

Chapter 7

Intercultural Identity Structure of Second Generation French Women of African Descent

Vijé Franchi and Anne Andronikof-Sanglade

The ... hybrid is not only double-voiced and double-accented ... but is also double-languaged; for in it there are not only (and not even so much) two individual consciousnesses, two voices, two accents, as there are [doubling of] socio-linguistic, consciousnesses, two epochs ... that come together and consciously fight it out on the territory of the utterance ... It is the collision between differing points of view on the world that are embedded in these forms ... such unconscious hybrids have been at the same time profoundly productive historically: they are pregnant with potential for new world views, with new “internal forms” for perceiving the world in words.¹

(Bakhtin, 1981:360)

How does one speak of women in African immigrant communities in Paris, women of all ages and of different generations, without betraying the uniqueness of each age, the singularity of each generation? Moreover, how does one explore the structuring of identity among young women raised in these so-called “communities”, when the very notion of African immigrant communities can obscure the distinctions to be drawn between Diaspora communities and those found in the native African country?

This chapter advocates a clear distinction between the issues facing migrant women, or women of the first generation, from those facing French-born young women of the second generation. The experiences and challenges facing these two distinct generations cannot be conflated by

assuming their concurrence within the confines of imagined spatial and temporal locations in the Diaspora.

In the case of first generation migrants from Africa to France, the difficulties tackled by most migrants, including language inadequacies, a general unfamiliarity with the expectations and customs of the host country (what anthropologists refer to as cultural discontinuities)², are compounded by a relationship with France that is conditioned by a long history of colonisation, racial oppression and unequal access to power. Furthermore, for many of these women, immigrating to France is not a choice to which they necessarily have the right to freely consent. Rather, their inferior and oppressed status as women obliges them to follow their husbands to the new and often alienating Diaspora context. This separates them from family and community and leaves them unprotected in the face of further oppression and domination at the hands of their husbands and relatives in these so-called immigrant communities in France. In the home country, the wife's father, brothers, family and community constitute an important psychological and emotional resource and recourse for her in the case of the man abusing his power as a husband. However, in the Diaspora context, she is often isolated from all resources and recourse, a predicament that is compounded by the absence of controls or sanctions on the behaviour of the men that surround her. The psychological and material threat of being sent back to the home country without her children is a further restraining mechanism against any envisaged departure from her assigned role and identity as a wife.

Nonetheless, despite these highly constraining factors, of which the above enumeration is but a short list of examples, women of the first generation exhibit remarkable courage and inventiveness. This is evident in the way they shape their relationship to their African culture and to their predicament as women, wives, and mothers in a foreign country. It seems a distinguishing characteristic of both 1st and 2nd generation women that they possess a particular distance and perspective on culture. This mediates the way they relate to the gender constraints of their African culture of origin, the discrimination and inferior status assigned to them by the new French

host culture, and the tensions and conflicts engendered by contact between these two very different cultures of unequal status.

In the case of the 1st generation, this particular perspective is a function of what Suárez-Orozco and Suárez-Orozco (1995)³ have called “*the immigrant’s dual frame of reference*”. It consists of the ability to view and experience their present predicament not in terms of the ideals and expectations of French society, but rather from the viewpoint of the ideals and expectations of the “old culture” (De Vos, 1973).⁴ Central to such an orientation is the belief that their current lot is an improvement on what they had or could hope to have in the home country.

For many of these African immigrant women this idea of improvement is projected onto their children. For them, their lot may seem considerably aggravated by migration to a new country. However, the prospect of numerous gains for their children (better schooling and opportunities in the future), seem to buffer them against many an adversity experienced in migrating and settling in an often hostile homogenising and discriminating, dominant host society.

This chapter argues that the rose-tinted lens of a dual frame of reference applies equally to the way these women perceive and experience their relationship with the African culture of origin. This excludes the obvious acculturation effects engendered by contact and “contamination” between cultures. The migration of a culture from its native context implies selection and manipulation of its codes and patterns, informed by factors contingent upon, amongst other things, the individual’s subjective reasons for migrating (which in the case of many of these women is less a matter of choice than of obligation). In the case of migrant African women, we argue that it is this dual frame of reference that permits them to consider the culture of origin in the light of the new Diaspora context. They then select and modify those aspects of it which are to be transplanted to the pockets of immigrant communities scattered across the Eastern shoulder of Paris. Ironically, Eliot (1949) described this very phenomenon with regard to migrating colonising cultures: “The people have taken with them only a part of the total culture”.⁵

Shifting African Identities

It could be argued that the manner in which these women deliberately prioritise, migrate and transplant specific aspects of their culture in France, attests not only to this dual frame of reference, but also to a measure of autonomy and agency. These are perhaps a function of stepping out of the mould of one's home culture, community and country, into an intercultural space of cultural plurality, inequity and difference, of collisions between differing world views and ways of constructing identity.

The modified African culture is partial—it is an immigrant or migration culture. In one sense it is crystallised, flawless and preserved, shimmering and frozen; bearing both an uncanny resemblance and a striking difference from the parent culture. The women's authorship of this partial immigrant culture permits them subsequently to exercise a measure of autonomy in regard to the constraints imposed on them as African women, and to begin to contest the gendered role assigned to them in their communities of origin. This appears to be the flip-side of the double jeopardy of their predicament as immigrant African women in a deregulated Diaspora context; it is a space in which to begin to question and contest, if not to radically change. Examples of radical contestation or transformation of these monoculturally referenced African gendered identities, are to be found less amongst this first generation than amongst their daughters.

Born in France, the 2nd generation can lay claim to more than a dual frame of reference: they bear witness to dual cultural affiliations, dual nationality, and intercultural embeddedness of their subjective experience, personal histories and identities. They are examples of Bakhtin's (1981) "hybrid forms", "pregnant with potential for new world views", with new "internal forms" for perceiving the world ... It is in articulation with their dialogic consciousness and experience of culture that they construct a representation of themselves at the personal and cultural levels.

Dual frame of reference, in the case of this 2nd generation, implies a process of socialisation characterised by dual or doubled enculturation. Moreover, it is underpinned by an intimate understanding of both cultures' partial, relative but unequal status in the intercultural context. The 2nd generation is born to and displays agency with regard not only to "partial" immigrant and host cultures, but also to those "*in-betweens*" of culture that

Bhabha (1996) describes as “*the contaminated yet connective tissue between cultures—at once the impossibility of culture’s containedness and the boundary between. [...]*”⁶ Their understanding and agency extends to the counterpart of the intercultural space they inhabit: namely, that partial “host” culture that, like the immigrant culture, is an unsigned forgery of “authentic” French culture. It is that aspect of French culture that is presented to those designated by the dominant as its “false nationals” or “2nd generation immigrants”.

A large part of dominant French culture remains invisible and inaccessible to immigrants. However, though excluded from this “true national French culture”, youths of African immigrant backgrounds, or France’s new “false nationals” paradoxically and inadvertently underwrite the “authenticity” of this culture by the politically orchestrated visibility and indeterminacy of a “false national culture” of which they are designated to be the carriers. Activated by what Etienne Balibar (1990) calls the identificatory language of discrimination working in reverse, this is a process whereby “the racial/cultural identity of ‘true nationals’ remains invisible but is inferred from ... the quasi-hallucinatory visibility of the ‘false nationals’ ...”⁷ Though born in France, these young women of African immigrant descent are denied access to “authentic” (white, Christian, male) French national culture, as well as to an identity as “true nationals”. Rather, their assigned political identity as 2nd generation migrants underscores their difference from “true nationals” and their affiliation to “another”, and in their case racially prejudiced, colonised, culture. Moreover, as we have argued, it simultaneously reinforces the authenticity of the culture and the identity to whose margins they are banished.

This discussion, however, brings a new dimension to bear on the picture. We argue, based on empirical findings, that these youths interrupt and challenge the homogenous claims of democratic French society. They bear witness not only to the displaced and disjunctive present of transplanted migratory African culture, but also to both the discriminatory and homogenising penchant of the dominant French host culture, and to the unequal footing of the two cultures at their points of interface (or clash) in the intercultural domain. We propose that their peculiar vision and

perspective on culture is a function of their embeddedness in an intercultural life context. Hence, their experience and understanding of the racially and culturally inequitable *mélange* of “part” or “partial” cultures that characterise this context, and of the intercultural tensions amongst and in articulation with which they construct their identities. It is from this standpoint that we argue that these youths exhibit autonomous agency and cultural expertise in structuring their identities. They avail themselves not only of their privileged understanding of each of their reference cultures, but also of the nature of the contact between them, as they strategically recruit from the intersections of these “part cultures in contact” the stuff from which to structure their gendered intercultural identities.

In their research with US-born second generation Latino youths, Suárez-Orozco and Suárez-Orozco (1996) argue that one should be less concerned with the place where the individual was born and rather focus on their subjective identification (e.g., as Mexican, Chicano, Latino, Salvadoran, etc.). These authors refer to individuals born in the host country, but whose cultural identity is referenced only in relation to their country of origin (e.g. Mexicans or Salvadoran and not Mexican-Americans) as “intergenerational” Latinos, thereby placing them in a metaphorical no-man’s land or in a suspended corridor between generations. The present chapter offers a very different model from the one cited above. It postulates that the French-born generation differs from the migrant generation primarily by virtue of their doubled or hybrid cultural consciousness of culture, a dual process of self-referencing identity and an embeddedness of the self in the intercultural context created by the contact between two part cultures in contact.

Moreover, this chapter takes a critical view of the previous trend, inherited from anthropology, to study the “ethnic identity” of youths of African immigrant descent. It argues that the construct of “ethnic identity” is reductive and displacing: it reduces the identity dynamics of “hybrid” youths to the simple reproduction and reification of gendered African identities within a displaced Diaspora context. We argue that any endeavours to remand young nationals of immigrant descent to an “unmarked, authentic ‘African’ origin or pre-text”, by uncritically

attempting to study their minority ethnic identity, could banish critical information from consciousness. These memories are about the construction of identity in articulation with the very discriminatory attributions (second generation immigrant; African; Arab) that underscore the exclusion of these youths from any and all claims to a “true” or “authentic” national identity. The “ethnic identity” approach distorts our understanding of the dual cultural affiliation of these youths and of their “hybrid” consciousness of culture. It obscures the intercultural embeddedness of their identities and overshadows the cultural tensions which mark the ill-defined boundaries between their “partial” reference cultures, by imagining them to be hermetic, substantive and homogenous, and “identity” to be referenced solely in relation to the “mono”culture of the parents.

This discussion endeavours to problematise the phenomena underlying the structuring of identities among young women belonging to this highly problematised second or hybrid generation of French-born youths of African immigrant descent. We analyse the cultural self-representations of French-born young females of different African backgrounds through the lens of the two phenomena that we have addressed above. These are the experience and structure or form of identity among youths of immigrant descent: namely, their *intercultural* embeddedness, and the *agency* with which national, racial, ethnic and religious identity markers are recruited and structured from the intersections of cultures, both partial and indeterminate.

The intercultural nature of the context refers to the tensions created by contact between partial African immigrant and French host cultures, whose differing values, systems of meaning and world views converge to produce conflicting and competing conceptions of personhood. For this first, French-born generation of youth raised in an African immigrant family and schooled in the host culture, the intercultural nature of the identity context frames the identity processes. These are activated during the years of junior and senior high school, and further complicate the negotiation of personally meaningful and socially valued identities.

Raised as they are in the midst of interfacing immigrant and French communities, their cultural affiliations are doubled, as are their construal of identity, their system of values, their consciousness and their language. All

these factors come together and fight it out on the intercultural terrain of the structuring of their representation of “self”. According to Camilleri (1990, 1994),⁸ when presented with conflicting cultural codes in contact, youths respond by developing “identity strategies” that permit them to strategically manoeuvre between the opposing camps to which they belong, simultaneously appeasing each culture’s identity demands, while safeguarding personally meaningful definitions of self.

The phenomenon of *agency* underscores the way in which they locate their identities in the space mapped out by the contact between these conflicting conceptions of personhood. Each dimension proposes a particular national, racial, regional, religious and ethnic profile which the youth is expected to embody as a member of that culture. Preliminary findings of a study of identity among French-born female youths of different African immigrant backgrounds point to the fact that these youths structure their representations of themselves interculturally. In other words, they enlist national, ethnic, racial, regional, and religious identity markers from both of their reference cultures and structure them into different combinations. This structurally intercultural identity contrasts sharply with the identity attributions made by significant others, whether African immigrant or French, whose construals of the “hybrid” youth are always framed in monocultural terms, as either belonging to or different from their own particular “authentic”, homogenous culture.

The central thesis of this chapter is that by defining themselves in intercultural terms, these youths contest the narrow subject locations mapped out for them by significant others. They perceive themselves not as members of one or the other monocultures, but as both affiliated and excluded from each of these “partial” cultures. Their self-representations speak of their subjective *intercultural* experience of identity, and of their capacity to shift between monocultural sites of identity, strategically inhabiting their intercultural in-betweens. However, at no time should the agency that they exhibit in structuring their identities be seen to negate the deleterious effects of negative stereotyping and constraining identity attributions.⁹ Rather, the structuring of their representations of themselves, interculturally, should be seen as a strategy for contesting the circumscribed

locations of assigned identities and exercising authorship in the creation of new intercultural locations from which to be and act their “hybrid” consciousness of themselves and their context, in spite of considerable pressures to embody prescribed and inferior gendered cultural identities.

The study

A study undertaken in 1997 compared the structure and content of the self-concepts and cultural representations of self among 850 youths of differing cultural backgrounds. We hypothesised that the recruitment and structuring of different dimensions of the *self-concept* (physical, intrapersonal, interpersonal, school, extracurricular, and cultural) and of the *intercultural representations of self* (French nationality, immigrant nationality, ethnicity, race, and religion) would vary differentially. This variance could be attributed to the youth’s gender, cultural background, level of schooling, plans to stay in France after completing school, and his/her parents’ plans to return to their country of origin.

The data presented below are taken from 478 of the original 690 French-born youths. The sample comprises 246 females and 232 males, divided into three groups according to their particular African immigrant backgrounds, namely, West, Central and East African immigrant (N=164); North African (Tunisian, Moroccan and Algerian) immigrant (N=274), and mixed African immigrant and French (N=40) origins. The preliminary results of this part of the study yielded three sets of findings that bear directly on the present discussion:

Firstly, the results indicated that all French-born youths of African immigrant backgrounds recruit and structure their cultural self-attributions (national, ethnic, religious, regional and racial identity markers) interculturally. They do this by enlisting cultural identity markers from each of their reference cultures into their representations of themselves, and structuring them using one of six different combinations or patterns. These six intercultural structures were identified using a grounded-theory approach, which saturated all 850 of the original coded responses.

Table 7.1: Six structures of intercultural representations of the self

1)	<i>Dual French-immigrant nationality</i>
2)	<i>French only</i>
3)	<i>Immigrant nationality only</i>
4)	<i>Ethnicity and (immigrant nationality/religion)</i>
5)	<i>Race and (immigrant nationality/ethnicity/religion)</i>
6)	<i>French and (immigrant nationality/race/ethnicity/religion)</i>

Secondly, we found that unlike the content domains used in their self-concepts, which varied primarily with gender and level of schooling, in the case of their cultural representation of themselves, the six intercultural structures varied only according to the youth's cultural background. Both the type (national, regional, ethnic, religious or racial) of identity markers chosen, and the ways in which they were combined (to yield one of the six possible structures), depended exclusively on their geographical origin of immigration. The two distinguishing contrasts were whether the young females were of North African (Algeria, Morocco or Tunisia), West, Central and East African or mixed French and African immigrant origin.

In the North African immigrant group, over two-thirds (73%) of the young females used *North African nationality* as the central marker in their representations of themselves. Of this 73%, 20% also defined themselves in terms of race, and 15% said that they were of dual nationality.

The young females in the West, Central and East African group prioritised *ethnicity* more than any other group of youths of African descent. Over half of this group defined themselves in terms of their African ethnicity, and of these, 30% also defined themselves in terms of their African nationality and religion and 16% in terms of their race. Only 10% said that they were of dual French-African nationality, in addition to citing their ethnicity, race and religion. Of the third of the group who did not make mention of ethnicity, all defined themselves exclusively in terms of their African nationalities.

Table 7.2: Cross-cultural variation in use of intercultural structures (%)

Intercultural structures	Female and male subjects of different African origins					
	East African female	Female	African female	East African male	Male	African male
Dual French/immigrant nationality	8,16	14,48	25,00	6,06	17,12	50,00
French only	1,02	3,12	25,00	3,03	2,05	15,00
Immigrant nationality only	34,69	50,00	20,00	33,33	47,26	15,00
Ethnicity and (immigrant nationality/religion)	29,59	7,03	5,00	22,72	5,47	5,00
Race and (immigrant nationality/ethnicity)	16,32	19,53	5,00	28,78	25,34	15,00
Church and (nationality/race/ethnicity/religion)	10,20	5,46	20,00	6,06	2,73	0,00
Total	(98)=100	(128)=100	(20)=100	(66)=100	(146)=100	(20)=100

In the third group of mixed French and African immigrant parents, over two-thirds (70%) prioritised their *French nationality* in presenting their cultural representation of themselves. Of these, a quarter described themselves only in terms of French nationality, while a quarter defined themselves as dual French-African nationals. Twenty percent (20%) of the female youths who said they were of dual nationality, also defined themselves in terms of race, ethnicity and religion. As was the case in the above two groups, those members of this group who did not mention French nationality (20%), all defined themselves exclusively in terms of their African nationality.

The third finding is an extrapolation of the data presented above. These results indicate that the structures used in the cultural representations of self vary with the youths' cultural backgrounds, in ways that clearly reflect the combined identity concerns of both their reference cultures. The findings lead us to suppose that youths of different immigrant backgrounds prioritise different types of identity markers in their representations of themselves, depending on the type of markers that are flagged for both positive and negative cultural identification by each of their reference groups. For instance, interestingly, the only cultural marker recruited from the French "part" culture was nationality, in contrast to the defining characteristics of ethnicity, race, religion and nationality which were recruited from the African culture or country of origin.

This could be explained by the fact that while nationality is more defining of one's civil status in France than any ethnic, religious, or regional identities, this is certainly not the case for the African community of origin. One could argue that different states or regions in Africa prioritise different identities, ones that reflect the history and imperatives of that particular geographical and political location. For instance, the young females of North African descent prioritised their national identities in defining themselves culturally, thereby reflecting the political and historical concerns of their Algerian, Moroccan or Tunisian parents. In the same way, ethnicity, which was central to their peers of West African descent, cuts across historically constructed geographic and national borders and is often

construed by their parents to be the determining indicator for cultural identity.

However, in both of the above groups, young females structured these markers in intercultural terms, recruiting from across the cultural divide in ways that clearly echo and convey the young women's experiences of belonging to two part cultures in contact. There were also indications of being raised at the interface of differing conceptions of what it is to be a person. This structuring of identity in intercultural terms can be seen as a deliberate act of mapping out a location from which to be and act out intercultural affiliations and cultural exclusions.

Discussion

Perhaps at the very heart of this study lies a desire to understand the strategic positioning of the "hybrid" self in different subject locations. Hence, our particular interests in the finding that these young females deliberately and strategically select different cultural identity markers, which they structure into different intercultural patterns of self-representation. The structurally intercultural singularity that each individual woman feels herself to be, is understood not as a substantive entity, but as a discursive intercultural location of the self: "[...] (a) site from which (to) perceive the world and [...] (a) place from which to act" (Harré, 1998).¹⁰ One could postulate that these different structures incorporate a limited yet selected range of intercultural subject positions, each of which mobilises different sets of representations, knowledge structures, cognition, motivations and actions. It implies that these young females have the capacity to shift between circumscribed locations of intercultural identity, and to speak, as it were, from their different cultural centres of interest, emotion, thought and action.

It is this negotiation of the inclusion and exclusion of their different, relative, but unequal identities in a strategically structured intercultural representation of themselves, that points to the agency and intercultural embeddedness of the identity dynamics of these young, French-born females of African immigrant origins. In the light of the tensions and inequalities between reference cultures and the impossibility of satisfying their

competing identity demands, interculturally structured identities are personalised strategies for mapping out a way of moving within and between cultures. This also involves being and acting in ways that fulfil each one's demands in part, or for part of the time. We have insisted all along that it is precisely by manipulating the insider-knowledge they possess about each culture, and shifting between different subject locations and intercultural sites of identity, that these young women bear witness to their agency in constructing their identities. They achieve this despite the constraining, undermining and discriminatory attributions made by others in their intercultural environments.

Conclusion

The outside world catches a glimpse of her changing at the street corner, from her deliberately tatty jeans or mini-skirt, to her tchador, removing all traces of the make-up belonging to the French face she shows at school. She then proceeds in the guise of an obedient and respectful young African woman, to her father's home—she takes on the appearance of a chameleon, playing off identities for her own benefit.

Her behaviour makes one wonder whom she really is, what she desires, values, or cherishes? But is this line of questioning appropriate? Does it not simply translate to our discomfort with her shifting location, our unwillingness to come to terms with the intercultural nature of her identity? We are stuck with the idea that it is in the in-between spaces of culture that she is to be found; that her identity is only shifting in so far as we insist on perceiving cultures as homogenous and bounded and identities as substantive.

If we were to stretch our imagination beyond the limits of cultural systems in contact, we could begin to conceptualise a third or “in-between” space, created by the intermingling of cultures, juxtaposed by tensions and brought closer by personal and group designs. Only then would we be poised to view this young woman's identity manoeuvres, not as shifting identities, but as an unfolding of an identity that spans the breadth of intercultural meanings and is captured and generated by its “in-betweens”.

This chapter has sought to present a different perspective on gendered female African immigrant intercultural identity. We have focused neither on the internalised constraints imposed on female identity by affiliation to a patriarchal culture that conceptualises women in restrictive and oppressing terms, nor have we focused on the internalisation of negative, racially discriminating attributions made by a hegemonic host culture whose interest is vested in excluding these “hybrid” youths from accessing the privileges that accompany definition as “true” or “authentic” nationals. Rather, the chapter has insisted on the agency and intercultural embeddedness that characterises the negotiation and experience of identity among young women caught in the spaces between African immigrant and French host cultures.

Equipped with an understanding of each, these young women have been shown to actively select from each culture’s reservoir a range of subject locations from which to be and act the different parts of their intercultural identities. In so doing, they assert their capacity to face up to the conflicting identity demands of each of their reference cultures, each of which competes for them to assume the gendered roles it construes as appropriate for a young woman of its own culture. It is this experience of straddling the tenuous divide between past and future meanings, that both colour the identity dynamics among these young women and open up new understandings for social scientists grappling with the puzzles presented by culture and identity.

In closing, one should perhaps draw attention to the fact that one limitation of an approach which focuses on the structures of identity, is that it does not sufficiently problematise the embodiment of these locations or sites by lived and experienced gendered subjectivities. The complexity of these women’s identities can only truly be captured through a contextualised study. This context refers to the ways in which they live reality by inhabiting the spaces in ways that reflect their particular gendered experience. The latter refers to the experiences of being and acting as a woman from a national, ethnic, religious and racial subject perspective where tensions characterise the intercultural contact between their reference cultures. If we were to advance a hypothesis in this regard, it would be that

these young women embody and experience the intercultural, as a site lived in and lived from, in an inclusive manner. In other words, we would presume that as women and as hybrids of doubled cultural consciousness, they would endeavour to include and give a voice to the largest possible number of their identity locations, rather than attempting to silence or exclude a part or parts thereof.

Notes

- ¹ Bakhtin, M. 1981. "Discourse in the novel", in Michael Holquist (Ed.), *The Dialogic Imagination*, translated by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, Austin: University of Texas Press, p. 360, cited in Bhabha, H. 1996. "Cultures in-between", in Stuart Hall and Paul Du Gay (eds), *Questions of Cultural Identity*. London: Sage Publications, p. 58.
- ² Suárez-Orozco, C. and Suárez-Orozco, M. 1996. "Latino Identities", in Lola Romanucci-Ross and George De Vos (eds), *Ethnic Identity: creation, conflict and accommodation*. Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press. pp.324 -327.
- ³ Suárez-Orozco, C. and Suárez-Orozco, M. 1995. *Transformations, Immigration, Family Life and Achievement Motivation among Latino Adolescents*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, cited in Suárez-Orozco, C. and Suárez-Orozco, M. 1996. "Latino Identities", in Lola Romanucci-Ross and George De Vos (Eds.) *Ethnic Identity: creation conflict and accommodation*. Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press. pp. 324-327.
- ⁴ De Vos, G.A. 1973. *Socialization for Achievement: Essay on the Cultural Psychology of the Japanese*. Berkeley: University of California Press. Cited in Suárez-Orozco, D. and Suárez-Orozco, M. 1996. "Latino Identities", in Lola Romanucci-Ross and George De Vos (eds). *Ethnic Identity: Creation, Conflict and Accommodation*. Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press. p. 325.
- ⁵ Eliot, T.S. 1949. *Notes Towards the Definition of Culture*. New York: Harcourt Brance. p. 62, cited in Bhabha, H. 1996. "Culture's in-between", in Stuart Hall and Paul Du Gay (eds). *Questions of Cultural Identity*. London: Sage Publications.
- ⁶ Bhabha, H. 1996. "Culture's in-between", Stuart Hall and Paul Du Gay (eds). *Questions of Cultural Identity*. London: Sage Publications.

- ⁷ Balibar, E. 1990. "Paradoxes of universality", in David Theo Goldberg (ed). *Anatomy of Racism*. Minneapolis and Oxford: University of Minnesota Press. p. 284, cited in Bhabha, H. 1996. "Culture's in-between", in Stuart Hall and Paul Du Gay (eds), *Questions of Cultural Identity*. London: Sage Publications.
- ⁸ Camilleri, C. 1990. "Identité culturelle et gestion de la disparité culturelle: Es sai d'une typologie". In: C. Camilleri, J. Kasterszein, M.E. Lipiansky, H. Malewska-Peyre, I. Taboada-Leonetti et A. Vasquez, *Stratégies identitaires*. Paris: PUF. pp.85-110.
- Camilleri, C. 1994. "Enjeux, mécanismes et stratégies identitaires dans les contextes pluriculturels". In: *Les Hommes, leurs espaces et leurs aspirations. Hommages à Paul-Henri Chombart De Lauwe*, Paris: L'Harmattan. pp. 291-298
- ⁹ For an example of a study dealing with the internalisation of negative stereotypes, see Vinsonneau, G. 1983. "Catégorisation et genèse de l'identité sociale: les jeunes Maghrébins en France". In: A. Bureau et D. De Saivre, *Apprentissages et cultures*. Paris: Karthala.
- ¹⁰ Harré, R. 1998. *The Singular Self*. London: Sage Publications.

This chapter is part of Ph.D. research undertaken under the supervision of Anne Andronikof-Sanglade, Paris X. Nanterre, France.

We would like to thank the CSD-HSRC Pretoria and the French Foreign Ministry for their generous funding of this research.

References

- Bakhtin, M. 1981. Discourse in the novel. In: Holquist, M. (ed.). *The dialogic imagination*. Trans. Emerson, C. & Holquist, M. Austin: University of Texas Press. pp. 360-347.
- Balibar, E. 1990. Paradoxes of universality. In: Goldberg, D.T. (ed.). *Anatomy of racism*. Minneapolis and Oxford: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bhabha, H. 1996. Culture's in-between. In: Hall, S. & Du Gay, P. (eds). *Questions of cultural identity*. London: Sage. pp. 53-60.
- Camilleri, C. 1990. Identité culturelle et gestion de la disparité culturelle: Essai d'une typologie. In: Camilleri, C., Kasterszein, J., Lipiansky, M.E., Malewska-Peyre, H., Taboada-Leonetti, I. & Vasquez, A. *Stratégies identitaires*. Paris: PUF.

Shifting African Identities

- Camilleri, C. 1994. Enjeux, mécanismes et stratégies identitaires dans les contextes pluriculturels. In: *Les Hommes, leurs espaces et leurs aspirations. Hommages à Paul-Henri Chombart De Lauwe*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- De Vos, G.A. 1973. *Socialization for achievement: Essay on the cultural psychology of the Japanese*. Berkeley CA: University of California Press.
- Eliot, T.S. 1949. *Notes towards the definition of culture*. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Harré, R. 1998. *The singular self*. London: Sage.
- Suárez-Orozco, C. & Suárez-Orozco, M. 1995. *Transformations, immigration, family life and achievement motivation among Latino adolescents*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Suárez-Orozco, C. & Suárez-Orozco, M. 1996. "Latino identities". In: Romanucci-Ross, L. & De Vos, G. (eds.). *Ethnic identity: Creation, conflict and accommodation*. Walnut Creek CA.: Altamira Press.
- Vinsonneau, G. 1983. Catégorisation et genèse de l'identité sociale: Les jeunes Maghrébins en France. In: Bureau, A. & De Saivre, D. *Apprentissages et cultures*. Paris: Karthala.