts in their own, and the national identity.

The analysis will emphasize the journey of these participants as they express their identities in terms of their *whiteness*, how this has undergone a great deal of *change*, resulting in acknowledgement of the *diversity* within South Africa and involving the inclusion of different *groups*. At this point of the journey, the overriding discourse becomes that of *integration,* which the participants articulate in numerous ways.

Extracts provided are coded to distinguish the individual participants and which group they belonged to. The participants are identified by their gender and a number indicating the order in which they first spoke. For example, the first female participant in the more progressive group is coded *PF1*; the second male participant of that group is coded *PM2* and for the more conservative group they would be *CF1, CM2* and so on. The participant codes are provided in brackets after each quote. Although I do not wish to provide a formal comparison between the two groups throughout the analysis, there are particular instances where differences between the groups seem relevant and are presented. Otherwise, the analysis considers the sample as a diverse whole, with each section providing extracts from both groups.

Identity in terms of whiteness

The participants made explicit reference to their white identity, which was characterised in their accounts by a number of features, including a heightened sense of whiteness; a sense of dominance in spite of numerical minority status; an absence of culture; feelings

of guilt associated with Apartheid and its legacy; and personal distance from the responsibility for South Africa's political past. These discursive features, while dominant in the accounts of the participants in this study were, however, offset by others in which the need for a greater engagement with the remnants and history of past oppression was acknowledged.

The participants in both groups articulated their identity as white people. For example:

> … *the music I listen to, the places I go to, are predominantly white, people just like me.* (PF2)

As researcher, I acknowledge my part in framing this particular aspect of the participants' identities. Findings from earlier research, however, show that people do not generally acknowledge their whiteness, which is seen to be a 'neutral' or 'default' identity (Frankenberg, 1993; Salusbury, 2003). In South Africa, whiteness is represented differently than in the rest of the world. These participants demonstrated a heightened sense of awareness, not only of their whiteness but of the privileged position this offers them and of its associated difficulties. The first participant began his account by clarifying that:

> … *you know when I speak, obviously I speak as myself, a white male of 42 years old, you know, having lived through those years of, having received the education that I did etcetera etcetera etcetera...* (PM1)

With reference to their minority status, another participant, displaying a persistent sense of dominance, commented that,

> … *you only feel it like when you voting or something. But like apparently we're the minority, white people, but I don't feel the minority (giggles from others), because, um, because of our, because of the way that, that things work. I don't feel that, I don't know.* (PF3)

This account supports earlier works on whiteness, which demonstrated that white people feel a sense of dominance in South Africa, which elevates their identity beyond the fact of their numerical minority (Salusbury 2003; Steyn, 2001). Tajfel (1978) refers to the psychology of minority groups as being an issue of status that is separate to the size of

the group. Thus, the South African context provides an interesting case, as whites are a numerical minority with the economic and psychological benefits of a majority group.

There is also mention of a lack of identity, a sense of not having distinct cultural markers, another typical discourse of whiteness (Salusbury & Foster, 2004)

...I went through a stage of being, feeling white and cultureless... (PF1)

There is acknowledgement that there is a difficult and complicated aspect of white identity that shadows personal experiences such as when starting work in an NGO in Khayalitsha:

...in the beginning when I first started I felt, I had, this white guilt. I'm white, I come from a privileged background… (PF3)

This demonstrates how privilege comes with a heavy sense of guilt and maybe shame of the past. This is reiterated by another participant, who when asked about a possible loss through affirmative action, his answer was:

I actually feel like I'm gaining, really, because you don't, I don't feel like I've needed a false, a sense of anything, to prop me up or to give me that [ ] because I don't have the baggage of that advantage of having been white in an apartheid society. (PM3)

This demonstrates this participant's view of having 'baggage' of the past, where there was a sense of guilt for being white and privileged.

Most participants were prepared to speak about the past, in which white people were perpetrators as well as beneficiaries of the old regime. However, there was still a certain amount of personal distancing from the responsibility.

*…there's a lot of hurt that stems back to the Apartheid days and a lot, a lot of it can be blamed [ ] The blame can be laid at **that** door because people suffered, they were treated as less than human...* (CF1)

In the above account, the use of the word 'that' indicates that this participant does not personally identify with the perpetrator and sees the apartheid government and its policies as separate from her. She is seeking to acknowledge the past yet does not readily portray *her* role in the events that lead to the "suffering" she mentions.

Later on in the discussion, she refers again to Apartheid as being something imposed on the South African population by politicians:

> *If it was left to us, as individuals, I think we would get on, there wouldn't be the apartheid as is, I think politicians are driving us apart...* (CF1)

Interestingly, she uses the present tense as if these structures are *still* in place. As this participant is part of the more conservative group, her mention of Apartheid in the present may be due to her age as this group consists of a much older sample then the first group (*M*= 64 vs. *M* = 33). The fact that she lived through more years under the old regime might mean she still considers it a salient aspect of the national identity. From this account, it seems as though Steyn's (2001) earlier work is being reiterated, where 'whiteness' discourses fall short of an actual acknowledgement of South Africa's racist past and where the responsibility lies.

In other accounts, the past is highlighted differently, indicating that a firmer acknowledgement is necessary:

> *...the reality of this country is something that is always going to be there, is the fact of that baggage [ ] these wounds are, have run deep, do you know what I mean? And, um, never should we just say lets bygones be bygones, you know, its, there will always be there. We need to recognise the fact, um, that that this is part of our culture, you know, and respect the fact that that, that these issues are there and they underlying and recognise them.* (PM1)

This account involves a greater sense of responsibility that indicates that the past may be behind us, but it is still being carried into the present and is something we all have to deal with, something that is encompassed in our national identity. The following section will demonstrate how these participants articulate that things have changed in South Africa and what that change has meant for their identity as WESSAs.

Identity as undergoing changes

While acknowledging the difficult past, reference is made to the fact that things have in fact changed and that whites are no longer positioned as perpetrators, allowing a more esteemed identity.

> *… the fact that South Africans now, I take pride in identifying myself as a South African because I'm not fearful from the rest of the world. Whereas when I was 21, which is twenty years ago and I travelled overseas for the first time with my backpack and set foot in London and travelled around Europe, you were at that stage, I was not a proud South African. It was something I needed to hide [ ]So that's just been my, and that's why I think that it is changing.* (PM3)

Previous literature has highlighted how white identity has shifted within the national category (Distiller & Steyn, 2004; Steyn, 2001). From this particular sample, the changes involve a sense of being part of a diverse nation, which is different from earlier experiences due to the rigid and enforced racial segregation during Apartheid. This has created a new sense of hospitableness to 'other' South Africans, something considered unlawful in the old exclusionary system. When asked about the people of South Africa, one participant emphasised this point:

> *…ja, I just, I think that um there's been so much or there's been (pause) change, we're, we're kind of been going through a period, in my lifetime, this sort of significant changes so there's been changes. So I think there's, there's quite a range of (pause) of people so I mean to **sort of** say yes we are diverse **but** um, I think that the changes are all positive so and that they're leading more to being (pause) invitational, hospitable, um, **sort of** what I would consider very positive things.* (PM3)

There is a degree of ambivalence to this account. This participant seems to struggle to form coherent sentences as he articulates his point, which may mean he is unsure of what exactly it is he wants to say. The phrase 'sort of' indicates a level of hesitation on his part to firmly state that things are diverse and positive, which seems to indicate he might have other ideas about these issues. The use of the word 'but' seems to signify that there may have been some resistance to the diversity now existing in South Africa *but* actually it has

worked out okay and is ultimately positive for him. His repeated use of the word 'change' indicates how important he regards this point.

With these changes come certain challenges and difficulties as well, such as the consequences of affirmative action.

> *Ja, being in business, affirmative action is, for me, just, it's, it's another business challenge [ ] if I choose not to follow that, affirmative action for instance, policies in my business, then that precludes me from a whole, a lot of business opportunities, that's another one of those challenges that we are dealing with in our changing (pause) society.* (PM3)

For others, the changes have meant acknowledging that their whiteness is linked to apartheid, whether they feel personally responsible or not. This participant, who is 25 years old, comments on the acknowledgement of her whiteness by children in Khayaltisha:

> *I like don't always find it funny when the kids point and go "white person, white person". I'm kind of like, like this is also a judgement at some level, like why are they doing this? It's kind of a reflection of, it's the aftermath of apartheid.* (PF3)

From the above accounts, it seems as though the changes that have occurred in South Africa have affected these participants in certain ways, which are either consciously experienced or go unacknowledged. Whereas certain individuals comment on the changes as either providing challenges or difficulties, there are also omissions as to a range of other possible positions available to them. Earlier works found a greater degree of dissonance between whites' acknowledgement of the past and their responsibility for it (Distiller & Steyn 2004; Salusbury & Foster, 2004; Steyn, 2001). The above account demonstrates that even though this participant is 25 years old, she still has a sense of her whiteness as being a signifier of apartheid and of the 'burden' it represents.

The participants in this study have communicated that there has been a shift in consciousness as to who is included in the national identity since the emergence of the 'new' South Africa. With this, whites have had to acknowledge other races, cultures and language groups. There is talk of diversity, but what does this mean for white people? The following section will highlight the kinds of talk around diversity that these participants articulated.

National identity in terms of diversity

Both groups communicated the theme of diversity, although there are differences in the ways in which it is articulated. For the more progressive group, diversity is referred to in a purely descriptive manner, while the extracts from the more conservative group provide an evaluative perspective whereby diversity is related to various challenges and difficulties. From the participants of the progressive group, there is frequent mention of the diversity within South Africa such as:

> *I mean, lets face it, you know there are such, by diverse, there are impoverished South Africans there are the well-to-do South Africans.* (PM1)

And,

> Or *maybe one needs to have some sort of a yardstick, some sort of a guideline if its, if things are broken down into maybe income groups from 0 to 1000, 1 to 5, 5 to 20 or um, ja, geographical locations because I mean when you talking diversity and you talk, there's just, there's I think every sort of element from 0 to 100. There really is.* (PM3)

In these accounts, both participants are indicating that diversity involves an array of different people in South Africa, ranging within income groups and geographical locations. For some this is seen to complicate matters,

> *…we've lived in various places and I always had Afrikaans-speaking, um, maids, and then later on we lived in Durban and it was North Suthu and you're very conscious of that there's a tremendous amount, then **they** inter-marry and sometimes in the towns of course, **they**, you very much have one mother who's Pedi and one who's Xhosa, you know, you're conscious that **they're all** mixed up as well. The Zulus seem to stand out on their own somehow but, um, there was a Swazi, I had a Swazi, um, you know, very to me. So as far as having a second language, which they always seem to advocate, which one would you take 'cause you know at one time I might have said Xhosa or Zulu, in Kwazulu Natal. If you're transferred a lot it's very awkward.* (CF4)

This account demonstrates some of the challenges for white people living in such a culturally diverse country. The diversity exhibited by the 'other' proves to be a

complicating and challenging aspect of life in South Africa. She sees it as something foreign and 'mixed up' and the use of the word 'they' indicates her 'othering' as she distances herself from these cultural hybrids (Duszak, 2002). This same participant, when asked about having an African identity commented:

> …*you see because they're thinking of the, of the whole continent, Africa, we think of ourselves as belonging to South Africa. I can't think of myself as belonging to Zimbabwe, in that same way. And it's a different, anyway they're different countries, anyway, to put it all it one country, seems very difficult to me (laughs), even more diversity.* (CF4)

This account demonstrates a level of discomfort conveyed by this participant as she seems to express concern for the concept of adopting an African identity, which encompasses 'other' countries' identities, resulting in further diversity. It is as if she is expressing a desire to 'rein in' the boundaries of our national identity so as not to include other identities that may further blur or complicate the matter.

Ultimately, she is articulating what many of the participants have expressed, that the changes in South Africa have brought along an influx of 'other' group identities to be included in the national identity, resulting in diversity. This seems to result in a new sense of openness and at the same time ambivalence for these participants. They are both overwhelmed and eager to welcome new group identities into the national category and their lives. The following section will demonstrate how the South African identity includes a range of different group identities and what that means for these participants.

National identity in terms of groups

We have seen the issue of diversity being illustrated quite positively in the media and by politicians in South Africa. The concept of the 'rainbow nation' and its figurative meaning has definitely formed our understanding of what the South African identity encompasses, or at least what those involved in nation-building practices would like it to mean for most South Africans. In this next section, the accounts given will demonstrate how separate the 'colours' of the rainbow still are and how there are still major disparities between groups in South Africa.

For example:

> *...you drive along the N2, you go from, the sort of more predominantly white*
> *areas to more black areas...* (PF3)

This participant is indicating how she literally moves between two worlds, the white world that she is from and the black world where she works at an NGO in Khayalitsha.

> *...before I did the work that I did I've never felt my race so strongly as I do now,*
> *um, obviously because I was just with white people...* (PF3)

This demonstrates the segregation still present in South Africa and how racial groups live separately until forced to come into contact, such as in public spaces or in work environments. Recent work on the contact hypothesis in South Africa has indicated that there is still racial segregation on beaches (Durrheim & Dixon, 2005), in nightclubs (Tredoux & Dixon, 2009), and at university residences (Schrieff, Tredoux, Dixon & Finchilescu, 2005).

Quite obviously, the legacy of the Apartheid government and its legislated racial segregation continues to affect intergroup contact today. Yet historically, divisions were not solely along racial lines. There was always a large gap between the Afrikaans and English white cultures, articulated by members of the 'older' group:

> *Yes, yes I understand. Other cultures, like you said the Afrikaans, and the English,*
> *we're both white but we have different, um, ideas, different likes...* (CF3)

One participant articulated the feeling of being different when comparing English and Afrikaans cultural groups when she was at school:

> *...I went to a duel-medium. Um, so then we moved to Newlands, and it was quite,*
> *ah, a cultural shock. Growing up Afrikaans, you went to school barefoot and*
> *coming into Newlands and we lived, well, I spent about 12 or 13 years in the*
> *Southern Suburbs, then two years in George and back to a small community and*
> *must say, South Africa has such beauty and so many different, ah, population*
> *groups and it was quite, um, an experience going back into an Afrikaans set up*
> *and Afrikaans people are different and birds of a feather do stick together...* (CF2)

For many, the recent changes in the country have resulted in an increased awareness of the different cultural groups. This can result in a great deal of comparison between what is considered 'natural' and 'normal' (the typical markers of whiteness) and

the 'exotic' or 'strange' cultures of the 'other'. When asked what the various cultures are in South Africa, the participants in the more conservative focus group provided a number of cultural markers:

> *I think one's background, well your roots for a start, I think education also plays a role...* (CF1)

> *...for me, it also includes customs, how you make up a bed, different amongst different folk...* (CM1)

They then went on to add specific details regarding some of the differences between themselves and the racialised 'other':

> *I think we were told, if you and I are having a conversation and there's a third person who wants to go to the other side, they'll go behind you in European culture, whereas I think in the black culture, that is rude, they will come straight through the two of you having a conversation, because in their culture they say they can walk behind and stab you in the back whereas they go between to show that there's no animosity [ ] for me I would think "oh that's rude" but its not rude in their culture.* (CF3)

> *I believe the loud talking, you know, you want to say [ ] 'you really shout' but I believe they speak loudly so that you know they not talking, skindering[1] about you* (CF1)

> *Ja, [ ] they can talk on one side of the road to the other, to the other black person, shouting away and they don't look at each other...* (CF4)

What these participants are indicating, is that they have had to learn about these other cultures and their various manifestations, which they probably did not know about before. These demonstrations of their knowledge about the 'other', however well-intended, exemplify just how much 'othering' is taking place as they continue to position themselves as the 'norm' in comparison to these seemingly 'rude', 'different' people. This is a typical case of categorization involving the distinction of 'us' versus 'them' that is said to provide a degree of psychological comfort while at the same time creating feelings of anxiety or opposition towards the 'other' (Duszak, 2002).

In as much as they express a desire to learn about these differences, they also foreground the difficulties that can occur when these differences are not known:

> *To be aware of the differences, um, to respect this (CF3: And I think we should be aware of their differences). But I wish they would be more open and make one aware of, what they expect of us and similarly what we expect of them.* (CF2)
>
> *That would do away with a lot of suspicion, about each other.* (CF1)

From this, it is evident just how much confusion and 'mystery' surrounds the 'other' for these participants. It is as if they are communicating a level of 'culture shock' that is new and daunting to these so-called 'cultureless' whites.

These participants seem to be communicating that it is only through differences that we can understand each other. In this next section, the discourse is of a completely different nature. When it is possible to put aside our differences, there is an opportunity for transformation. Where there was once only segregation, there can now be opportunities for integration.

Discourses of integration

From both focus groups, the discourse of integration was articulated. Within this discourse, there are various sites of integration, styles of integration and suggested opportunities for future and present integration provided. Ultimately, there is an acknowledgement that the separateness instilled through apartheid and perpetuated to this day needs to be addressed and is being slowly transformed towards a more unified South Africa.

> *…as there's more times that we lose our identity that I'm white or I'm Afrikaans or you know or this income group or that income group and um, its, its really been awesome so my whole perception of the country from being emigrated in my head, living in a white suburb to really feeling I'm now part of the city and I, I go to Khayalitsha a lot, I've got a lot of friends there. It's been quite amazing and its like healed my heart from a lot of stuff. So I think I personally think that's what's gonna happen in the future. Because kids are growing in school together and this sort of a thing so I think that whole, a lot of baggage from the past is [ ] likely to atrophy with time, won't really be that relevant.* (PM2)

In this account, this participant offers his personal story of integration, which he hopes will be reflected in future generations. In this example, the use of geographical locations as sites for integration is made explicit. There is a sense of physically moving away from the enclave of the 'white suburbs' and into the townships where there is a life for him to enjoy, with friends. The need for intimate relationships like friendships has been acknowledged in the literature as the most important kind of contact to improve intergroup relations (Finchilescu & Tredoux, 2008). Other sites of integration may be religious points of congregation:

> *I think the different groups mix most comfortably in the church situation. We had, um, you know, where everybody's treated as an equal and we had a little while ago, people were invited to pray in their home language and there were fifteen different languages being prayed in one congregation. That was wonderful.* (CF1)

This account demonstrates another place where opportunities for integration are made possible. This is also a wonderful example of how within the diversity that was articulated previously, individuals can find common ground and create an opportunity to share in that together. As another participant put it:

> *… the common divider was, they were Christians and we were Christians. And in that, in love we spoke the same language…* (CF2)

In order for these comments to be made, there is an underlying attitude of separateness and difference. Thus it is clear that the more conservative group is comprised of individuals who are struggling with the diversity of group identities within the country today. Because of this, it seems they need a third unifying factor, such as their Christian identity, in order to bridge the gaps between themselves and the 'other'. While this might indicate that these participants have greater difficulty with integration, it also reveals a space in which this difficulty might be resolved. It is important to remember that integration does not necessarily entail denial of our differences or repression of prejudiced ideas. It is actually an acknowledgement of these that allows integration and transformation to take place (Swartz, 2007).

> *I believe that, you know, this whole being a South African is this whole Ubuntu[2] that we talk about, is something that you actually, you know, have to respect and work on as well. I don't think its just, comes naturally, you know, we've got to*

work on recognising the past and we've got to work on creating a future, you know, and I think it's a, it's a big thing, you know, its not just a, it's a, its going to take graft to pull it off. (PM1)

This participant refers to the concept of Ubuntu in order to demonstrate his belief that integration is something of an *act* and needs to be worked on. It is also a foreign concept taken from the Bantu languages, further iterating his notion that it may not be 'natural' for him. It takes a degree of effort.

He further emphasises this point again:

I for example, have to be purposeful in how I want to get involved you know and I mean [ ], to make South Africa a better place there has to be a purposeful coming together of people and walking together, you know, as against um so often, you know, we are in isolated groups. So I think that for, for me. I've had to, on my return, actually say right this is what you want to do, this is how I'm going to bridge those gaps within myself, this is how I'm going to reconnect with people that [ ]I wouldn't have known before in years gone by, before I left, I wouldn't have entertained the thought, you know. Because it was just the way it was, now South Africa is a democracy, has been for years, and it's like I need to get to know my people, you know. (PM1)

From this account it is clear that he is communicating how the changes in South Africa provide opportunities for integration that were not made possible before. He is very adamant that one needs to be purposeful in this effort and that there is a certain degree of hard work and determination that goes into bridging these gaps.

This is contrasted to other versions of integration:

If you, if you recognise a common humanity then you don't really need to integrate, because I can feel what you're feeling, you know. And so, I think that's [ ] Ubuntu, that sort of common humanity thing, is, is its not a physical thing like I'm gonna change from a green into a pink, its more just saying okay I'm recognising everybody's common humanity so I think it's more a consciousness thing... (PM2)

This account provides a further example of the variation in terms of which integration is conceptualised. Here there is a rejection of the concept of integration as being a physical

act and an alternative view is provided, that of a 'consciousness thing'. This seems to reduce his responsibility as an agent of transformation as he considers it something that somehow happens without effortful action. The concept of a common humanity is echoed by others as well.

> *You know when it comes to just colour, colour eventually loses, you know you're not aware of colour anymore. And that's a good thing. It's when we live together and meet each other, [ ] you're aware of people as a valuable human being.* (CF1)

What is also communicated is that however integration is conceptualised, there is still a certain level of involvement required and that this is something actively negotiated by these participants.

> *I think, um, you know, its almost like, you do need to embrace what you do and integration is not a, I don't see it as a, as a forced thing and I think integration, certainly (pause) there'll be more integration over time and that's, I'm talking, that a long time, because I think that has a lot to do with education, um, but I'm still gonna go to the same places that I've always been going to. I have no reason to go to a different place and other people are going to still do the same thing.*
> (PM3)

Here, this participant is communicating that there is a decision to be made with regards to integration, involving a change in activity or a choice to continue in the same way as before. One option is to shift behaviour patterns in order to 'do' transformation and the other is to remain the same and wait for the structures to shift, for example through the education process. This can create a degree of ambivalence and anxiety.

> *…when I'm at work I've got friends at work who are great, I enjoy them but I don't see them outside of work, and I think often why I don't see them, and a lot of it does have to do with um I think firstly education [ ] if I go to university with someone from the townships, there's a big bridging because of that, we're both on the same sort of wavelength and unfortunately economics does come into it because [ ]I don't feel comfortable suggesting to one of my work friends lets go there, cause I know that there's a certain expense involved in it. So you sort of almost avoid those sort of situations and you'd rather stick to, for me personally I just stick to the situations where its comfortable, I can speak for myself, we're not*

gonna be like well I feel like doing a good deed now so I'm going to try and
integrate myself if its not comfortable. (PF3)

In this account, the participant communicates the difficulties that arise when 'trying' to integrate. It is clear that there are difficulties involved in 'acts' of integration yet this kind of 'excuse' is not enough to completely evade responsibility. In as much as it may disrupt white people's comfortable lives, reliance on this position is not unproblematic.

There is repeated mention from her and others about education playing a role in maintaining the gap between groups. The economic factor she alerts us to is also a crucial one to understand. Both economic and educational differences have been found to prevent integration (Finchilescu & Tredoux, 2008). Maybe because of this, in certain circumstances such as in social environments, integration is not as easy as in others.

…if we're talking about integration, I'm not thinking about where I work, and
where I study and the people I'm around during the day, its where I am at night,
where my social environment is, and for me, like, the music I listen to, the places I
go to, are predominantly white, people just like me, and its, when I go to places
like that, its um, I don't feel like we're moving forward, I feel I'm not as integrated
as I w---, I wish I could be on a social level…(PF2)

These last few accounts provide a textured description of the kinds of struggles and dilemmas facing white South Africans today. The concept of ideological dilemmas established by Billig et al. (1988) can be used to illuminate these WESSA accounts. Through this lens, they can be understood more compassionately as individuals who are actively grappling with the ideological implications of their whiteness, while trying to find meaning and purpose within a new system. Thus, this particular reading of these WESSA accounts has provided a new hue to the multifaceted white identity in South Africa, which continues to change alongside our changing nation. If transformation is to be actualised within the lived experiences of individuals then an understanding of their dilemmas as well as their acts of negotiation can only aid this process.

CONCLUSION

From this analysis, it is clear that the identity of these WESSA participants has undergone changes along with the country. These accounts demonstrate an awareness of

their whiteness, a reflexivity of the typical components of such an identity, its status and its shortcomings. There is also a sense of having to share in the national identity, something that maybe was not felt before. The 'new' South Africa has brought an influx of 'other' group identities to be included in the national category, providing opportunities for new voices to be heard. For some there is a certain amount of trepidation and anxiety around diversity where efforts need to be made in order to understand the 'other'. A certain reading of these accounts would highlight and reference this prejudice as being a signal of underlying racist attitudes or the desire to maintain an ideology of segregation. Certainly much of the literature on whiteness has intended to provide a racialised 'corner' for whites to sit in, banding them together in one homogeneous category, resistant to transformation. This racialised thinking is supported by work on the contact hypothesis indicating the extent of racial segregation still evident in contemporary South Africa.

This analysis, however, has gone beyond that point. As Billig and his colleagues (1988) have pointed out, ideological dilemmas are abundant in social life. People face difficult decisions regarding such politicised thought-processes. This analysis has gone beyond segregation and 'us' versus 'them'. Unlike previous accounts of whiteness in South Africa, it tells a story of the next step, towards transformation. This account provides textual evidence for the reality of WESSA's daily struggles with integration and their decisions as to where and how such things are to manifest. It also demonstrates some of the difficulties involved in a process for which no one has the answers, as well as some possibilities for solutions. If these are to be taken as examples of South African citizens today, then it is clear that the process of integration is a very individual journey, something to be mapped out and demonstrated by each person in his/her own capacity. In the words of one participant, *"there's a sort of a getting to know you"* phase of integration taking place. The different social groupings are coming into contact and thus a new range of subjectivities is encompassed in our national identity. At this time in our history, I think that is a fair position. As South Africa is such a young democracy, a more radical transformation may be around the corner. I hope that it is just a matter of time. As a social psychological investigation, this study demonstrates and highlights possible sites for transformation and integration, which is certainly a good place to start.

NOTES

1.	Skindering is an Afrikaans word, which is directly translated as gossiping

2.	Ubuntu is a word originating from the Bantu languages. It is an African philosophy with diverse definitions. It refers to the way human beings are interconnected and therefore individuals need to respect others and the community. All individual action impacts the community and thus one needs to take others into account in one's daily interactions.

REFERENCES

Billig, M., Condor, S., Edwards, D., Gane, M., Middleton, D., & Radley, A. (1988). *Ideological dilemmas: A social psychology of everyday thinking*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cock, J. & Bernstein, A. (2002). *Melting pots & rainbow nations: Conversations about difference in the United States and South Africa*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Cooper, A. (2003). *Trade unionists and t-shirt makers: Constructing political identities that challenge 'whiteness'*. Unpublished honours thesis, University of Cape Town, South Africa.

Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (Eds.) (1998). *The landscape of qualitative research.* Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage.

Distiller, N. & Steyn, M. (Eds.) (2004). *Under construction.* Sandton: Heinmann.

Durrheim. K. & Dixon, J. (2005). *Racial encounter: The social psychology of contact and desegregation.* London: Routledge.

Duszak, A. (Ed.) (2002). *Us and others: Social identities across languages, discourses and cultures.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Eaton, L. (2001). *An experimental study of adolescents' identification with South Africa and Africa.* Unpublished masters thesis, University of Cape Town, South Africa.

Eaton, L. (2002). South African national identity: A research agenda for social psychologists. *South African Journal of Psychology*, *32*, 45–53.

Eaton, L. (2006). *National identity in the 'new' South Africa: A social-psychological investigation*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of St Andrews, United Kingdom.

Finchilescu, G. & Tredoux, C. (2008). Intergroup contact, social context and racial ecology in South Africa. In U. Wagner, L. R. Tropp, G. Finchilescu, & C. Tredoux (Eds.), *Improving intergroup relations: Building on the legacy of Thomas F. Pettigrew* (pp. 179-194). Oxford: Blackwell.

Foster, D. (2006, July). *Social Change and Contact: Macro-Political Considerations*. Paper presented to the Contact 50 Conference, KwaZulu Natal, South Africa.

Frankenberg, R. (1993). W*hite women, race matters: The social construction of whiteness*. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.

Kroger, R. O. & Wood, L. A. (1998). The turn to discourse in social psychology. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie canadienne, 39,* 266-279.

Marecek, J., Fine, M, & Kidder, L. (1997). Working between worlds: Qualitative methods and social psychology. *Journal of Social Issues, 53,* 631-644.

Phillips, N. & Handy, C. (2002). *Discourse analysis: Investigating processes of social construction.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Potter, J. & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Discourse and social psychology: Beyond attitudes and behaviour.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Reicher, S. (2004). The context of social identity: Domination, resistance, and change. *Political Psychology, 25,* 921– 945.

Reicher, S. & Hopkins, N. (2001). *Self and Nation.* London: Sage.

Rojo, L. M. (2001). New developments in discourse analysis: Discourse as social practice. *Folia Linguisticae: Acta Societatis Linguisticae Europaeae, 35*, 41-78.

Salusbury, T. (2003). *Discourses of whiteness informing the identity of white English speaking South Africans.* Unpublished masters thesis, University of Cape Town, South Africa.

Salusbury, T. & Foster, D. (2004). Rewriting WESSA identity. In N. Distiller. & M. Steyn (Eds.) *Under construction* (pp. 93-109). Sandton: Heinmann.

Schrieff, L. E., Tredoux, C. G., Dixon, J. A., & Finchilescu, G. F. (2005). Patterns of racial segregation in residence dining halls. *South African Journal of Psychology, 35,* 433-443.

Sennett, J. & Foster, D. (1996). Social identity: Comparing white English speaking South African students in 1975 and 1994. *South African Journal of Psychology, 26*, 203-211.

Steyn, M. (2001). *Whiteness just isn't what it used to be: White identity in a changing South Africa.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Steyn, M. (2004). *"White talk": Whiteness and the strategic management of diasporic whiteness.* Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Cape Town, South Africa.

Steyn, M. & Foster, D. (2008). Repertoires for talking white: Resistant whiteness in post-apartheid South Africa. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *31*, 25-51.

Swartz, S. (2007).The power to name: South African intersubjective psychoanalytic psychotherapy and the negotiation of racialized histories. *European Journal of Psychotherapy and Counselling*, 9, 177-190.

Tajfel, H. (1978). *The social psychology of minorities*. London: Minority Rights Group.

Tredoux, C. G. & Dixon, J. A. (2009). Mapping the multiple contexts of racial isolation: The case of Long Street, Cape Town. *Urban Studies, 46*, 761-777.

Varas-D´ıaz, N. & Serrano-Garc´ıa, I. (2003). The challenge of a positive self-image in a colonial context: A psychology of liberation for the Puerto Rican experience. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 31,* 103-115.

Wale, K. & Foster, D. (2007). Investing in discourses of poverty and development: How white wealthy South Africans mobilise meaning to maintain privilege. *South African Review of Sociology*, *38*, 45-69.

Wodak, R., de Cillia, R, Reisigl, M., & Liebhart, K. (1999). *Discursive construction of national identity.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

APPENDIX A

Focus group protocol

Procedure

1. Welcome participants, introduce yourself.
2. Give verbal overview of what the focus group will entail. Explain the need for consent forms and request that participants read and sign them.
3. Ask participants to introduce themselves to the group.
4. Switch on recording device.
5. Introduce discussion
6. When discussion ends, thank participants. Invite anyone who felt upset by the discussion in any way to talk to you afterwards, or to contact the Principal Investigator (provide contact details again).
7. Pay participants.

Proposed structure of the discussion

1. *Social groups and identification*

"I'd like to start off by asking you to imagine that you are talking to a person who is visiting South Africa for the first time. This person does not know anything at all about the country. They ask you to describe the people of South Africa. What would you tell them about South Africans?"

→ Pick up on references to groups within the population. If none mentioned, probe the issue of diversity within the population. Then get participants to reflect on their own social identities:

"We'll come back to some of these points. For now I'd like to pick up on the issue of groups / diversity that was raised. Imagine again that you are talking to your visitor. He/she asks you: so what group or groups do YOU belong to? What would you say?"

→ Explore identifications in more detail; encourage each person to express their identification, reflect on choices / dilemmas etc that may be raised in the discussion.

2. *Majority and minority groups*

"I'd like to turn to the question of **majority groups** and **minority groups**. First of all, do you think South Africa has a majority group or groups?"

"What about minorities? Does South Africa have minority groups?"

→ Probe participants' identification with majority and minority groups:

"You have spoken about groups that you feel you belong to. Do you ever think of these groups as being a majority or a minority?"

→After responses to this general question get participants to reflect specifically on the **relative position of their group within SA.** "White people are a numerical minority in SA. What does it mean for whites that we are a minority group in the sense of having small numbers?"

Guide the discussion to reflect on three domains:

Economic power / status

Political power / status

Cultural power / status

Encourage participants to speak about the status of both their race group as a whole, and their ethnic group. If the discussion starts off being about race, let it run and later ask specifically about ethnicity. This is especially important for the black participants, where there might be a disjuncture between being a member of a majority group in terms of race, and a minority group in terms of ethnicity.

Example probe question on ethnicity:

"We have mainly been talking about black people, as we spoke about how they are a numerical majority. But what if we look at our ethnic identity? Are there differences between the ethnic groups in terms of their status and power?"

3. *Relative prototypicality / ingroup projection*

"I would like to change the focus of the discussion now to the issue of South African identity. All of us here are South Africans, in addition to being members of subgroups within the population. For many years now there has been an ongoing debate about what it means to be South African and how we can define the nation. People disagree about what it means to be an authentic, real South African, or even what is a *typical* South African. Everybody has their own views. I would like to hear from you, thinking about the different groups within South Africa, are some groups within the population more South African than other groups?"

→ Play Devil's Advocate and get the participants to consider views that contradict their own. E.g. If participants are saying that everyone is equally South African, present the "strong" version of the Africanist argument and ask why South African identity should not be defined according to the black majority. If black participants argue that blacks are more prototypical, present the Rainbow Nation argument, and also ask about the issue of minority black ethnic groups.

APPENDIX B

Transcription details

The speaker's words are written down verbatim, including grammatical errors.

Pauses were not timed. If the participant paused between words, the pause is indicated by brackets with the word 'pause' inside e.g.:

And that is why I (pause) always say

Round brackets indicate the actions or words of other speakers, e.g.:

And that is why I always say that (giggles from others) or ***(F1: Hmm)***

In the report:

Ellipsis at the beginning of extracts indicates that the quote is selected from a larger extract, e.g.:

…and that is why I always say that

Square brackets indicate that some of the transcript has been purposely omitted, e.g.:

And [ ] I always say