Identity Construction and Perception of a Low-Status Numerical Majority Group:

Implications for Black South African Youth.

Thabang Motsoke Sekete

Department of Psychology

University of Cape Town

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

South Africa's history of oppression has created a social atmosphere in which the numerical minority (the White population) has a high-group status, whilst the numerical majority (the Black population) has a low-group status. Social Identity Theory (SIT) suggests that this imbalance of power between the majority and minority groups can be problematic in identity formation for the low-status numerical majority. Using two focus groups, consisting of 15 Black African participants in total aged 20 to 25, I explored the discourses around what it means to be part of the numerical majority in South Africa. I further explored how members of the low-status numerical majority construct their identity and whether it is problematic to be part of the low-status numerical majority. The evident themes were that of language and its relation to culture, the importance of recognition and status to enable groups to express their identities particularly in the workplace, and the sentiments surrounding the representation of these factors in the media and how these relate to the individuals identities. The discussions generated evidence on the importance and complexities of ethnicity and culture. Ethnicity and culture were mainly represented through language use and representation, particularly in the media. This further elucidated evidence of sentiments of resentment as a result of the lack of recognition for being part of the low-status numerical majority. And sentiments of injustice were expressed as a result of the power possessed by the high-status numerical minority, particularly in the workplace.

Keywords: imbalance of power; minority/majority group status; identity formation; language and culture; recognition and status; discourse; high-/low-group status; Social Identity Theory.

1. **INTRODUCTION**

This study aimed at exploring the concept of what it means to be part of the low status numerical majority. Furthermore, it aimed at exploring how this meaning affects Black[1] South African Youth's identity formation and perception. Foregrounding literature was used to inform the theoretical position from which this research was undertaken, the most apt methods to employ, and the implications of the findings. The review of the literature on status and intergroup relations indicated that South Africa is an ideal context to explore the concepts of identity construction and perception amongst the various groups, in particular Black South Africans.

The legacy of Apartheid has had a long-term effect on the country's social construction. The effects were such that the numerical majority has a low-status whereas the numerical minority has a high status. Most studies regarding identity construction of majority groups are conducted where there is a simple division between the majority and minority groups across all societal constructions. These studies assume that the numerical majority is the majority group. (e.g. Cunningham & Platow, 2007; Kenworthy, Hewstone, Levine, Martin & Willis, 2008; Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005; Tropp & Bianchi, 2006). However, in South Africa this division is not so simple, nor can one make such an assumption. During apartheid, the numerical majority (Black South Africans) was oppressed and therefore synonymous with minority groups; whist the numerical minority (White South Africans) maintained the economic, political and cultural dominance.

---

[1] Refers to Blacks of African descent because they constitute the numerical majority.

Social Identity Theory (SIT)

Social Identity Theory (SIT) is a broad theory that attempts to explain identity constructs under an immense assortment of social interactions using various sub-theories; these sub-theories include intergroup contact and relations, ethnic and racial identity development, inferiority perceptions of minority and low-status groups (Tajfel & Turner, 1981) (as cited in Bettencourt & Bartholow, 1998; Hocoy, 1999; Hogg, 1996; Hogg & Abrams, 1988; Redersdorff & Martinot, 2009; Shinnar, 2008; Smith, 1991; Spears, Ellemers, & Doosje, 2009).

SIT suggests that an individual's identity is constructed and maintained through group identification (Emler & Hopkins, 1990; Hogg & Abrams, 1988). Furthermore, an individual's identity is related to the construction of the group to which that individual belongs. If one is to maintain a positive identity construction then one must compare one's identity to that of an individual who identifies with a different group (Abrams, 1996; Emler & Hopkins, 1990; Hogg, 1996; Shinnar, 2008; Tajfel, 1978). This is also known as intergroup relations where the group with which one identifies is known as the in-group and the group with which one does not identify is known as the out-group (Hogg, 1996; Wenzel, Mummendey, & Waldzus, 2007). An important aspect of this comparative process is that one compares one's self and one's group to other individuals and groups with a bias that portrays the self in a favourable framework; this ensures a positive identity construction. Thus, group identification enables an individual to structure his or her environment and therefore contribute to a positive identity construct (Liebkind, Henning-Lindblom & Solheim, 2008; Peeters & Oerlemans, 2009). SIT places great emphasis on group identification being intertwined with personal identity perception. Therefore, by defining the identity of the group one is able to gain a sense of the

identity of the individual. It is necessary for this definition to be clear so a clear sense of the individual's identity and their relation to the group can be explored and noted.

Definition of majority/minority groups

There have been inconsistent views, in the literature subsequent to SIT, regarding the definition of majority and minority groups. These concepts are taken for granted and clear construct definitions are not provided; it is naive to presume that the numerical majority group automatically equates with the dominant group. Smith (1991) provides a seemingly uncomplicated definition of being a majority status group where "it is defined on the basis of a group's position of power within society" (p. 182). Similarly, distinctions have been made whereby a group could either hold a low-status or a high-status. A group regarded as a high-status group is one in which the individuals possess a measure of power within society over and above any other groups in the society (Bettencourt & Bartholow, 1998; Liebkind, Henning-Lindblom & Solheim, 2008; Redersdorff & Martinot, 2009).

The more complicated definitions were found in a study involving prejudice among numerical minority and majority status groups, conducted by Tropp and Pettigrew (2005), it was suggested that the numerical minority group is the group whose status is devalued. This was also seen in a study conducted by Sibley and Barlow (2009) regarding status and its relation to numbers in New Zealand and Australia. In South Africa this cannot be seen to be the case because the numerical majority's status was devalued to the extent of oppression. As a result, in South Africa defining the numerical minority as the devalued group becomes problematic.

Similarly, Tropp and Bianchi (2006) suggest that numerical minority groups are those who have experienced longstanding histories of prejudice and discrimination. Yet, the South African majority – black South Africans – also experienced a longstanding history of

prejudice and discrimination.. It must be noted that within different contexts different groups can possess a measure of power over other groups. For example, in South Africa, Black people possess the numerical majority whilst White people posses power within the economic sector. Thus, it is more suitable to define groups by the status they possess. Even years after an illegitimate system lay the foundation for an imbalance in group status the effects continue to impact on South African society. A more in-depth look at the South African context will illustrate this to be the case, particularly in the economic and cultural domains.

Group status in the economic domain

The economic sector is characterised by numerous, complex and diverse factors – it includes local and global markets as well as formal and informal sectors, amongst other things. By considering the local, formal economic sector the census data from Statistics South Africa (2009) illustrates that 90% of White workers are employed in the formal sector whereas 64.6% of Black workers are employed in the same place. Xaba and Mofokeng (2005) recognise this disparity and note that "Colonialism and apartheid left high inequalities between racial groups in South Africa, with the white minorities left owning and controlling the economy while blacks locked into the working class mode." (p.78). Xaba and Mofokeng suggest that the majority of White people contribute a larger proportion to the economy by holding more formal positions and owning many of the country's businesses. It can therefore be noted that in the economic sector the numerical minority of the population has a high status over the numerical majority. Not only is this evidenced in South Africa's economic sector but also in its social context. This can be emphasised by illustrating the interaction of cultures in everyday interaction in the country.

Group status in the cultural domain

One of the basic features of culture, and its relation to identity development, is language. Language can be a powerful cultural tool because it allows an individual to construct their identity and express this identity in that language (Xaba & Mofokeng, 2005). In South Africa, the numerical minority maintains the cultural power whereby the numerical majority must conform to using this cultural tool if they wish to 'expand their horizons'. Campbell (1995) found that black township youth in South Africa perceived that "the ability to speak English was a key means of expanding one's horizons" (p. 11). Herein lays the implication that White culture – in terms of language – is a dominating force over Black culture. Even though there are 11 official languages the language spoken that yields the most influence, in the most influential positions, is English. Although there is opportunity for individuals to speak any of the official languages, the State of the Nation's address is given in English; Parliament is conducted in English; final Matric examinations are in English. As a result, the numerical majority is limited in constructing and expressing their identity through a language that represents their culture.

When a group's language is overshadowed by another language so too is the culture overshadowed. An example of this is the cultural practice of slaughtering animals as a symbolic ritual; this culture is practiced by all predominantly Black cultures but not by White South Africans. In 2007, a prominent politician, Toni Yengeni, was taken to court by the Society of Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (SPCA) for slaughtering a bull. Yengeni was engaging in a cultural practice which is a cultural liberty in South Africa. However, it was suggested by the SPCA that Yengeni was engaging in animal cruelty (News24, 2007). This is an example of how a Black cultural practice can be discouraged and become assimilated in White cultural practices where ritual slaughtering is not practiced. Similarly, this is an example of how the numerical majority's cultural practices can be overshadowed by the numerical minority's cultural practices because of the status attributed to each group. This

example is a practical, real-world example of intergroup relations and status and it relates well to the implications of my research. The scientific studies of intergroup relations and status groups, on the other hand, is fraught with methodological issues that tamper with the applicability of their findings to my exploration. A brief look at these issues will follow.

Methodological issues

Studies have been conducted using Likert-scale surveys where a series of responses direct the respondent to either identify with a discriminatory group or a group being discriminated against (e.g. Cunningham & Platow, 2007; Hong et al., 2006; Tropp & Bianchi, 2006). Other studies have tested intergroup bias as a result of the interaction between two groups and measured according to inferential statistical measures, such as analysis of variance (ANOVA) (e.g. Bettencourt & Bartholow, 1998; Redersdorff & Martinot, 2009; Sibley & Barlow, 2009). These quasi-experimental studies have been effective but limited. They are able to show that intergroup identification and bias exists. But they are unable to illustrate the implications of this identification for the individuals within the groups. Very rarely was a qualitative study conducted where the discourse surrounding high and low status groups was investigated. This has resulted in a lack of understanding regarding the implications of belonging to a specific group like, for example, a low status group. SIT might be able to account for the identity processes in individuals in laboratory or experimental contexts, it cannot fully account for individuals' identities in the non-experimental contexts – in the real world (Campbell, 1995). Hocoy (1999), in his field research, conducted interviews with his informants in an ethnographic study researching racial identity development. This method provided a much more descriptive and comprehensive view of how identity development progressed amongst black South Africans – the numerical majority of South Africa. Hocoy's

(1999) methodology was a prime example of how qualitative research can provide rich, descriptive data.

In conclusion, Although the literature on SIT is extensive it is by no means exhaustive; it is able to encompass theories ranging from prejudice and intergroup bias to racial and ethnic identity development. SIT contributes towards understanding identity of the self in relation to a group and others. In South Africa, identity becomes a salient feature of the individual because of the diverse groups. The complexity of the South African social system has questioned the normative assumptions around the numerical majority possessing a high-status. This can be evidenced by examining the cultural and economic spheres. Thus, by attempting to clarify what it means to be a majority group in South Africa one would be taking a step towards clarifying the ways in which individuals relate to groups and how this impacts on their identity. Moreover, the richness of this definition can be discovered in discourse and narrative analyses as opposed to the assumptions made by survey research. This paper, therefore, serves as an illustration of the exploration of young Black South African identities as they navigate their way through society as part of the numerical majority with a low status. The next section outlines the ways in which this exploration was undertaken, the findings as a result of the exploration, and consequently the implications of the findings.

2. METHOD

Qualitative research aims at describing and addressing human experiences; it is subjective, exploratory, descriptive and interpretive (Polkinghorne, 2005; Rennie, Watson, & Monteiro, 2002). The focus group approach allows for open-ended discussions and for the participants to become the subjects of their own contributions. Hence, the participant becomes a co-researcher (Parker, 2005). I used a Qualitative research approach – focus groups – to explore the discourses around identity and identity construction for Black South African youth. Such means of investigation allowed for an enriching discussion forum where the interchanging of ideas and thoughts highlighted commonalities and contradictions of views around identity for young Black South Africans.

Participants

My sample consisted of young Black African South Africans aged 20 to 25 years of age. I opted for this age bracket because the youth are in a period of their lives in which they are discovering themselves and trying to develop and define their own personal identities and place in the world. Secondly, young adults between the ages of 20 and 25 have not been deeply entrenched in the political systems that were formulated as a reaction to the apartheid government. Rather, they have been afforded the opportunity to formulate their identities during the dawn of a new era – one of equality and freedom. The participants' ethnicities ranged to compose a rather representative sample of the Black South African population and are presented in Table 1:

Table 1

Demographics of Participants in Focus Group 1

	Male		Female	
	Age	Ethnicity	Age	Ethnicity
Participant				
1	23	Tswana/Swati	20	Xhosa
2	22	Zulu	21	Xhosa
3	22	Xhosa	21	Zulu
4	21	Zulu	20	Venda

Table 2

Demographics of Participants in Focus Group 2

	Male		Female	
	Age	Ethnicity	Age	Ethnicity
Participant				
1	22	Tswana	20	Tswana

2	24	Zulu	22	Zulu
3	22	Zulu	22	Zulu
4	25	Pedi		

Thus, my sample consisted of 8 males and 7 females; 7 Zulus, 3 Xhosas, 3 Tswanas, 1 Pedi, and 1 Venda. Both focus groups comprised of individuals from all socioeconomic statuses as well as residential area codes; participants were from the township as well as the suburbs.

Materials

Two focus groups comprising of seven and eight participants were conducted. Both focus groups were recorded with an analogue Dictaphone and transcribed manually by myself.

Design

The data obtained was a representation of the perceptions, meanings and interpretations formulated by the participants. As a means of analysis discursive methods were employed. They focus on the detail of the text, explaining ways in which the phenomena are brought about through language and discourses (Madill & Gough, 2008).

Data Analysis. As a general applicative tool I used discourse analysis for analysing the data because it allowed me to explore the ways in which language constructs subjects within majority groups. In particular, I adapted Potter and Wetherell's 'discursive resources' type of discourse analysis (DRDA); this "allows one to explore the role of discourse in the construction of objects and subjects, including the self" (Willig, 1999). According to van Dijk (1985) "discourse analysis provides insight into the forms of human communication and verbal interaction" (p. 1). My analysis elucidated the consistencies and variations in

communication and interaction. Furthermore, it considered these interactions within the specific social context; whether it was within an institution such as the office or home.

Whilst DRDA served as the theoretical basis that informed my analysis it did not stringently refer to DRDA. The nature of the discussions, regarding the identity of those belonging to the majority group, further allowed me to question and challenge the relevant constructions of psychologically relevant concepts, such as majority groups (Willig, 1999). In my analysis I grouped aspects of the discussions into themes. This classification further allowed me to identify patterns of language and show how these constitute aspects of society and the people within it; it also allowed me to analyse individual discourses as well as the common discourse of the group.

Procedure

Recruitment Strategy. I approached individuals with whom I was acquainted through my experiences in Cape Town – students, bartenders, and office clerks mainly. This minimised issues of access to the potential participants who fitted my desired demographics. I then asked the participants who had agreed to participate to bring a partner. My acquaintance with some of the participants assisted in developing a rapidly good rapport with myself and the participants; but also, with me as the common acquaintance, a good rapport was quick to develop amongst the participants.

Focus Group Discussions. A focus group protocol, which was determined by my supervisor Liberty Eaton (see Appendix A), was used as a guide in which to direct the discussion. The protocol was a semi-structured guide that allowed me the freedom to guide the participants towards discussing the meaning of being a majority group and what this meant for each participant. The focus group protocol provided the platform for me to explore the concept of

what it means to be a South African and who constitutes this classification. The first focus group (FGi) was conducted at my house in Cape Town because all of the participants were acquainted with me and felt that it would be more comfortable to be in a known environment. The second focus group (FGii) was conducted in the Humanities Building at the University of Cape Town because of its centrality to all the participants and the convenience it afforded in terms of providing a comfortable location. Each focus group was conducted in the evening because of day-time responsibilities, such as work and lectures, the participants could not avoid Both focus groups lasted approximately 2 hours. The focus groups were mainly conducted in English but every now and again a participant would revert to their mother-tongue and use a Zulu or Tswana phrase or word. The audio recordings were then transcribed manually using a key of transcription symbols adapted from the American Communications Journal (2008), translated into English where necessary, and analysed by myself.

Ethical considerations. Participants were each offered a R100 incentive to take part in the focus groups. Before the discussions were undertaken the participants were informed that their identities would remain anonymous. The participants were also informed that before the discussion took place they needed to fill out and sign a consent form (see Appendix C). The focus groups were recorded with a Dictaphone with the full knowledge and consent of the participants; it was stressed that the discussions were recorded for analytic purposes.

Reflexivity. Even though the participants were the primary agents within this research, my own involvement cannot be discarded. I am a 21 year-old black individual; I consider myself to be multicultural and the product of an amalgamation of my father's Venda and Pedi heritage as well as my mother's Xhosa and Tswana heritage. Consequently, I am multi-lingual with regards to South African languages; I am able to converse in the major Nguni

(specifically Zulu and Xhosa) and Sotho (specifically Sotho and Tswana) languages. This was advantageous in the focus groups because it allowed the participants to be involved in the discussion in their language of choice; this did not happen but some comments were in Zulu and Tswana. Finally, my inexperience as a guide in the focus groups was evident each time I expressed my own opinions as though I was a participant as opposed to simply observing and guiding the discussion.

3. RESULTS

In both focus groups the participants mostly discussed issues relating to their identity and the way in which South Africa's social construction affects their identity. They further discussed the impact of the country's cultural melting pot on the participants' identities. Philosophical debates ensued regarding South Africa's social construction and it became evident that many of the participants initially took for granted that being part of the numerical majority equated to having power and a high social status. The philosophical debate also included what having power and a high social status meant.

As the discussions progressed the participants discovered that it was naive to assume that the numerical majority was the high-status group, especially in South Africa. Rather, they acknowledged that a more preferable position would be to look at South African society in two ways in order to contextualise being part of a majority. First, by solely considering the Black citizens of South Africa the participants discussed that being part of the majority meant being the numerical majority, in addition to having power and a high social status; in effect, Zulus in South Africa have the numerical majority and therefore power and a high status. This further led to discussions regarding culture and ethnicity and how these contribute to each participant's identity and how they contribute to the South African cultural milieu. Consequently, the participants recognised that White Afrikaners are a numerical minority and yet they have power and a high social status. Furthermore, the participants indicated that it was most evident in the economic and social sectors of South African society that the numerical minority had a high status. Most importantly, the participants indicated what it meant to them – how it impacted on their identity – to be part of a society where the numerical minority had a high status and the numerical majority were the marginalised, low-

status group. Thus, the results are presented in such a way that they illustrate the participants' discussion around their culture, its meaning to their identities, and its relation to other groups, particularly the numerical majority. The participants' discussion progresses to illustrate how culture is represented in aspects of society, like the media, through language. Finally, the participants discussed how they represent their culture in the economic sector.

Culture, identity and the numerical majority

In both focus groups the personal importance of each participant's culture was made evident. The discussion mostly focussed on predominantly Black, African cultures. It therefore influenced the participants to discuss the implications of belonging to a certain culture, for example:

> *"We we would all probably say we see ourselves as South Africans. But it goes back to the question where we would say 'I'm Zulu' and when that foreigner asks me where do I belong to, I belong to South Africa but I am the core of the Nguni languages."*
> (F3i)

F3i indicates that she is indeed South African, but more than that, she is part of the Nguni nation; her ethnic identity is more of a prominent factor to her than is her national identity. Furthermore, ethnic identity is a salient factor for each of the participants' overall identity formation. Its importance became evident in the first focus group:

> *"I think in South Africa because we're so diverse in cultures there's this pressing need to find your identity, which makes you kind of press yourself towards a certain culture. I know for me personally if I had to find myself in [M1i's] shoes, and the way that I've been brought up, it would be very difficult to find my identity. 'Cause I hold the fact that I'm Zulu close to my heart. And that question you just posed now, I would*

primarily see myself as a Zulu person and that's how I always introduce myself when

someone asks me." (M3i)

M3i's point is that there is such a wide array of cultures and ethnicities in South Africa that it could be easy to lose one's sense of self if one does not have a firm identity in mind. He holds steadfast and strong to his Zulu identity because it is his strongest defining point. Other participants strongly identify with their ethnic backgrounds but those backgrounds are a little more difficult to define making their own identities a little more fluid.

Unlike the Zulu participants F4i seemingly has a choice as to which ethnicity she can relate to and although she chooses to relate to Venda ethnicity she recognises another part of her identity – her Tswana ethnicity:

"Um, I think it's very interesting because when people ask me 'what am I?' I out

rightly say, without even thinking about it, 'I'm Venda'. But I think when you say what

relates to me(-)I suppose if I had to think about it now whilst we're discussing it, I

would be more Tswana." (F4i)

However, that is not to suggest that the Zulu participants do not have a choice. On the contrary, F3i, a Zulu participant, illustrates this:

"But I think if we all wanted to we would modify and be multi-cultural, we could

make the effort. So we make the decision what we actually want to be." (F3i)

In other words, all ethnic groups have a choice as to what ethnic group they would like to belong to. However, the choice might be available but whether a Zulu participant makes the choice to change their ethnicity is doubtful. This was evident in the second focus group where F2ii expressed her connection with Zulu culture and that she feels it is the 'best' culture:

"You can't really call any language an official language in South Africa. Everyone

would have their say. And in my experience within Black people there's always been

those Blacks who say which is the most official out of all the languages" (M1ii)

[interrupted by F2ii]

"That's Zulu..." (F2ii)

Language is an important contributing factor to a culture; it therefore contributes to one's identity and connection to that culture. In both focus groups all of the participants share a strong connection with their ethnic group and culture, and therefore their language. F2ii's comment above, where she automatically assigns her own language as the official language, is indicative of her connection to Zulu. The ethnic group connection is also suggested in the first focus group where the participants state that they relate more to their ethnic culture than to being South African. Other discussants were less forthright with their connection to their ethnic identities. F3ii gives reason as to why she thinks Zulus, like F2ii, would consider themselves to speak the official South African language:

"It's just... I don't wanna be somewhat racist to everyone else but I feel we're the best..." (F2ii)

"It's because we have numbers..." (F3ii)

M4i raises the point that the reason for officialising a language is dependent upon the number of people who speak the language. This further echoes the sentiment that F2ii expresses about Zulu being the official South African language F3ii's reason for that sentiment. M4i states:

"It largely depends on a population group study that shows a majority. It's based on a majority. How many are more and how many are less" (M4i)

F3ii and M4i recognise that numbers have a big role to play in terms of what is deemed a majority and what is deemed official. F2ii takes for granted that having the numerical majority equates to having an official status – a high status, if you will. In the first focus

group, F4i also acknowledges that Zulus have a numerical majority and therefore have more recognition and a higher social status:

> *"And I honestly think the whole recognition thing, it honestly boils down to the majority. And the majority of South Africa is (-) there are more Zulu people than Venda people"* (F4i)

The arguments the participants present appear to be contradictory. Although the discussion is revolving around the numerical majority and recognition the participants acknowledge that these concepts are not rigid. Many of the participants in the first focus group concurred with each other that ethnicity and culture were learned rather than inherited. Therefore, anyone can become Zulu and be acknowledged as the 'best' or become Venda or Ndebele and be part of a marginalised minority:

> *"Like now, I could change from the Zulu culture and move to the Eastern Cape and marry a Xhosa woman and I could totally just drop out my Zulu ways. And I would kind of adopt now a Xhosa culture. In 10 years, 20 years time there's nothing wrong with me saying I've adopted a Xhosa culture."* (M3i)

Many of the participants in the first focus group recognise that culture is not rigid and that to assign a status to one culture above another may perhaps be pointless because anybody can then adopt the high-status culture; culture is an ever-changing concept that can be adopted by anyone. However, this only applies to cultures that are predominantly Black. 'Black' cultures can intermingle and it does not pose any problems. But as soon as predominantly White cultures and Black cultures begin to mix a problem arises for many of the participants:

> *"I think it's very interesting because my younger brother went to an Afrikaans preschool. And for the longest time, for about 2 years, he couldn't speak English, he couldn't speak Venda or Tswana. He spoke strictly Afrikaans. And (-) it was crazy! I*

*suppose that's why they took him out of there. It was **insane** when we realised that"*

(F4i)

The participants imply that it is not possible for cultural lines to cross the racial divide even though it is alright to cross the ethnic divide.

"'Cause like I went to an English primary school but I can speak English and I can speak Xhosa. And I've been at an English school my entire life but I can still speak Xhosa. So surely it's a bit of a problem." (F2i)

F2i implies that there is no excuse for F4i's little brother to not be able to speak any language but Afrikaans because she had a similar experience with English yet she can still speak Xhosa – she can still identify with her ethnicity through language. The racial divide would seemingly only apply to White Afrikaners because the participants involved in the discussion realise that they are conversing in English and that they are influenced by an English culture:

"And I know that my influences largely come from the fact that I'm Zulu. And secondly, other influences like the fact that I speak English is an English culture that I have adopted more than the culture that I have inherited." (M4i)

None of the participants suggest that it is insane to speak English. Yet Afrikaans is a seemingly prohibited language for Black youth to speak. Furthermore, it is implied that it is okay to speak English as long as you can speak another language. The participants are suggesting it is problematic for Black youth to only identify with Afrikaans or English culture and not with any other African culture.

Recognition and status

It is evident that language contributes to the participants' culture and therefore their identity. It is further evident that participants ascribe status to their language through its official recognition. Thus, the participants ascribe status to their culture and ultimately to their

identity. The participants discussed what it means to be recognised and to have a high status and what it means to be a marginalised minority. The participants in the first focus group were conscious of the fact that even as diverse as South Africa is, it still is not as encompassing as it can be. But this acknowledgement merely brought up the question:

"What kind of recognition would those other tribes want?" (M4i)

The majority of the participants in the first focus group felt that recognition was necessary for status but that it was merely a matter of ego. Nevertheless, they felt that it was still necessary to be recognised so that each language and culture can be on equal footing:

"But who's to say that having Xhosa as an official language is better than having Balobedu as an official language. So if you're gonna choose[interrupted]" (F2i)

Balobedu is a language and culture in South Africa that is not official, and F2i is suggesting that if we are able to recognise Xhosa as an official language then we should have no problems with recognising Balobedu as an official language; we should not have to choose which languages become official, and therefore recognised, and which do not. Nevertheless, the participants express that many South African languages are recognised above others. This can be witnessed in the media.

Language in the media. Much of the discourse in both groups was focussed on how culture is recognised, through language, particularly in the media. For example,

"when you are the minority, like my father is a Venda man, if he wants to listen to the news in his home language he needs to ensure that he is home by 17:30. From where he works to Soweto, in the traffic, is rough. Whereas, the Zulu man can listen to his news comfortably at 19:00... That's what it means. It means you are prioritised according to the number you are." (F4i)

F4i states that being recognised and having a high status means that one is prioritised over and above other groups. Furthermore, recognition and high-status are closely tied in with media exposure. For example, in television advertisements, films, and books:

> *"It's the most widely spoken language... But that doesn't mean that it should be the official. And I sometimes get offended. Like, if, you know, you have an international movie portraying South Africa its some Zulu guy. Or like there's some Zulu drum music playing in the background and like a guy in a kilt. [Group laughs] Sorry. Jamming in the background, holding like a spear."* (F1ii)

F1ii expressed strong counter feelings against the Zulu dominance and assumptive position. According to F2i "It doesn't make it right!" that Zulus are afforded such a high status just because they are the numerical majority. The media seemingly has a substantial effect on the recognition and status a culture is afforded. Zulus can be thankful to TV personnel and historians who broadcast the Zulu language and culture across the globe through their acting and writing.

> *"What I'm saying is not that Zulu people have forced their language on other people. What I'm saying is that Zulu's well-known. When you turn on the TV and you see Joe Mafela speaking Zulu, Joe's not forcing Zulu on other people..."* [Interrupted] (M2ii)

> *"I mean, it also goes way before that, like, if you were to ask any White South African about Black history they'll tell you about King Shaka, you know. And I won't lie to you, I don't know any other kings."* (F3ii)

Even though Zulu, the language and culture, experiences media coverage in the form of television and history books the participants also acknowledged other influences that contribute to the status and recognition Zulu receives.

> M1ii: *"But, it doesn't matter where in South Africa you are, if you're not in Natal there is a Zulu influence somewhere else."*

The suggestion is that although there are geographical strongholds for each South African language Zulu predominates across the country and therefore holds the biggest influence; it would be difficult to exclude the numerical majority from any kind of media coverage. The influence and dominance of Zulu is also recognised when commentating sports games. The participants in the first focus group recognised that the national broadcaster, South African Broadcasting Commission (SABC), tends to cater more for the numerical majority. They also expressed the sentiment that this is not fair and that each language should be represented. Even though catering for eleven official languages may provide a problem because of the diverse nature of the languages they still share similarities. These similarities are enough to enable languages to be grouped within a root or base language.

The participants in the second focus group seemed to not be in support of recognising all the possible South African languages. Rather, they suggested that because the South African languages can be grouped into 6 categories – Nguni, Basotho, Venda, Tsonga, English , and Afrikaans – there should be 6 major languages to which SABC caters. Ndebele, Swati, Zulu and Xhosa belong to the Nguni group. Sotho, Tswana, and Pedi belong to the Basotho group. And the others are rather self explanatory. The participants agreed that by grouping the languages SABC contends with 6 base languages as opposed to eleven. SABC can therefore cater to more people using less resources. But SABC must also provide for the languages equally and they must be represented equally:

> *"You know, Kwa-Zulu Natal is an Nguni province. Have Nguni languages at the airport... You know, separate it like that. But then as well with events like that it's a problem because then you have broadcasting and you only have SABC 1, 2, and 3 and you gonna have people complaining ukuthi no one's commenting the sports in*

> *Venda. It's impossible. But my problem is that you'll find one channel is commentating in Zulu, the next is commentating in Xhosa, next in Sotho, another Tswana. When actually it should just be one Nguni language, which is Zulu or Xhosa cause we, well you can't hear everything but you can at least more or less make it. And then one Sotho or Tswana situation..."* (F3ii)

Surprisingly, even though many of the other African languages are excluded, Afrikaans is recognised as a language that should receive its own dedicated sports, Afrikaans-commentating channel on SABC. M3ii pointed out that:

> *"...You've gotta have the Afrikaans people in there representing for the Afrikaans people."* (M3ii)

It was surprising because :

> *"I think it's the oppressive language. It's the past that people don't need to now here..."* (F2ii)

However, it was soon clarified:

> *"But it is a language that exists in South Africa and it's an official language."* (F3ii)
>
> *"Even so... Ay!"* (F2ii)
>
> *"I don't think we can just disregard a language."* (F1ii)
>
> *"The thing is guys is that it's the person who oppressed you, not the language hey."* (F3ii)

Thus, Afrikaans is included in the officially recognised languages because it is a South African language that just cannot be disregarded. However, the results of the discussion further illustrated that Afrikaans cannot be disregarded as a language because of its power and status. This will be discussed in the following section.

The majority and the economy

In terms of the marketing economy the participants found that each South African language plays a role in contributing to the society; some languages play a larger role than others. The participants acknowledge that Afrikaans is a language that receives a substantial amount of recognition. However, they suggest that this is not just because it is a South African language and deserves recognition but because there is status and power behind the language:

"I mean that's catering for money" (M2ii)

M2ii refers to the reason Afrikaans receives so much recognition, in terms of television programming and the like, even though it is spoken by a small percentage of the population in comparison to many of the other African languages. M2ii attributes the Afrikaans recognition to money. This notion is further explored by M2i who suggests that Afrikaans is synonymous with higher wages:

"As much as you have the option of working for a Black man who might not be able to give you as much money to do his garden, or to go to a White person's house where he can give you a little bit more money to do his garden. So therefore you wanna learn Afrikaans so you can communicate with him" (M2i)

M2i indicates that the minority of the population, White Afrikaners, have more money than the majority of the population. This argument is presented from a different perspective:

"If I'm producing a high-quality product and I'm adding a premium to it I'm gonna do it in Afrikaans. If I'm producing a product with low margins and lots of volume I'm going to produce it in an Nguni language." (M2ii)

This statement illustrates the high status afforded to Afrikaners because high-quality products would be targeted towards them. This statement was further explained:

*"Let's be serious!... What is fair? And what is fair is that the people of the system need to make money and provide for their families so we need to be rational. And what is **rational** is to say 'okay fine, so the spending power is with the Afrikaans*

people so let's have Player 23 be an Afrikaans guy. The boep where you're drinking

beer, 'cause that's where their support base is... 'Cause the bottom line is what? Will

determine who gets the recognition." (M2ii)

M2ii explains how he regards Afrikaans speakers as a high-status group with the spending

power to get the necessary recognition. Therefore, the more money a group has the more

power and recognition it has. However, M2ii's statement also raises issues around the

fairness of the system, money equating to recognition, and how he responds to the minority

holding a high-status. The participants refer to a number of advertisements to illustrate this

point. In the first focus group, the *Skip/Omo* advertisement was the focus of the discussion. A

debate ensued:

"How else do you feel about a 'Skip' or an 'Omo' advert where the Black person is

hand-washing and the White person is throwing the clothes in the washing machine?

How do you guys feel about that as a Black consumer? Do you not feel discriminated

against when you have a washing machine at home?" (M1i)

Another respondent countered:

"Can you not understand who those particular ads are targeted for?" (M4i)

M4i continued to explain that he does not feel discriminated against because he

acknowledges that the advertisements are targeted towards specific populations – high-end

products are targeted towards the people who can afford them; in other words, the White

women with washing machines. This acknowledgement of marketing strategies does not

seem to affect M4i as much as it bothers M1i. M1i's offence is evident in his counter

argument to M4i's postulation about what seems to be current marketing strategies:

"Now why can they have that Hunter's Dry advert where they have Black and White

people running around the streets or whatever. And we can relate because Hunter's

Dry can't be afforded by everyone, right? But, we can relate to this ad as young,

vibrant, aspirational, professionals and this is the beverage we're supposed to be

drinking when we go out. All of us! Why can they not take that idea into things like

consumer products, like washing machines and what not? It's purely because still to

this day a lot of advertisers, a lot of advertising firms, don't recognise us. There's

very few Black representation in the creative side of things." (M1i)

M1i suggests that the reason why advertisements seemingly target high-end products towards the minority of the population is not because of buying power. Rather, it is because of a lack of Black representation in advertising companies who can actually change the status-quo and ensure that products are also geared towards the majority of the population. As a result, M1i feels discriminated against because of the lack of representation of the Black middle class in television advertisements and expresses this sentiment:

"For me, it makes me sick to my stomach to see this White woman because they are

ignoring those things that I've just spoken about. The fact that you can do the same

thing with a Black person and achieve the same, or better results." (M1i)

Many of the participants can understand who the advertisements are targeted towards and as a result express strong feelings against the advertising marketing strategies to the extent that they choose not to relate to the advertisement. M1i is disgusted by the fact that the minority group is afforded such a high-status when it is not necessary. However, a different sentiment is expressed towards the marketing strategies and the advertisement:

"I wanna say that I personally feel nothing. Based on the fact that I used to feel so

much and there's so much of that, like, the Golf ad is a White person, the Mini Cooper

ad is a White person, everything is a White person. So if you're going to keep being

petty about all of the ads then you're going to be nowhere." (F4i)

F4i indicates that it is pointless to feel disgusted or angry or discriminated against simply because it will achieve nothing. Seemingly, she has adopted a defeatist attitude.

The working economy. The participants in the second focus group discussed the notion that the financial sector of South Africa is controlled by the minority of the population. This further lead to a discussion regarding what this implies for their positions in the financial sector. M2ii suggests that the numerical minority's high-status is problematic and not something that he particularly enjoys because he has to be "completely untrue to who he is", for example:

> *"if I wanted to stay here and I wanted to succeed in business here, it doesn't matter how awesome my product is, it doesn't matter... Well, it implies a factor, but the most important factor is my connection base. So I need to ascribe to a specific culture. Either that or I need to impress them so wholly that I don't need to change my culture. But more likely than not I'll need to subscribe to their culture, I need to be drinking their wines, completely untrue to who I am."* (M2ii)

The participants observe that it is apparent that in order to become successful, one needs to be Afrikaans or White. F1ii expresses the sentiment that it is not just problematic but also slightly insulting:

> *"It's a whole group of people who are denied... When you're forced within the workplace to hide who you really are and it's not just you being that you're strange. You're representing the majority yet you're not able to reflect that when you're working."* (F1ii)

Both M2ii and F1ii suggest that Black people have no choice in who they become in the workplace; they have to subscribe to a predetermined personality that represents the minority population as opposed to the personality they wish to represent

> *"Basically, to make it in the workplace you just can't be Black."*
>
> ...

"If you want to clench a deal you have to go take someone to play golf. You can't take them to Mzoli's." (F3ii)

"You have to adapt to their environment" (M1ii)

...

"we're forced to not be ourselves in order to make money. And that's a problem! It's not fair that you can't be yourself in order to survive, and live, and feed your kids." (M2ii)

The participants agree that, in the workplace, Black people suffer in the sense that we have to adapt to a White-, male-dominated economic system and disregard our own identities in order to succeed. The participants seemingly feel resentment for the numerical majority having a low-status. This disjuncture in status and power is considered to be inequitable, and almost unjust. Surprisingly, this is not problematic for all the participants because according to F2ii, "it's just the way it's happened to be" because, as F3ii phrases it, "nothing's gonna change". However, some group members still present the discourse that it is not right that things will not change but it is okay because it is working and people are still happy and content. M3ii develops his argument and provides another perspective for accepting the White, male-dominated economic system:

"Adapting is not forgetting who you are. It's really not forgetting who you are. Because you're seeing that's a way to, you know, further your well-being, to strengthen your well-being." (M3ii)

For M3ii it is not problematic for one to have to adapt to another culture in the workplace because it contributes to one's well-being – presumably economic well-being. Furthermore, M3ii suggests that the adaptation of culture is merely temporary and therefore one does not

forget one's identity. Moreover, M4ii offers a different perspective as to why Black people feel they have to adapt to White culture:

> *"Sometimes I just think that we also take, we bring our status down. I mean sometimes if you ask a guy from eKhayalitsha, like 'I wanna go with you to Khayelitsha on weekends', they'll tell you about these bad things like 'you're gonna get robbed' and stuff like that...So before you think of bringing Johann into Khayalitsha... It's a White man, you think of getting involved or you'll think you'll embarrass yourself. So I better go with him to hunt for a kudu than go to Mzoli's"*
> (M4ii)

The suggestion is that the participants are limiting their choices by their perception of their own culture; the participants indicate that their culture is not good enough for display therefore they would rather adapt to a more 'acceptable' cultural practice in a public sphere.

Elitism of the high-status groups

The recognition and high-status afforded to some groups in South Africa, like White Afrikaners and Zulus, has an impact on the way the participants perceive the way in which they are treated. The participants express the sentiment that not only do they resent the minority group for having a high status but they also feel that the minority group does nothing to correct the imbalance.

They don't really care about us. Many of the participants feel that the groups in the positions of power and high-status do not really care about the other groups. F4i indicates that it is pointless to feel disgusted or angry or discriminated against simply because it will achieve nothing. As a result, she has adopted a defeatist attitude:

> *"I feel like it doesn't matter that we are the majority...I feel like even if they have done their research and they find that more Black people have got washing machines the person at the top will still be like 'put Sally in the advert instead of uThembi.' That's what's gonna happen. So I feel that it doesn't matter if a Black person says anything. Right now, the power of our country is still in the minority."* (F4i)

What is important is the feeling that the group that holds the power does not care about the majority of the population – the minority group (White people) does not care about the majority group (Black people). In the second focus group, some of the participants suggested that it was a lack of choice that resulted in the minority group not caring about the majority group:

> *"But only because of the circumstances in which you are currently. You don't have a choice but to suck it up, go to work and do what the big boss says. Otherwise you go home and you have nothing to feed your family with. I think if circumstances were different, if we had the choice, like if we weren't being exploited of our current situation, I think then we'd see change."* (F1ii)

F1ii suggests that Black people's lack of choice is exploited by those in a high-status because it allows them to maintain their high-status whilst Black people retain a low-status. There is evidence to suggest that participants in the focus group felt that White people do not care about the rest of the population because of the power they are able to sway in their favour:

> *"They [White people] don't care."* (F1ii)

A possible suggestion is offered as to why White people do not care to change the imbalance of power:

> *"I feel like there's so many, the minority, and I'm not trying to be whatever, but they, I don't know, I think they find it very difficult to not even understand, but tolerate, Black culture."* (F3ii)

F3ii suggests that it is not simply about wielding power and status for the sake of it. Rather, she indicates that White people do not understand nor do they tolerate Black culture. Therefore, they use their power and status in their favour to maintain a dominating culture that they understand and tolerate. However, White people are not the only 'majority' group. The participants also feel that the numerical majority, Zulus, do not care about the rest of the population. There is the sentiment that Zulus expect people from other ethnicities to know their language because they have "pushed their agenda" but they make no effort to learn other languages. This suggests hypocrisy on the part of the Zulu participants and resentment on the part of the non-Zulu participants.

> *"... most of the Zulu people, like okay, they don't really care where you come from. Maybe you're from Pretoria and you speak Tswana and they don't even ask if you understand Zulu."*
>
> *...*
>
> *"You know, some of us are willing to learn...He'll **never**, he'll **never** take this effort to learn anything or speak to me in Tswana."* (M4ii)

Language is an important part of each participants' identity and therefore it is insulting to the participants when their language – part of their identity – is trivialised and marginalised. M4ii states that Zulus do not care enough about his culture to learn his language. Furthermore, they do not care where he is from or how he constructs his identity; they simply take these aspects for granted and expect him to adopt a Zulu culture.

These results illustrate the ways in which the participants construct their identity and the importance they assign to their culture and language, and their recognition. Furthermore, the results illustrate how the participants perceive the representation of their culture and language in the media. Finally, they illustrate the way in which the participants perceive their position

as a low-status group in the economic sector and the implications therein. The discussion to follow will make sense of the participants perceptions and constructs of identity.

4. DISCUSSION

The focus group discussions were intended to assess the ways in which Black youth perceived their status within the numerical majority group in South Africa. However, the discussions yielded results that represented themes of ethnicity and language and how they relate to culture and identity; these included many of the South African cultures, including White cultures. The analysis revealed that by discussing what it means to be part of the (numerical) majority the participant's were also discussing what it means to be Black in South Africa. The discussions unfolded in two directions: firstly, the results illustrated the impact that being part of the numerical majority has on the participants' identities within the social context. And secondly, they illustrated the impact that being part of the numerical majority has on the participants' identities within the workplace and media.

By discussing their identities in two contexts the participants illustrated that they view the South African social context through two lenses – a cultural and racial lens. Through the cultural lens, their personal identities, in relation to their culture, was the focal point. In addition, their cultures were represented through language. As mentioned, of the 15 participants, 7 of them were Zulu. This numerical majority in the discussions influenced the direction of the discussions; just as it was stressed that Zulus are dominating and domineering so it was that they dominated the topic of discussion. Consequently, marginalised, numerical minority groups were absent from the topic of discussion because they were barely represented in the groups. They were also absent from the discussion because the focus of the

discussion inadvertently excluded minority groups. Thus, through the cultural lens, it was observed that the numerical majority, Zulus, maintained a high status over and above the other groups.

The inclusion of Afrikaans culture, a minority culture, as a topic of discussion contradicted the discussions regarding the numerical majority receiving a high status. This highlighted the discussion through the racial lens because it considered White Afrikaners. Afrikaans was not included among the other marginalised groups; it was given a high status through its inclusion as a major topic of discussion. This is contrary to the typical finding that the numerical majority has a high status; the numerical minority had a high status in this discussion. This disjuncture questions normative assumptions of what it means to be a majority; it provides reason for explicit terminology such as 'numerical majority'. However, this untypical finding was problematic for the group for two reasons. Firstly, Afrikaans has a high status as a result of illegitimate circumstances, namely Apartheid. This has resulted in all of the participants belonging to the low status group. The members of the group are attempting to preserve their own sense of identity by preserving the group's identity whilst at the same time being biased against the high-status group. They therefore attempted to ascribe as many negative characteristics onto the high-status group. Secondly, it is seemingly unappealing for the numerical majority to be the low status group; it is like the biggest child on the playground being bullied by a much smaller child.

Representations in the media of Black people and culture was mainly observed through the racial lens. It was a sensitive point to mention that the media misrepresents Black people because it lacks Black representation within the structures. Thus, the marginalisation of the numerical majority in the media is perhaps a result of the lack of Black creative directors. However, a different perspective could be that because Black people feel that they are unable to express their identities freely within the workplace it is evident in the lack of

Black expression in television advertisements; rather, Black people are adapting White cultural practices in the workplace and are therefore showcasing this on television. In a different vain, it was expressed that White people cannot understand or tolerate Black culture. And because White people have the power and the final decision in the workplace it is that final decision that excludes 'incomprehensible' and 'intolerable' Black representation from being aired on television. Either way, the limited expression of Black people can be seen to be a product of the numerical minority's high status and the marginalisation of the numerical majority. It raises concerns regarding the necessity for having groups with statuses. Equal status groups would be ideal because it would avoid intergroup conflict and bias. South Africa is a society constantly striving for equality yet it fails to adjust for the disparity of status of the groups.

Limitations and recommendations

The timeframe in which to conduct this research was an initial limitation because it rushed the data collection and analysis procedures. As a result, few participants were involved in the process thereby limiting the extent of exploring the discourses around identity construction for Black South African youth belonging to the low-status numerical majority group. It would therefore be best for this research to be conducted over a longer period of time so that more focus groups can be conducted and analysed for more extensive results. The participants were acquaintances of mine and therefore the possibility of bias in representing the construction of their identities was present. However, this relationship with the participants assisted in the comfort of the participants and therefore their willingness to reveal controversial aspects of their identity. The use of focus groups precluded more in-depth personal explorations of identity formation in a low-status numerical majority group. Furthermore, some participants were more expressive than others. Consequently, not everybody responded with the same

depth, and important aspects of the participants' identities and sentiments may not be included in the findings. Nevertheless, the majority of the themes that emerged from each of the two focus groups were highly congruent. Not to mention the research was focussed on exploring group sentiments as opposed to individual constructions.

Concluding remarks

I discovered that many young Black South Africans are still impacted by the lingering effects Apartheid had on South Africa. This impact is represented in the way that Black youth perceive their own identities in a low-status group in relation to the high-status group. Even though English, as a language, is an access tool to success Black youth still hold dear to their languages as they form a salient part of their identities; similarly with key cultural practices. Consequently, it is problematic for Black youth to be in the numerical majority yet at the same time be in the low-status, marginalised group; we would much prefer equal statuses and recognition in all aspects of society.

REFERENCES

Abrams, D. (1996). Social identity, self as structure and self as process. In W. P. Robinson

(Ed.) *Social groups and identities: Developing the legacy of Henri Tajfel* (pp. 143-

167). Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Alberts, C., Mbalo, N. F., & Ackermann, C. J. (2003). Adolescents' perceptions of the

relevance of domains of identity formation: A South African cross-cultural study.

Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 32, 169-184.

American Communication Journal (2008). Key to transcription symbols. Retrieved October

21, 2009, from

http://www.acjournal.org/holdings/vol9/spring/articles/sensemaking/transcription_sy

mbols

Bettencourt, B. A. & Bartholow, B. D. (1998). The importance of status legitimacy for

intergroup attitudes among numerical minorities. *Journal of Social Issues, 54*, 759-

775.

Boddy-Evans, A. (2001). Apartheid legislation in South Africa: Starting in 1948, the

Nationalist government in South Africa enacted laws to define and enforce

segregation. *African History*. Retrieved May 17, 2009, from

http://africanhistory.about.com/library/bl/blsalaws.html

Campbell, C. M. (1995). The social identity of township youth: An extension of Social

Identity Theory: I. *South African Journal of Psychology*, *25*(3), 150-159.

Cunningham, E., & Platow, M. J. (2007). On helping lower-status out-groups: The nature of

the help and the stability of the intergroup status hierarchy. *Asian Journal of Social*

Psychology, 10, 258-264.

Duckitt, J., & Mphuthing, T. (1998). Group identification and intergroup attitudes: A longitudinal analysis in South Africa. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 80-85.

Emler, N. & Hopkins, N. (1990). Reputation, social identity and the self. In M. A. Hogg & D. Abrams (Eds.) *Social Identity Theory: Constructive and critical advances* (pp. 113-130). Hertfordshire: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Heaven, P., Stones, C., Simbayi, L., & Le Roux, A. (2000). Human values and social identities among samples of White and Black South Africans. *International Journal of Psychology*, *35*(1), 67-72.

Henry, P. J. & Saul, A. (2006). The development of system justification in the developing world. *Social Justice Research, 19*, 365-378.

Hocoy, D. (1999). The validity of Cross's model of black racial identity development in the South African context. *Journal of Black Psychology, 25*, 131-151.

Hogg, M. A. (1996). Intragroup processes, group structure and social identity. In W. P. Robinson (Ed.) *Social groups and identities: Developing the legacy of Henri Tajfel* (pp. 65-93). Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Hogg, M. A. & Abrams, D. (1988). *Social identifications: A social Psychology of intergroup relations and group processes.* London: Routledge.

Hong, Y., Liao, H., Chan, G., Wong, R. Y. M., Chiu, C., et al. (2006). Temporal causal links between outgroup attitudes and social categorization: The case of Hong Kong 1997 transition. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 9*, 265-288.

Kenworthy, J. B., Hewstone, M., Levine, J. M., Martin, R., & Willis, H. (2008). The phenomenology of majority-minority status: Effects on innovation in argument generation. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *38*, 624-636.

Kim, J., & Ng, S. H. (2008). Perceptions of social changes and social identity: Study focusing

    on Hong Kong society after reunification. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 11*,

    232-240.

Leach, C. W., & Spears, R. (2008). "A Vengefulness of the Impotent": The pain of in-group

    inferiority and schadenfreude toward successful out-groups. *Journal of Personality*

    and Social Psychology, 95, 1383-1396.

Liebkind, K., Henning-Lindblom, A., & Solheim, E. (2008). Group size, group status, and

    trait valence as determinants of intergroup bias: Stereotyping in Finland and Sweden.

    European Journal of Social Psychology, 38, 637-651.

Madill, A., & Gough, B. (2008). Qualitative research and its place in psychological science.

    Psychological Methods, 13, 254-271.

Mid-year population estimates. (2008, July 31). Retrieved May 13, 2009, from

    http://www.statssa.gov.za/publications/P002/P03022008.pdf

News24, (2007, January 23). Yengeni: Slaughter 'Complex.' News24. Retrieved May 14,

    2009, from http://www.news24.com/News24/South_Africa/Politics/0,,2-7-

    12_2058420,00.html

Painter, D., & Theron, W. (2001). Heading South! Importing discourse analysis. *South*

    African Journal of Psychology, 31, 1-8.

Parker, I. (2005). *Qualitative psychology: Introducing radical research*. England: Open

    University Press.

Peeters, M. C. W., & Oerlemans, W. G. M. (2009). The relationship between acculturation

    orientations and work-related well-being: Differences between ethnic minority and

    majority employees. *International Journal of Stress Management, 16*, 1-24.

Polkinghorne, D. E. (2005). Language and meaning: Data collection in qualitative research.

    Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52, 137-145.

Quarterly labour force survey. (2009, May 5). Retrieved May 13, 2009, from

http://www.statssa.gov.za/publications/P0211/P02111stQuarter2009.pdf

Redersdorff, S.& Martinot, D. (2009). Being outperformed in an intergroup context: The

relationship between group status and self-protective strategies. *British Journal of

Social Psychology, 48*, 275-294.

Rennie, D., Watson, K., & Monteiro, A. (2002). The rise of qualitative research in

psychology. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie canadienne*, *43*, 179-189.

Shinnar, R. S. (2008). Coping with negative social identity: The case of Mexican immigrants.

The Journal of Social Psychology, 148, 553-575.

Sibley,C. G. & Barlow, F. K. (2009). Ubiquity of whiteness in majority group national

imagination: Australian = White, but New Zealander does not. *Australian Journal of

Psychology, 61*, 119-127.

Smith, E. J. (1991). Ethnic identity development: Toward the development of a theory within

the context of majority/minority status. *Journal of Counselling and Development, 70*,

181-188.

Spears, R., Ellemers, N., & Doosje, B. (2009). Strength in numbers or less is more? A matter

of opinion and a question of taste. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 35*,

1099-1111.

Tajfel, H. (1978). Social categorization, social identity and social comparison. In H. Tajfel

(Ed.) *Differentiation between social groups: Studies in the social psychology of

intergroup relations* (pp. 61-76). London: Academic Press Inc.

Taylor, S. (2001). Introduction. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, & S. J. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse as

data: A guide for analysis* (pp. 9-41). United Kingdom: Sage Publications.

Tropp, L. R., & Pettigrew, T. F. (2005). Relationships between inter group contact and

    prejudice amongst minority and majority status groups. *Psychological Science, 16*,

    951-957.

Tropp, L. R., & Bianchi, R. A. (2006). Valuing diversity and interest in intergroup contact.

    Journal of Social Issues, 62, 533-551.

van Dijk, T. A. (1985). Introduction: The role of discourse analysis in society. In T. A. van

    Dijk (Ed.), *Handbook of discourse analysis, Vol. 4: Discourse analysis in society* (pp.

    1-8). London: Academic Press.

Wenzel, M., Mummendey, A., & Waldzus, S. (2007). Superordinate identities and intergroup

    conflict: The ingroup projection model. *European Review of Social Psychology, 18,*

    331-372.

Willig, C. (1999). *Applied discourse analysis: Social and psychological interventions.*

    Buckingham, United Kingdom: Open University Press.

Xaba, J. & Mofokeng, L. L. (2005). Diversity, institutional transformation, and minority

    groups: Reflections on the dilemmas facing higher education institutions.

    International Journal of Diversity, 5, 76-88.

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 (Liberty Eaton; liberty.eaton@uct.ac.za).

7. Pay participants (R100 each).

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?"

"Black people are the numerical majority in SA. What does it mean for blacks that we are the majority in the sense of being 80% of the population?"

→ After responses to this general question, get participants to reflect specifically on the **relative position of their group within SA.**

Guide the discussion to reflect on three domains:

Economic power / status

Political power / status

Cultural power / status

→ Lead the discussion towards the participants relating these group positions to how it affects them individually:

"So how does it affect you personally to know that you are part of the numerical majority and yet you do not hold economic power?"

APPENDIX B

Consent Form

University of Cape Town

Faculty of Humanities

Consent Form

Title of research project: Identity Formation amongst South African young adults

Names of principal researchers: Thabang Sekete, Carly Abramovitz, & Liberty Eaton

Department/research group address: Psychology Department, Humanities Building, University Road, Upper Campus, University of Cape Town, Rondebosch, 7700.

Telephone: 021 650 4444

Email: skttha004@uct.ac.za; liberty.eaton@uct.ac.za

Name of participant:

Nature of the research: The nature of the research is to discuss the way identity is constructed and expressed in South African young adults.

Participant's involvement: You, the participant, will simply be required to engage in conversation with six other individuals of similar age. The topic of conversation will be around the way you construct and perceive your South African identity.

What's involved: You, the participant, will be required to join in a discussion with six other people around identity formation in South Africa and what it means to you.

Risks: There are no risks involved in this research. However, if you feel you do not want to participate you may leave at any time.

Benefits: You will be able to discover what your fellow South Africans have to say about their identities and perhaps meet like-minded individuals.

Payment: At the end of the focus group you will receive R100.00 cash

I agree to participate in this research project.

I have read this consent form and the information it contains and had the opportunity to ask questions about them.

I agree to my responses being used for education and research on condition my privacy is respected, subject to the following:

- I understand that my personal details may be included in the research so that I will not be personally identifiable.

- I understand that I am under no obligation to take part in this project.

- I understand I have the right to withdraw from this project at any stage.

Signature of Participant / Guardian (if under 18): _____

Name of Participant / Guardian: _____

Signature of person who sought consent: _____

Name of person who sought consent: _____

Signatures of principal researchers: a)_____ (name)

b)_____ (name)

c)_____ (name)

Date: _____

APPENDIX C

Transcription Symbols

[[ ]]

[[ ]]   Overlapping talk

=   Latched or nearly overlapping turns at talk

[ ]   Transcriber's description and translation

(.)   Very brief untimed intervals of silence

(-)   Long pauses

Bold   Stressed words

?   Rising intonation (not necessarily indicative of a question)

.   Cascading intonation that rises at the beginning and falls at the end of an

                utterance (not necessarily the end of a sentence)

,   Cascading but continuing intonation (not necessarily the end of a clause or

                phrase)