South African national identity: A research agenda for Social Psychologists

Liberty Eaton
Department of Psychology, University of Cape Town,
Private Bag, Rondebosch 7701

South African social psychology has largely neglected the topic of national identity. Where the issue has been addressed, the theories applied and questions posed have been limited by the dominant 'intergroup relations' paradigm. This paper is an attempt to encourage local social psychologists to take a renewed interest in national identification processes. The paper argues for the intrinsic academic interest, and the practical social importance, of this topic in the South African context. A range of international research is presented, arranged according to a typology of national identity work suggested by Reicher, Hopkins and Condor (1997). Existing research within the Social Cognitive, Social Identity Theory / Self-Categorisation Theory, and discursive traditions, is shown to offer a wealth of ideas for exploration in South Africa. The intention is to stimulate the development of a lively research agenda for the study of South African national identity.

National identity in South Africa

> *As South Africa attempts to negotiate the transformation from an identity based on racial separateness to an identity based on shared loyalty to the new South African state, of critical political and scholarly importance is the question of how the contours of this new South African nation are being defined.... understanding fully the implications of the current nation-building process is paramount. For example, how, or can, a country so deeply and historically divided...unite around a common national identity; what will or should provide the content of that identity; and what is the relationship, real or assumed, between a strong and cohesive national identity and the functioning of a stable democratic state?* Croucher, 1998, 640-641

Social analysts agree that the way in which South African national identity was construed by the Apartheid regime was exclusionary and divisive, premised as it was on reified racial categories and an ideology of 'separate development'. Formal citizenship and political representation were denied to the vast majority of the country's inhabitants until 1994. Black ethnic groups were conceptualised as distinct 'nations' apart from the White 'nation', with other races not being accorded any specific national identity. Until 1994 the South African national symbols of the flag and anthem represented only the White English and Afrikaans group identities and cultural heritage, to the total exclusion of all others.

Meanwhile, many intellectuals within the resistance movement countered this version of South African national identity with a pan-Africanist discourse. The ANC and PAC both adopted strongly Africanist identities, rather than focusing on a national identity within South Africa. The anthem of the resistance movement, N'kosi sikelela iAfrika, speaks of an African identity that goes beyond the borders of South Africa. The 'white' South African flag and anthem were seen as symbols of oppression, and had no power to elicit loyalty of identification with a broader community of South Africa. During the negotiations after 1990, it became clear that just as the Apartheid regime had refused to see Black inhabitants of the country as legitimate citizens, so certain radical African groups were refusing to see the White 'settlers' as part of the new nation.

It is therefore no surprise that South African national identity was a hotly debated topic during the period 1990 to 1996. Despite the various positions taken, there seemed to be a general consensus among lay people, politicians and intellectuals that the country lacked a cohesive, commonly accepted national identity, and that South Africans therefore did not have a sense of unified nationhood (Mattes, Taylor, & Poore, 1997). In the words of Heribert Adam, "A South African nation has yet to be born. South Africa at present constitutes an economic and political entity, but not an emotional one" (Adam, 1994, 46). The lack of an acceptably inclusive, pre-existing sense of nationhood led to much discussion about how to create one. The discourse of 'nation-building' came to be prevalent in the media (such as the SABC's 'Simunye' slogan), political rhetoric (for example, Archbishop Desmond Tutu's popularisation of the 'Rainbow Nation' metaphor), and even on the sports field (the 1995 World Cup Rugby contest being hailed as a triumph of reconciliation and nation-building) (Baines, 1998; Mattes *et al.*,1997). The then president Nelson Mandela gave his full support to the nation-building ethos, frequently emphasising the need for reconciliation and unity.

The popular discourse of 'Rainbowism' was criticised by some commentators at the time as reifying and emphasising cultural difference (*e.g.* Baines, 1998; Boyce, 1997). Liberal intellectuals also warned against the possible dangers of an unexamined, blithely accepted nation-building agenda: the possibility of oppressive social engineering for homogemeity, a Jacobin state nationalism that would override the identities of minorities (*e.g.* Boyce, 1997; Degenaar, 1994). The ANC's openly expressed desire to assert the hegemony of Africanism, rather than promoting total pluralism, was also noted with some concern by those favouring a multicultural model (Baines, 1998).

Since 1997, there appears to have been a shift away from the nation-building discourse in the public sphere. The post-election euphoria has abated, and public debate has changed focus to other issues. Identity politics, however, still remain vital and contested: for example, in the period 1999 to 2000 there was lively debate in the press about Afrikaner identity in the new South Africa, and 'White guilt'. The new ANC leadership has also presented a significantly different vision of national identity. Since 1999, President Thabo Mbeki has steered away from Mandela's nation-building discourse, choosing to promote the supra-national ideal of the 'African Renaissance' and 'African Century'. Instead of inspirational, idealistic 'Rainbow Nation' talk, Mbeki has focused on lingering racism and social inequality within South Africa. Mbeki has argued that South Africa is not one nation but two: affluent Whites and poor Blacks (Mbeki, 2000). The question is whether this stark critical analysis will succeed in promoting social transformation and goodwill.

Why is national identity important?

Why should we be interested in national identity in South

Africa? Is such an identity not just a product of politicians' rhetoric, media hype, and the tendency of people to want to identify with something powerful and transcendent? Should we take seriously a notion that captures the most irrational of people's emotions and loyalties, but which offers no solutions to real socio-economic problems? Why study South African national identity when no-one seems to think that such a thing exists?

This paper is based on the author's belief in the intrinsic interest and discipline-specific value offered by the social psychological study of national identity. But a compelling and more practical argument comes from political philosophers. It is argued that countries require most of their citizens to adopt a shared sense of nationhood as a prerequisite for the democratic and successful functioning of the state (Mattes, 1999; O'Malley, 1994). The state will not be able to exercise peaceful authority over its citizens unless they perceive themselves to be members of a national collectivity, and are willing to make sacrifices for the good of the 'nation' (such as paying taxes). A sense of nationhood also prevents 'divided societies' from being torn apart by sectarian conflicts and recidivism. For a democracy to function, its citizens must accept the appropriateness of the demarcated territory which bears that country's name; must see themselves as members of that community; and must be proud of that membership and willing to support it (Mattes, 1999). An "imagined community" (Anderson, 1991) that coincides with the boundaries of the country is crucial in developing legitimacy for the state and the communal processes of citizenship. For a newly-democratised, multicultural state such as South Africa, 'national legitimacy' and a subjective sense of shared group membership among citizens is crucial for the establishment of effective democratic governance and civil stability.

It is, however, apparent that the social fissures and sectarian pressures in a country like South Africa can make it all the more difficult for the populace to subscribe to a unifying national identity (Mattes, 1999). The social identity dynamics of national identification, and the accompanying social representations and attitudes towards the national 'imagined community', would seem to pose many important questions to social psychologists.

South African Social Psychological research on national identity

The South African Social Psychology scene in the Twentieth Century was dominated by an intergroup or 'race relations' approach (Sennett & Foster, 1996). A review of publications in seven South African Psychology and behavioural science journals between 1948 and 1988 reports that the majority of social psychological research published locally during that period was cross-racial perceptions, attitudes and stereotyping (55%). Astonishingly, there appears not to have been *any* social psychological research focusing on South African national identity to have been published in South Africa between 1948 and 1988 – a remarkable revelation (Seedat, 1998). Of course research has been published elsewhere, but a search of international journals and databases finds even international publication output to be very scant. It appears that before 1990 in South Africa, social psychology all but ignored national identity as a topic for research.

Before 1990, national identity and patriotism sometimes featured in research into White political attitudes and identities (*e.g.* Heaven, 1984; Morse & Nell, 1977). But it has only been since 1990 that social scientific researchers have really taken an interest in issues of national identity. Out of all the research that has been reported, however, only a small proportion can be classed as Social Psychological in nature. Within this group, the research approach is often fairly generic and descriptive, rather than testing particular theories, with large-scale surveys conducted by research institutes forming a significant proportion of the research. The work has been almost entirely quantitative.

It is beyond the scope of this paper to present a comprehensive review of the literature to date. The point here is to illustrate the kinds of research that have, and have not, been carried out. This author has attempted to locate any research dating from 1990 on South African national identity. The following summary may therefore not be exhaustive, but it is reasonably comprehensive.

The research topics and variables that have been included for investigation have been:

- Endorsement (by checking the category) of South African national identity (Finchilescu & Dawes, 1999)
- The importance of national identity to the self (the 1997 Idasa survey, reported by Mattes *et al.*, 1997; Sennett & Foster, 1996)
- Rankings of national identity among other social identities (Bornman, 1995; Finchilescu & Dawes, 1999; Kotze, 1997; Mattes *et al.*,1997)
- Identification with racial or ethno-linguistic social categories (Bornman, 1995; Finchilescu & Dawes, 1999; Kotze, 1997; Mattes *et al.*, 1997; Sennett & Foster, 1996)
- National pride (Mattes *et al.*, 1997; Møller, Dickow, & Harris, 1999)
- Support for the Rainbow Nation ideal (Møller *et al.*, 1999)
- Orientations towards the future: optimism, hopes, fears and expected outcomes (Braungart & Braungart, 1995; Finchilescu & Dawes, 1999; Harris, 1997)
- Feelings of connectedness with fellow citizens (Møller *et al.*, 1999)
- The extent to which different experiences or symbols connected to the country evoke pride or patriotism (Møller *et al.*, 1999; Sennett & Foster, 1996)
- The way in which F.W. de Klerk constructed his version of the "New South African" identity (Roper, 1997)

Except for the single qualitative study (Roper, 1997), the focus has been on differences between ethnic and racial groups on central variables of national identification and pride. In some cases, correlations between these and other identity variables have been calculated, such as between strength of national and ethnic identity (*e.g.* Mattes *et al.*, 1997).

Overall, these studies suggest that the salience of both ethnic and national identity increased during the transition to democracy (Finchilescu & Dawes, 1999; Mattes *et al.*, 1997; Sennet & Foster, 1996). This is reflected in higher rates of endorsement of ethnic and national labels in all groups, as well as increased ratings of the importance of these categories to the self in some groups. Identification with the country appears to be accompanied by pride in that identity. Various national surveys during the 1994 to 1997 period (Mattes *et al.*, 1997; Møller *et al.*, 1999) find that the vast majority of South Africans express pride in their country and citizenship. Additional findings relating directly to the issue of 'nation building' were that 82% of respondents believed that people should think of themselves as South African before some group label, and 83% said that it is desirable to create one unified nation (Mattes *et al.*, 1997).

The main conclusion that has been drawn from these findings is that sub-national ethnic, racial or linguistic identities are compatible with an overarching sense of national identity. It is possible for citizens of South Africa to have high "across the board" social identity salience (Sennett & Foster, 1996). Put

another way, "it is possible to have high national identity amidst the multiple group identities of a diverse society such as South Africa" (Mattes *et al.*, 1997, 17). The findings of high national pride and identification would seem to provide evidence for the existence of the crucial 'national legitimacy' or consensus about nationhood discussed by Mattes (1999).

The picture is not, however, entirely rosy. Research has found persistent differences between the identity patterns of the main ethno-linguistic groups. It appears that Black South Africans are most proud of their country and the new political dispensation, with Coloured and Indian South Africans somewhat ambivalent. White South Africans show less pride in the country, coupled with sometimes high levels of negativity and alienation towards the new dispensation (Finchilescu & Dawes, 1999; Møller *et al.*, 1999). There is also a marked difference between ethnic groups in expectations about the future and levels of optimism, reflecting a similar pattern of comparative Black optimism and White pessimism (Harris, 1997).

Apart from complex differences between racial groups, the research also points to differences in levels of national identification and pride between provinces (Finchilescu & Dawes, 1999; Harris, 1997), social classes (Finchilescu & Dawes, 1999; Møller *et al.*, 1999), supporters of different political parties (Møller *et al.*, 1999), and age groups (Finchilescu & Dawes, 1999; Møller *et al.*, 1999). Thus, while ethnicity was undoubtedly a primary organiser of experience for South Africans at the time these studies were conducted, it is clear that there are many additional factors affecting people's patterns of identification in South Africa. More research is needed to unravel the contextual influences of these other social cleavages and alignments.

All of the findings discussed above require further elaboration and investigation. The research to date has barely scratched the surface, and raises more questions than it has answered. The main problem is that the approach taken to national identity has followed closely from the 'intergroup relations' paradigm without branching out into other lines of enquiry. The resulting research questions are narrow, and when they have a theoretical background (which appears not always to be the case), the theory is limited to certain aspects of Tajfellian Social Identity Theory, Realistic Conflict theory, Relative Deprivation Theory and various developmental perspectives on political socialisation. There is no reference to newer theories being applied to national identity elsewhere in the world. In addition to this, the methods used have been extremely limited. There is no experimental work, and only unpublished qualitative research, relating to national identity. The published work is mostly questionnaire-based research. But even the potential of this method has not been fully tapped. The kinds of questions asked – and *not* asked – reveal a simplistic, theoretically-impoverished operationalisation of complex social identity issues.

One example will serve to illustrate the opportunities that have been overlooked. The research to date has asked people to endorse, rate or rank the identity 'South African' without first establishing *what that identity term means to people*. Mattes *et al.* (1997) note that many of the apparent contradictions in recent survey findings may be due to respondents' differing definitions or schemas of national identity. The fact that in 1996 sports victories made affluent white men feel most proud of being South African, while poor black people were made to feel most proud by the economic Reconstruction and Development Programme, and by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (Møller *et al.*, 1999), suggests that South Africans from different social groups may have very different ways of imagining the nation. The apparent contradictions emerging from the research, such as high Black national pride coupled with relatively low endorsement of the self-categorisation 'South African', and the reverse appearing among White respondents, call for a thorough investigation of the way national identity is construed in these groups.

The challenge and the opportunity is clear: it is time to broaden the range of theory and method that is applied to the question of national identity in South Africa. Where to from here?

Developing an agenda for research on South African national identity: starting points

Mattes (1999) sets out an admirable research agenda for investigating the relationships between sub-national identities (especially ethnicity), national legitimacy, regime legitimacy, and the success of democracy and civil society. The focus here is on the challenges that a multicultural society poses for the establishment of democracy and civil society. Mattes provides a set of interconnected, testable hypotheses: for example, that the more strongly people identify with a sub-national identity group, the less likely they are to tolerate members of out-groups, to participate in democratic politics, or to comply with rules made by government.

A shortcoming of this research agenda is that it is very focused on showing whether or not sub-national identities are compatible or incompatible with national loyalty and democratic principles. The research evidence seems to suggest that, in South Africa, sub-national identities are not *in principle* dissonant with national legitimacy and identification. The real question is under what specific conditions identification with a sub-national group might lead to lowered identification with the whole national community, and under what conditions this would spill over into undemocratic behaviour. (Mattes does suggest one such variable: that of relative political status and power. This will be discussed later).

Mattes' suggestions, while well-developed and detailed, represent just one potential avenue for research. A survey of international research suggests the diversity of research questions, theories and methods that could be applied to South Africa.

International research and theory on national identity

The lack of research in South Africa, discussed above, is not unique. Social psychologists in Great Britain have recently pointed out how the discipline has neglected national identity compared to other forms of social identity (Breakwell, 1996; Reicher, Hopkins, & Condor, 1997). But the global increase in ethno-national conflict in the later part of the Twentieth Century, as well as the moves towards European economic union in the last decade, appear to have had a galvanising effect on the study of national identity. European and British social psychologists in particular are currently working on a wide set of research questions pertaining to national identity.

Reicher *et al.* (1997) provide a useful typology of psychological approaches to national identity research. Three general types of research are identified. 'Individualistic' approaches, including the social-cognitive paradigm, predominate in the USA. According to Reicher *et al.* (1997), researchers in this school of thought tend to be skeptical of group-level perceptions. These researchers see national stereotypes or nationalistic sentiment as mass pathology at worst, sub-optimal cognitive processing at best. Another branch of this approach extrapolates personality metaphors to apply to 'national character'. (It is also fair to say that researchers in the USA do not pay national identity nearly as much attention as do their colleagues in the UK and Europe,

perhaps because national identity in that country has not been brought to the fore and rendered problematic as it has in recent times in Europe.)

The second type of research, based in Europe, applies Social Identity Theory (SIT) and Self-Categorisation Theory to the category of 'nation'. This research tradition focuses on the general processes of inter-group perceptions and stereotyping that flow from people's identification with a national category.

Lastly, British and European researchers have more recently begun applying critical analysis to the discourses and rhetoric used to construct and contest specific versions of national identity.

Reicher, *et al.* (1997) are extremely critical of the individualistic 'national character' and social cognitive approaches to national identity. Research on 'national character' is seen to use an individualistic metaphor of personality, and apply it inappropriately to a collectivity. Both of these individualistic approaches are seen to "deny the possibility of any social structuration" through their reductionism (Reicher *et al.*, 1997, 80). They are also criticised for being profoundly socially conservative, in that they attribute inequalities between groups to differences between the members of the groups, and do not consider the possibility of social change.

Reicher *et al.* (1997) do not reject Social Identity Theory as an approach to the study of group psychology. They value the contribution of the SIT research tradition, and support its approach to studying the psychological *effects* of identifying with the 'nation'. But Reicher *et al.* (1997) consider SIT to have important limitations. Firstly, as a general theory of group identities, SIT does not provide any insight into the specific features of national identity, as opposed to any other social identity. It cannot explain why people are more willing to die for their nation than for most other social groups. Secondly, SIT's focus on cognitions comes at the expense of the study of emotions and evaluations. SIT does not contribute to understanding the passion that is elicited by national identity, or the value attached to it. Thirdly, SIT focuses on the consequences of identifying with a group, and takes the definition of the group for granted. It does not pay attention to the antecedents of group membership: that is, the construction of the category prior to self-categorisation. SIT tends to see category definition as 'natural', passive and consensual, thereby failing to acknowledge the strategic, active and contested nature of national identity construction.

Reicher, *et al.* favour a discursive approach. They accept the implications of SIT for identification with a pre-defined national category. They also acknowledge that discursive or rhetorical approaches run the risk of "losing sight of the subject" (1997, 80). But they stress the need to investigate how national identities are constructed and contested, how they are advanced in favour of particular social causes, and what constrains them. This requires the analysis of talk -- and action. Behaviour must be incorporated into theories or investigations of national identity, since the possibilities of identity formation and enactment are constrained by the actions of others. Reicher *et al.* (1997, 83) propose that national identity research should aim to "examine the continuous interplay between discourse, identity and action".

Reicher *et al.* (1997), and more recently Reicher and Hopkins (2000), provide a compelling argument for a discursive approach to national identity. They also acknowledge that SIT research (often in the form of experiments) has a contribution to make. But to read their critiques of the 'individualistic' social cognitive paradigm, one would think that this approach has nothing meaningful to offer the social psychologist. Perhaps this is true for those who reject traditional attitude-based social psychological research on the grounds that it denies social structuration. But for those trained in the American tradition of social and political psychology, who see attitudes as being social in nature even through they are studied at the individual level, the social cognitive approach can still offer rich pickings in research on South African national identity. It could be argued that we should be guided by the principle of triangulation through multiple theories and methods. It does not seem unreasonable to encourage researchers to choose whichever theoretical approach they find most stimulating, if they pick research questions that are worth asking.

Within the three main approaches outlined above, a number of different research topics and angles can be identified. Some of them are more applicable to the South African context than are others. Those avenues offering the most fruitful directions for exploration in this country will be discussed below. The following discussion is by no means a comprehensive review of current international research. Rather, it highlights examples of interesting work, arranged according to the typology presented by Reicher *et al.* (1997). The aim is to encourage local researchers in their thinking about new avenues for investigation in the South African context.

Areas for possible exploration in South Africa

Ideas from the American social-cognitive tradition

1. Type of attachment to the nation: Nationalism versus Patriotism.

In the political psychology literature, patriotism and nationalism are seen as two distinct types of attachment to the nation. Patriotism is love of one's country/nation coupled to a benign attitude towards other countries. Nationalism is usually defined as love of one's country/nation combined with an attitude of superiority or belligerence toward other countries/nations (militaristic nationalism). It can also take the form of a desire to keep the nation culturally 'pure' (Schatz & Staub, 1997), or be expressed through economic nationalism: a zero-sum competitive mentality to international economic relations which seeks to advantage one's own country over others (Baughn & Yaprak, 1996).

The two dimensions of nationalism and patriotism are positively correlated with each other, but can be distinguished through factor analysis (Feshbach & Sakano, 1997; Kosterman & Feshbach, 1989; Mueller-Peters, 1998; Sidanius, Feshbach, Levin, & Pratto, 1997). Patriotism can be seen as 'pure' categorisation, which nationalism implies categorisation plus discriminatory intergroup bias (Mueller-Peters, 1998).

The research which makes use of this distinction does not, however, propose why some people may be patriotic and some nationalistic, and also does not address the possibility that someone who is patriotic in one context, may become nationalistic in another. Nationalism appears to be correlated with authoritarianism and intolerance of ambiguity (Baughn & Yaprak, 1996). This, combined with the finding that nationalism is linked to blind patriotism (see below) could imply that nationalism is part of a stable personality configuration such as Right Wing Authoritarianism. But no research has been done to investigate the contexts which might elicit patriotism versus nationalism. Surely these could be social, rather than personality, phenomena? Both can be seen as having strong ideological elements which tend to be promoted by political and community groups.

Thus, for example, a recent report commissioned by the South African education ministry recommends a cautious approach to

'nation building' in schools, since it would be undesirable to promote narrow xenophobic nationalism. But the report recommends that schools celebrate symbols of national identity, such as the national anthem and flag. The report even suggests the introduction of a pledge of allegiance to South Africa to be said in schools (James, Auerbach, Desai, Giliomee, Jordan, Krog, Kulati, Lehoko, Leibowitz & Tlakula, 2000). Thus in the current political climate, 'politically correct' patriotism is officially encouraged while nationalism is discouraged. Research in South Africa could explore the social conditions that promote either patriotism or nationalism.

2. Blind versus constructive patriotism.
A further distinction has been made between blind and constructive patriotism. Blind patriotism refers to unquestioning allegiance and acceptance of one's country's policies and practices – an attitude of 'my country right or wrong'. Constructive patriotism is more flexible, combining "affective attachment with the capacity and willingness to question, criticise, and work for change" (Schatz & Staub, 1997, 213).

Several studies demonstrate that the two types of patriotism are conceptually and empirically distinct, and that they entail very different attitudes and political behaviours (Schatz & Staub, 1997; Schatz, Staub, & Lavine, 1999; Staub, 1997). These American studies have found that, among other things, blind patriotism (but not constructive patriotism) is positively associated with militaristic and cultural nationalism and perceptions of foreign threat; and blind patriotism is characterised by a preference for symbolic patriotic behaviours rather than political engagement. Constructive patriotism is positively associated with political involvement, as measured by political efficacy, interest, knowledge, and self-reported behaviours (such as activism).

Research into the nature of South African national identity could also try to map out the kinds of attachment that citizens feel for the country. Both the nationalism versus patriotism distinction and the blind versus constructive patriotism distinction seem to have clear repercussions for the development of constitutionalism and participatory citizenship in our new democracy. Research into these dimensions could inform educational policy to guide democracy education, in an effort to promote constructive patriotism rather than blind chauvinism.

Ideas from Social Identity Theory (SIT) and Self-Categorisation Theory (SCT)

1. National pride / self-esteem.
SIT posits that the need for self-esteem motivates most social identity processes. (See below for alternatives to the self-esteem hypothesis.) Pride in the ingroup is part of the phenomenon of group-based self-esteem. But the way that national pride manifests itself, shows that collective self-esteem can be derived from various dimensions of the group's self-image. For example, it has been established that the national pride of many European countries is multi-dimensional, comprising pride in cultural aspects such as language and history, and pride in economic and political progress, as two distinct dimensions (Mueller-Peters, 1998). Future research in South Africa could investigate the dimensions of national pride in this country, how pride on these dimensions relates to one's membership of various social categories, and what psychological and social purposes it serves.

2. Motivations for attachment to the nation
The central 'self-esteem hypothesis' of SIT has recently come under fire for being too limited (*e.g.* Breakwell, 1996; Hogg & Abrams, 1990). Several authors have suggested other psychological needs that might influence the development of a group's identity, and the identification processes of individual members. Some of the motives that could apply to national identity construction as well as to other social identities, are the need for self-efficacy, continuity, and distinctiveness (Breakwell, 1996; Cinnirella, 1996; Lyons, 1996); the need for transcendence (Salazar, 1998); and the need for control and autonomy (Cinirella, 1996). Two motives that may be specific to national identity construction are the desire for a sense of historical destiny for the in-group, and for a 'homeland' (Billig, 1995, in Reicher *et al.*, 1997). The social diversity of South Africa presents excellent opportunities for investigating the different psychological motivations that may drive identification with the 'nation', and the conditions under which particular kinds of motives come to the fore.

3. International inter-group comparisons and the 'other'
SIT makes inter-group comparisons central to social identity processes. Thus it follows that national identity is constructed, and collective self-esteem maintained, largely through comparing one's country with others on relevant dimensions. Discursively oriented theorists have proposed that the construal of the national 'other' is central to the way citizens define their own national identity (Billig, 1996). A particularly interesting suggestion is that countries use 'significant other' nations in times of national crisis or transition to help shape national identity discourses – especially setting the nation apart from enemies, but also rethinking or defending contested territories or history (Triandafyllidou, 1998).

Given the current Africanist discourse promoted by the South African President, it would be of great interest to establish under who South Africans see as their national 'significant others'. Who looks to Africa and who looks to the West, and for which dimensions of social comparison? What social purposes do these kinds of comparisons serve? A further, and very socially relevant, aspect of inter-national perceptions is the issue of xenophobia towards Africans from other countries. Croucher (1998) has written about the need to study xenophobia in South Africa, as the rejection of 'aliens' or 'others' is an important part in the construction of an ingroup identity.

Of course it is a testable assumption that a national 'other' is necessarily a part of national identity construction. It may not always be the case. A study of members of six European countries found that, when asked to describe their own country, only 20% made spontaneous references to other countries (Brown & Haeger, 1999). (Of course this could mean that the comparison process is so taken-for granted that people do not make it explicit in their descriptions.) Research in South Africa could help to determine the conditions under which international comparisons become salient within the construction of one's own national identity.

4. The relationship between multiple identities

> *South Africans have multiple identities in multiple contexts, depending on factors of expedience, recruitment and mobilisation, and the company one keeps.* (Thornton, 1996: 150).

Every person has a repertoire of social identities to which they subscribe, and which may move in and out of salience depending on the context. Self-Categorization Theory posits that identity can be understood at different levels of abstraction (such as sub-national, national and supra-national identities). Different levels compete within the categorisation cognitions of the individual. Categorising oneself at a certain level of abstraction makes it difficult to categorise oneself simultaneously at a lower or higher level – seeing the wood *and* the trees. According to Turner, "There is...a *functional*

antagonism between the salience of one level of self-categorisation and other levels: the salience of one level produces the intra-class similarities and inter-class differences which reduce or inhibit the perception of the intra-class differences and inter-class similarities upon which lower and higher levels respectively are based" (Turner, 1987, 49, italics in original).

Research thus far in South Africa has focused on the compatibility of national and sub-national identities. It seems to have demonstrated that people do have multiple social identities, including ethnic, linguistic, racial and national identities, and that national identity seems in general to be compatible with strongly-held sub-national identities. But research has been correlational: no experimental work has been done to establish whether increased salience at one level of identity has significant effects on either salience of, or attachment to, an identity at another level. Self Categorization Theory (SCT) has not been fully tested or operationalised in South Africa.

Research abroad has begun to look seriously at the ways in which people configure complex, politically sensitive identities at the sub-national and national level – for example, adolescents of Pakistani origin in Scotland (Saeed, Blain, & Forbes, 1999) and young Catholics and Protestants in Northern Ireland (Cassidy & Trew, 1998; Trew & Benson, 1996). Perhaps the bulk of the national identity work has, however, focused on the relationship between national and supra-national identity within the context of the European Union.

SCT and SIT form the backbone of this approach. Most of the work is descriptive and correlational, but a few experiments show the potential theory-testing and conceptual enrichment. For example, one questionnaire-based experiment found that stereotyping one's own country *and* another country, lead to lower levels of identification with Europe than in the conditions in which only one's own or another country were stereotyped (Cinnirella, 1998). All three experimental conditions made salient the level of national identity. But it was when the ingroup was being compared directly to an outgroup, that the idea of combining these groups within the superordinate identity became particularly unacceptable to many respondents. This research supports SIT and SCT, since direct inter-group comparison accentuated perceived incompatibility between the national and supranational levels of identification.

The correlational, questionnaire-based research has had the advantage of being large-scale and cross-national. Surveys during the 1990's, in the build-up to the creation of the European Union, document various responses to the idea of a common European identity. The main finding is that in most countries, national identity and European identity were perceived to be compatible, and in a minority, were perceived to be dissonant (*e.g.* Breakwell, 1996; Cinnirella, 1997). The fear of one's national identity being swamped or contaminated by the supranational identity ranked as the third most prominent reason for the decline in enthusiasm for European economic unification that was observed as the implementation of the EU came closer. But some nations showed high levels of both national and European identity (*e.g.* Mlicki & Ellemers, 1996). The research disproves the prediction from SCT that adjacent levels of identification are by definition antagonistic. In addition, there are individual differences based on motivational factors: "some people may not identify strongly at either level of inclusiveness, whereas others do not seem to have difficulty expressing their feelings of identity simultaneously at two adjacent levels" (Mlicki & Ellemers, 1996, 112).

Further evidence that a person's degree of identification with a supra-national entity is not predictable from their degree of identification with their own nation, comes from research with British, French and German subjects. This study found none of the expected (negative) correlations between strength of identification with one's country, and attitudes towards European unification or identification with Europe (Hilton, Erb, Dermot, & Molian, 1996). Attitudes towards unification were, however, predicted by utilitarian concerns and representations of history (for example, the role of Hitler in the Second World War). These authors suggest that in certain contexts, political scripts based on representations of history, rather than cognitive processes such as self-categorisation or intergroup comparison, may drive attitudes towards and identification with Europe.

In South Africa the level of supranational identity has received little attention. Nobody has tried to investigate systematically what the Africanist discourse of the ruling party means to the ordinary citizen. What do people see as South Africa's relationship with the rest of Africa? Who is perceived to be 'African' and who is not? Who claims to be African and who does not, and under what conditions are these identity claims made? (Bechhofer, McCrone, Kiely, & Stewart, 1999). Who identifies with 'Africa', and under what conditions might this supranational African identity be in competition with South African identity? Do Black South Africans construe African identity differently to South Africans of non-African descent? A thorough investigation of national versus supra-national identity, including experimental manipulations of identity salience, should be a major focus of new Social Psychological research in South Africa.

A theory that offers a way to incorporate ethnic, national and African identities in the same equation, is the Theory of Comparative Identity (Huici, Ros, Cano, Hopkins, Emler & Carmona, 1997; Ros, Huici, & Gomez, 2000). This theory, derived from SCT, posits that the influence of identifications at one level are qualified by identification at lower or higher-order levels. Comparative identity research in Europe has shown that a sub-national identity will have a greater impact on social cognitions not only if it strongly held, but if it is strongly held *in comparison to* national identity. Thus, the fact that Scots prefer their regional to their state (British) identity, while Andalucians identify equally with Spain and with their region, means that the identity 'Scottish' will be permanently more accessible and potent for Scots than will the identity 'Andlalucian' to Andalucians. There are also repercussions for the identification of these two groups with Europe or the EU. The relative strength of regional versus national identity qualifies identification at the supra-national level, because the EU offers different potential benefits to regions and to states (Huici *et al.*, 1997). This theory has clear applicability to the South African context. For example, it seems likely that the relative strength of ethnic/racial versus national identity would be related to identification with Africa. This is an eminently testable hypothesis suggested by Comparative Identity theory.

Another way to approach the question of levels of identity is through Optimal Distinctiveness Theory (Brewer, 1991). This theory says that people will identify most strongly with identities that provide for the dual needs for distinctiveness and inclusion. The identity configurations that emerge are often compound or nested identities, and reflect the current identity politics of the community. For example, Brewer discusses how Chinese residents of Hong Kong showed signs of changing their nested identities during the transition to Chinese control. Whereas the prior identity configuration was Chinese as a subset of Hong Kong (differentiating themselves from Western Hong Kong residents), the new identity during the transition was Hong Kong as a subset of China (differentiating themselves from the rest of the Chinese) (Brewer, 1999). One can subscribe

to a broad, inclusive identity but obtain distinctiveness by feeling part of a specific community within that large group.

Brewer (1999) uses notation derived from set theory in describing these identity configurations. This allows for an easily-understandable graphic representation of the relationship between two identities. The challenge is to extend this to include three or more identities. Tracking over time the ways in which layered, hyphenated identities are construed and used in South Africa, will help us to understand how and why people identify with multiple groups.

Ideas from discursive social psychology

The Social Cognitive and the SIT/SCT traditions emphasise the psychological motivations for, and individual differences behind, types of identification with the nation. Intrapsychic processes are the focus of analysis. The discursively oriented researchers acknowledge the need to study the psychological consequences of self-categorisation at a given level. But they hold that it is not enough to look only at the way that social categories structure thought. They argue that it is equally important to investigate the ways in which these categories are constructed – to look at the content that people ascribe to social categories, and the ways in which these constructions then affect social interactions and social change. They also point out that national identity is never monolithic: rather, there are multiple, contested versions. Researchers should analyse critically how these serve different social goals, and are contested through talk and text (Reicher & Hopkins, 2000; Reicher *et al.*, 1997).

1. Contents of national identity.

As discussed earlier, South African research has shown that people do identify themselves as South African; but the research has not yet looked at the meaning of those identities. What are the social representations of the South African 'nation' with which people identify? There is huge scope for investigating the content of South African national identity, and the key areas of commonality and of disagreement in the way this identity is contested. One could focus on the representations put forward by ordinary citizens, or on the views of influential public figures and 'identity entrepeneurs'.

Examples of exciting work being done overseas are interview-based research on ordinary people's representations of 'Englishness' (Condor, 1996), and an analysis of the way politicians have constructed Scottish and English national identity in order to support arguments for or against Scottish autonomy (Hopkins & Reicher, 1996). As mentioned earlier, only one such study in South Africa has come to the attention of this writer. Roper (1997) investigated the rhetorical tools used by the then-President de Klerk in various speeches and interviews. The analysis shows how the 'New' South Africa social category produced in this right-wing discourse is rooted in earlier representations of identity and maintains earlier social divisions and relations. This kind of analysis would be just as fruitfully applied to the identity rhetoric of current political figures in South Africa.

2. Representations of history.

Sociologists have discussed at the theoretical level the importance to national identity of national 'myths' – shared stories about national ethnic origins, past struggles and victories, the 'destiny' of the nation, and national heroes (*e.g.* Hosking & Schopflin, 1997; Pearson, 2000). Discursive social psychologists are starting to make a contribution to describing the ways in which history is invoked to support identity goals. Sometimes relatively recent events going back one or two generations are pertinent (*e.g.* Hilton *et al.*, 1996). In other contexts, ancient times are revived in the construction of modern national identity (Triandafyllidou, 1998). Research has also considered the way in which people understand the notion that their nation 'has history' (Condor, 1997).

Lyons (1996) suggests that certain principles will guide the way in which nations collectively remember and reconstruct their history. These principles are the need for "continuity, collective self-esteem, distinctiveness, efficacy or potency and cohesion." (Lyons, 1996, 36). The particular context in which a nation finds itself, such as experiencing a threat to its internal values, or a lack of recognition from other nations, will determine which of these principles guide national 'remembering'.

South African offers a fascinating example of a country with a short history of statehood (since 1910), an even shorter history of inclusive democracy, but a very long history of intergroup conflict and oppression. The Nationalist government promoted a certain version of South African history in order to support its vision of Afrikaner nationalism and 'separate development'. How is history being re-interpreted in the new dispensation, and what kind of national identity do these reconstructions promote? How do ordinary citizens construe our collective (but divided) history?

3. Power

Related to respresentations of history are perceptions of relative political power within the country. Political status can be a major factor driving identity patterns. In his proposed research agenda, Mattes (1999) highlights the difference between politically dominant and politically weak ethnic groups as a variable that influences identification with the state. The international literature suggests that members of ethnic majorities which have high status and political power within a country (such as White Americans in the USA, English people in the UK and Jewish Israelis) tend to blur the distinctions between their ethnic and their national identity. For these groups, ethnic and national identity is consonant and mutually reinforcing. But for minority, politically marginal or low status groups (such as Black and Latino Americans, Welsh and Scottish citizens of the UK, or Arab Israelis), ethnic / subnational identity may be dissonant with national identity (Langlands, 1999; McCrone, 1998; Sidanius *et al.*, 1997). Low-status ethnic groups tend to show an inverse relationship between identification with the ingroup and national patriotism (Sidanius *et al.*, 1997).

This issue has mostly been explored abroad from a Social Cognitive, quantitative position. But it is included in this section because it would seem to call also for qualitative, discursive analyses of the ways in which different social groups within a country construe their position in relation to the nation as a whole. Thus in South Africa, an important question would be to try to establish which groups now perceive themselves to be dominant or marginalised. One could then examine possible relationships between perceived social status and political power, and affinity with state or alternative 'anti-national' identities.

Conclusion

I have argued that national identity in South Africa is a topic that has been sadly neglected by social psychologists. The paper presents a brief glimpse at the kinds of research being conducted abroad, the theoretical frameworks guiding this research, and the ways in which it might be applicable to South Africa. This body of international research offers great opportunities for the building of conceptual linkages and for suggesting theories and methods that might guide local research. Ultimately, however, local research must develop its own agenda based on South African priorities.

National identity offers enormous scope for creative, theoretically nuanced research, and therefore has intrinsic academic interest. But it also has a strong relationship with practical concerns about the establishment of 'national legitimacy' and stable democracy. As Mattes (1999) points out, we should bear in mind the need to link identity processes with behaviours. If we are interested in the actual effects of social identification, and certain constructions of nationhood and citizenship, we need to be able to assess how people will express those subjective motivations and conceptions. Both quantitative and qualitative work can help us towards this goal. The point is that we are not only interested in national identity for its own sake. We are interested in it because we want South Africa to succeed. The more we understand about how people construe the national political community and their place in it, the more chance we have of contributing to debates about nation-building, of influencing government policy, and of encouraging constructions of nationhood which will enhance a healthy democracy.

Acknowledgements

This is a revised version of a paper presented at the PsySSA 6th National Congress in August 2000. Funding for attendance at the conference was supplied by the UCT Psychology Department. I would like to thank Andy Dawes (UCT) and Clark McCauley (University of Pennsylvania) for their comments on an earlier draft. I am grateful to the Spencer Foundation for funding my studies in 2000 and 2001.

References

Adam, H. (1994). Nationalism, nation-building and non-racialism. In N. Rhoodie & I. Liebenberg (Eds.), *Democratic Nation-Building in South Africa* (pp. 37-51). Pretoria: HSRC Publishers.

Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined Communities*. New York: Verso.

Baines, G. (1998). The rainbow nation? Identity and nation-building in post-apartheid South Africa .

Baughn, C. C., & Yaprak, A. (1996). Economic nationalism: Conceptual and empirical development. *Political Psychology, 17*(4), 759-778.

Bechhofer, F., McCrone, D., Kiely, R., & Stewart, R. (1999). Constructing national identity: Arts and landed elites in Scotland. *Sociology, 33*(3), 515-534.

Billig, M. (1995). *Banal Nationalism*. London: Sage.

Billig, M. (1996). Nationalism as an international ideology: Imagining the nation, others and the world of nations. In G. Breakwell & E. Lyons (Eds.), *Changing European Identities: Social Psychological Analyses of Social Change* (pp. 181-194). Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Bornman, E. (1995). *Patterns of group identification* (Unpublished paper). Johannesburg: University of the Witwatersrand.

Boyce, B.P. (1997). *Nationbuilding discourse in a democracy.* Paper presented at the Conference on National Identity and Democracy, Cape Town.

Braungart, R.G., & Braungart, M. M. (1995). Black and White South African university students' perceptions of self and country: an exploratory study. *South African Journal of Sociology, 26*(3), 77-87.

Breakwell, G.M. (1996). Identity processes and social changes. In G. M. Breakwell & E. Lyons (Eds.), *Changing European identities: Social Psychological analyses of social change* (pp. 13-27). Oxford: Butterworth Heineman.

Brewer, M.B. (1991). The social self: On being the same and different at the same time. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 17*, 475-482.

Brewer, M.B. (1999). Multiple identities and identity transition: Implications for Hong Kong. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 23*(2), 187-197.

Brown, R., & Haeger, G. (1999). 'Compared to What?': Comparison choice in an international context. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 29*, 31-42.

Cassidy, C., & Trew, K. (1998). Identities in Northern Ireland: A multidimensional approach. *Journal of Social Issues, 54*(4), 725-740.

Cinnirella, M. (1996). A social identity perspective on European integration. In G. M. Breakwell & E. Lyons (Eds.), *Changing European identities: Social Psychological analyses of social change* (pp. 253-276). Oxford: Butterworth-Heineman.

Cinnirella, M. (1997). Towards a European identity? Interactions between the national and European social identities manifested by university students in Britain and Italy. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 36*, 19-31.

Cinnirella, M. (1998). Manipulating stereotype rating tasks: Understanding questionnaire context effects on measures of attitudes, social identity and stereotypes. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 8*, 345-362.

Condor, S. (1996). Unimagined community? Some social psychological issues concerning English national identity. In G. M. Breakwell & E. Lyons (Eds.), *Changing European Identities* (pp. 41-68). Oxford: Butterworth-Heineman.

Condor, S. (1997). "Having history": A social psychological exploration of Anglo-British autostereotypes. In C. C. Barfoot (Ed.), *Beyond Pug's Tour" Stereotyping in theory and literary practice* (pp. 213-253). Amsterdam / Atlanta: Rodopi.

Croucher, S. (1998). South Africa's illegal aliens: constructing national boundaries in a post-apartheid state. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 21*(4), 639-660.

Degenaar, J. (1994). Beware of nation-building discourse. In N. Rhoodie & I. Liebenberg (Eds.), *Democratic Nation-Building in South Africa* (pp. 23-29). Pretoria: HSRC Publishers.

Feshbach, S., & Sakano, N. (1997). The structure and correlates of attitudes toward one's nation in samples of United States and Japanese college students: a comparative study. In D. Bar-Tal & E. Staub (Eds.), *Patriotism in the Lives of Individuals and Nations* (pp. 91-107). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Finchilescu, G., & Dawes, A. (1999). *Adolescents' socio-political perspectives on South African society: an investigation into the effects of the social change between 1992 and 1996.* Cape Town: University of Cape Town.

Harris, M. (1997). Monitoring optimism in South Africa. *Social Indicators Research, 41*, 279-304.

Heaven, P.C.L. (1984). Afrikaner patriotism today: The role of attitudes and personality. *Canadian Review of Studies in Nationalism, 11*(1), 133-139.

Hilton, D.J., Erb, H.-P., Dermot, M., & Molian, D. J. (1996). Social representations of history and attitudes to European unification in Britain, France and Germany. In G. M. Breakwell & E. Lyons (Eds.), *Changing European identities: Social Psychological analyses of social change.* Oxford: Butterworth Heineman.

Hogg, A., & Abrams, D. (1990). Social motivation, self-esteem and social identity. In D. Abrams and A. Hogg (Eds.), *Social Identity Theory: Constructive and critical advances.* New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Hopkins, N., & Reicher, S. (1996). The construction of social categories and processes of social change: Arguing about national identities. In G. M. Breakwell & E. Lyons (Eds.), *Changing European Identities: Social Psychological Analyses of Social Change* . Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Hosking, G., & Schopflin, G. (Eds.). (1997). *Myths and Nationhood*. London: Hurst and Company.

Huici, C., Ros, M., Cano, I., Hopkins, N., Emler, N., & Carmona, M. (1997). Comparative identity and evaluation of socio-political change: Perceptions of the European Community as a function of the salience of regional identities. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 27*, 97-113.

James, W., Auerbach, F., Desai, Z., Giliomee, H., Jordan, P., Krog, A., Kulati, T., Lehoko, K., Leibowitz, B., & Tlakula, P. (2000). *Values, Education and Democracy: Report of the working group on values in education.* Pretoria: Department of Education, South Africa.

Kosterman, R., & Feshbach, S. (1989). Toward a measure of patriotic and nationalistic attitudes. *Political Psychology, 10*, 257-274.

Kotze, H. (1997). *Culture, ethnicity and religion: South African perceptions of social identity* (Occasional Paper). Johannesburg: Konrad Adenauer Stiftung.

Langlands, R. (1999). Britishness or Englishness? The historical problem of national identity in Britain. *Nations and Nationalism, 5*(1), 53-69.

Lyons, E. (1996). Coping with social change: Processes of social memory in reconstruction of identities. In G. Breakwell & E. Lyons (Eds.), *Changing European Identities: Social Psychological Analyses of Social Change* . Oxford: Butterworth-Heineman.

Mattes, R., Taylor, D., & Poore, A. (1997). *The role of identity in building a democratic culture in South Africa.* Paper presented at the Conference on Multicultural citizenship in the "new" South Africa, Cape Town.

Mattes, R.B. (1999). Hypotheses on identity and democracy: Community, regime, institutions and citizenship. In S. Bekker & R. Prinsloo (Eds.), *Identity? Theory, Politics, History* (Vol. 1, pp. 151-180). Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council.

Mbeki, T. (2000, June 16). *Speech of the President of South Africa, Thabo Mbeki.* Paper presented at the Youth Conference on Nation Building, Centurion, Gauteng.

McCrone, D. (1998). *The Sociology of Nationalism*. New York: Routledge.

Mlicki, P.P., & Ellemers, N. (1996). Being different or being better? National stereotypes and identifications of Polish and Dutch students. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 26*, 97-114.

Moller, V., Dickow, H., & Harris, M. (1999). South Africa's "rainbow people": National pride and happiness. *Social Indicators Research, 47*(3), 245-280.

Morse, S.J., & Nell, E. (1977). National identity among a sample of students at an Afrikaans university in South Africa. *Social Dynamics, 3*, 35-44.

Mots Pluriels, 7 (available on http://www.arts.uwa.edu.au /motspluriels/mp789gb.html)

Mueller-Peters, A. (1998). The significance of national pride and national identity to the attitude toward the single European currency: A Europe-wide comparison. *Journal of Economic Psychology, 19*, 701-719.

O'Malley, K. (1994). A neglected dimension of nation-building in South Africa: the ethnic factor. In N. Rhoodie & I. Liebenberg (Eds.), *Democratic Nation-Building in South Africa* (pp. 77-88). Pretoria: HSRC Publishers.

Pearson, D. (2000). The ties that unwind: Civic and ethnic imaginings in New Zealand. *Nations and Nationalism, 6*(1), 91-110.

Reicher, S., & Hopkins, N. (2000). *Self and Nationhood*. London: Sage.

Reicher, S., Hopkins, N., & Condor, S. (1997). The lost nation of Psychology. In C. C. Barfoot (Ed.), *Beyond Pug's Tour: National and ethnic stereotyping in theory and literary practice* (pp. 53-84). Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi.

Roper, K. (1997). *National identity in a changing South Africa: A study of 'new' Right discourse.* Unpublished MA, University of Cape Town, Cape Town.

Ros, M., Huici, C., & Gomez, A. (2000). Comparative identity, category salience and intergroup relations. In D. Capozza & R. Brown (Eds.), *Social Identity Processes* (pp. 81-95). London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: Sage.

Saeed, A., Blain, N., & Forbes, D. (1999). New ethnic and national questions in Scotland: post-British identities among Glasgow Pakistani teenagers. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 22*(5), 821-844.

Salazar, J.M. (1998). Social identity and national identity. In S. Worchel, J.F. Morales, D. Paez, & J.-C. Deschamps (Eds.), *Social Identity: International Perspectives* (pp. 114-123). London: Sage.

Schatz, R.T., & Staub, E. (1997). Manifestations of blind and constructive patriotism: Personality correlates and individual-group relations. In D. Bar-Tal & E. Staub (Eds.), *Patriotism in the Lives of Individuals and Nations* . Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Schatz, R.T., Staub, E., & Lavine, H. (1999). On the varieties of national attachment: Blind versus constructive patriotism. *Political Psychology, 20*(1), 151-174.

Seedat, M. (1998). A characterisation of South African psychology (1948-1988): the impact of exclusionary ideology. *South African Journal of Psychology, 28*(2), 74-84.

Sennett, J., & Foster, D. (1996). Social identity: comparing white English-speaking South African students in 1975 and 1994. *South African Journal of Psychology, 26*(4), 203-211.

Sidanius, J., Feshbach, S., Levin, S., & Pratto, F. (1997). The interface between ethnic and national attachment. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 61*, 103-133.

Staub, E. (1997). Blind versus constructive patriotism: Moving from embeddedness in the group to critical loyalty and action. In D. Bar-Tal & E. Staub (Eds.), *Patriotism in the Lives of Individuals and Nations* (pp. 213-228). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Thornton, R. (1996). The potentials of boundaries in South Africa: steps towards a theory of the social edge. In R. Werbner & T. Ranger (Eds.), *Postcolonial Identities in Africa* . London / New Jersey: Zed Books.

Trew, K., & Benson, D. E. (1996). Dimensions of social identity in Northern Ireland. In G. M. Breakwell & E. Lyons (Eds.), *Changing European Identities* (pp. 123-143). Oxford: Butterworth-Heineman.

Triandafyllidou, A. (1998). National identity and the 'other'. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 21*(4), 595-612.

Turner, J.C. (1987). A self-categorization theory. In J. C. Turner (Ed.), *Rediscovering the Social Group* (pp. 42-67) Basil: Blackwell.