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Abstract

It is now estimated that around 50 million displaced persons (highest number since the end of World War 2), and as many as 10 million are ‘on the move’ between countries at the present time. Mass migration is now undoubtedly be one of the biggest issues demanding global attention. A major concern for the United Nations over the next few years will certainly be how to deal with mass migration. The dominant messages from the mass media and politicians are dominated by ‘political correctness’, but fail to focus on the main issue of how newcomers and their children will function in their new location after arrival. Whilst the discourses of assimilation are becoming more pronounced, the question might then justifiably be asked, ‘What happens to the children of newcomers after arrival?’ This is a critical question in every sense and raises the issue of immigrant youth adaptation and experiences of identity and place in this age of shifting demographics, large-scale migration, and multicultural communities.

Not long ago most of the people who came to New Zealand were coming from parts of the United Kingdom with relatively few coming from anywhere else. Relatively little is known about the psychosocial adaptations and self-identities of young immigrants coming of age in the compound multiethnicity of contemporary New Zealand. Therefore, the overall aim of this study was to better understand the complexities of contemporary youth adaptation, at a time when immigrants into New Zealand are coming from an increasingly diverse range of nations. Specifically, the aim was to offer insights into how personal, social and cultural factors might combine to shape male adolescent experiences, and how these insights may be of use to teachers who work with this age group in culturally and ethnically diverse contexts.

I used detailed one-to-one interviews and drew on a social constructionist theoretical framework, to map the complex ways in which the boys said they negotiated, navigated, contested and resisted their engagements with the different discourses and stories about them that operate in their high school environment. Much of the analysis included an examination of how they reconstructed
adolescence from a position of young adulthood. The sort of data that I collected is not designed to offer a logical set of generalized statements about the immigration. Rather, the individualised comments offer a glimpse into the complexity of the individual experience of adapting to life in a new country for South African boys.

The findings of this study tend to suggest that there is a lot more going on in the lives of immigrant boys than what essentialist categories assume. *Identity uncertainty and confusion* and *surveillance and policing of school masculinities* were key themes raised during the analysis of the interviews. A main argument in the study is that cultural and ethnic identities for South African boys were defined through the possibilities offered to them in their social contexts. The themes draw attention to a distinctive contradiction between cultural messages from home to ‘remain rooted’ in their heritage culture versus messages from the host to either ‘fit in’ or to be socially excluded. This home/host contradiction had different meanings for individual boys, and this varied across the different ethnic groups.

The findings also tend to suggest that the masculine identities that South African boys constructed and lived out were not fixed and unproblematic but rather fluid and in constant flux. They show the role of schooling in the shaping of a range of different male heterosexual subjectivities, and how the subject positions that the boys inhabited held different configurations of threat and promise of social inclusion based on their particular South Africanness. Although these findings are not representative of all South African boys in New Zealand, they do suggest some of the ways that immigration and masculinity might intersect during adolescence and the ways aspects of masculine identity expressions come to reflect the social relations at school.
Preface

“There is no greater agony like bearing an untold story inside you”
(Hurston, 1942, p. 176)

The study came into existence with concerns about school-resistant student (sub-) culture for South African boys, frustrating teachers at my school and pulling the welcome mat well and truly from under their feet. Appallingly, these boys committed offenses that ranged from swearing at teachers, truancy, fighting, and vandalism to smoking weed on the school premises. One day a colleague of mine remarked: “These guys of yours are out of control, we should just kick them out of school, and they don’t know how lucky they are to live in New Zealand.” I felt bitter that the reputations of immigrant students were trashed by the bad behaviour of these rule breakers.

Inspired not only by my own cultural link as a South African and my direct professional motivation as a teacher, my research agenda included a desire to better understand what was going on in the lives of these young immigrant males. I was interested to find out the extent to which immigration and ethnicity intersect with adolescent development. I realised that additional efforts were needed to find out if the issues that all adolescent boys have to deal with from time to time are different for immigrant boys. More information was needed about some of the contradictions imposed on immigrant boys by the dominant discourses about them, and how they navigated and negotiated these discourses on a daily basis. To be more specific, I wanted to investigate why some immigrant boys seem to struggle adapting/adjusting to their new learning and social environments while other newcomers seem to navigate adolescent school life with little or no fuss, sometimes against some powerful odds.

I invited a small group of South African young men to tell the stories of their lived experiences of adapting to life in New Zealand. My hope was to engage with
them in one-to-one interviews and to listen to their retrospective accounts of why it could be easier or more difficult for certain immigrant boys to adapt to life in a new country compared with other boys, and to find out if navigating adolescence would be more difficult for immigrant adolescent boys than for their New Zealand counterparts.

The potential significance of this study is not in making statements about the adaptation patterns of immigrant boys in a broad sense. Rather, this study’s usefulness lies in providing much-needed information about the links between youth migration, adolescent development and schooling as captured directly from ‘young immigrant voices’ (Ward 2013). The study calls for proper self-reflective scrutiny of pedagogical practices and invites teachers who work in culturally and ethnically diverse contexts to ‘rethink’ the taken-for-granted interpretations through which understandings of immigrant youth are framed.

The theme of this study is therefore as much in seeing what else retrospective storytelling may tell about the often hidden lives of immigrant boys than what conventional research methods are able to do as it is about opening up debates about how to accommodate immigrants coming into New Zealand classrooms. Writing the thesis has been a real privilege, and I have tried to be as faithful to the participants’ voices as possible. Their stories have touched me deeply and certainly changed my initial conceptions of immigrant youth and the very real issues that some of them face as they have to deal with adapting to life in a new country.
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Framing the study

“We all carry worlds in our head, and those worlds are decidedly different. We educators set out to teach, but how can we reach the worlds of others when we don’t even know they exist?”

(Delpit, 1995, p. xiv)

Introduction

For several centuries large numbers of people have lived a major part of their lives in a country other than that in which they were born, and their children may never have lived in the country their parents call home. Forced movements are happening for many reasons, particularly the desire to colonize, enforced movement in slavery and to escape religious/ethnic persecutions in extreme conflicts. In 1885, Ernest Ravenstein formulated his ‘laws of migration’ in which he asserted that migration movements during the industrial revolution were motivated primarily by a desire to escape extreme economic hardship. Central to his migration model is the concept of absorption and dispersion. To illustrate the relationship between migration and economic hardship, Ravenstein showed how people during that period were forced to move from low income to high-income areas, and from densely to sparsely populated areas.

The main thrust for international migration flow between countries has historically been governed by a ‘push-pull’ process (Lee, 1966). Host countries generally offered newcomers economic prosperity and lifestyle changes in return for their skills and social investment. Linda Molm and her colleagues posit that the motivation behind international migration patterns has remained fundamentally unchanged and is still governed by social exchanges of pulling out and pushing out (Molm, Witham & Melamed, 2012). They claim that social exchanges between individual migrants with sought-after resources (possessions
or behavioural capacities) and host countries normally develop within structures of mutual dependence, which take the form of productive social and economic exchanges (Molm, et al, 2012).

From the late 20th century voluntary emigration has become a global phenomenon that is growing in scope, complexity and impact with more than 214 million people, about 3 percent of the world’s population, now living outside their country of birth (United Nations Population Division, 2013). Contemporary migration typically involves moving for various reasons. People may move countries in order to improve life chances, increase work opportunities, experience new lifestyles and to escape religious/ethnic/political persecution, crime and extreme economic hardship (Faist, Fauser, & Reisenauer, 2013; Lee, 1966). Economist Robert Wade (2011) called into question the push-pull framework (Lee, 1966) for understanding contemporary migration patterns and gave a strong economic rationale for why people cross international borders permanently. He argued that flows of people are a function of economic inequality, since the fastest way for a poor person to get richer is to move from a poor country to a rich country.

As voluntary movement across national boundaries has increased, so too has forced migration to escape extreme physical dangers and economic hardship. It is now estimated that around fifty million displaced persons (highest number since the end of World War 2) and as many as ten million are ‘on the move’ between countries at the present time (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 2015). A consequence of the current situation is that nations in many areas of the world are presented with a ‘crisis on their doorstep’ forcing them to rethink ‘migration’ in all respects – from profound ideological persuasions through to coping with everyday realities when faced with dealing with a major forced displacement crisis. Thus, a major concern for the United Nations over the next few years will certainly be how to deal with mass migration.
The main focus of this study is to explore the developmental experiences of members of families who emigrated to another country ‘voluntarily.’ This does not imply that there were no significant threats or dangers that underpinned their decision-making, but that circumstances would not label them ‘refugees’ or ‘displaced persons.’ Rather, these ‘volunteer migrants’ are individuals and families who moved to another country in the hope of employment and lifestyle opportunities better than the ones they were leaving behind. Also, this study is concerned primarily with individuals from families whose decision-makers had chosen the new country carefully and planned to make it a permanent move.

Paying equal attention to the historical, cultural, religious and economic features of the host country’s population when researching and theorizing the experiences of adaptation for immigrants is important for this study. Here, I suggest that such experiences will not only be affected by the personal and cultural histories immigrants bring with them but how these have a particular interface with the host country. Therefore, an individual or group of individuals from any given country may face quite different challenges in their efforts to adapt to different host countries. It is for these reasons that I maintain that the experiences of immigration for individuals would unquestionably be immensely different if immigrants choose to settle in a country that is quite similar or vastly different to their country of origin.

There a number of factors that directly or peripherally impact migrating identities. Of relevance to my work, transformations in identity must now be seen as a result of how people think about themselves in relation to their social environment, both localized and global. Thus, by taking a more holistic approach to identity formation, I suggest that migrating identities for South African boys may be significantly different because they will be affected not only by these two sets of cultural influences but also by a sense of belonging to a global community. It is argued that most people worldwide now develop a bicultural identity that combines their local identity with an identity linked to a global culture (Arnett, 2002).
Accordingly, migrants may well question whether they feel a strong connection towards their heritage culture, host culture or indeed feel cosmopolitan or ‘like a person of the world.’ Given that many children and adolescents in particular now grow up in pluralistic societies and with a global consciousness (Arnett, 2002), I would be remiss to ignore the influence of globalisation on shaping the immigration experience for teenage boys and look beyond previous theorising that is grounded in a binary understanding of host culture/home cultural influence (Ward, 2013). Most of globalisation debates of the last decade have focused on the emerging economic and political aspects of transnational dynamics (Pries, 2004), and make us aware of potential conflicts as certain cultures collide.

This study is about the experiences of South African boys in New Zealand. It aims to examine the interface between the histories and legacies that South African boys bring with them and that they would come up against in New Zealand. In order to adequately explore these and other pressing issues facing these young males, the study is not primarily about the decisions made by adult family members in the late 20th century to leave South Africa and come to New Zealand, but of the experiences of their children who had to deal with life in a new cultural context as well as dealing with more general developmental issues of adolescence and the demands of secondary formal education. Central to my study is the exploration of the ways in which the particular historical and present-day cultural landscapes of the two countries (particularly as shaped by legacies of Apartheid and colonisation) meet to influence the specific opportunities and challenges these young immigrants have to face.

As a result of the particular recruitment process the study is about the children from families who left South Africa between 1992 and 2009, and who were aged from 7 months to 17 years old when arriving in New Zealand. The focus is exclusively on immigrant adolescent boy’s experiences of adaptation as they negotiated and navigated an educational context in New Zealand, which since the 1990s has been significantly influenced by concerns about ‘boys’
underachievement.’ The study attempts to provide insights from the lived experiences of a group of South African males with varied ethnic and cultural backgrounds as they negotiated the ethnic and cultural diversity of adolescent life in New Zealand. The idea is not only to give this particular group of participants an opportunity to tell their stories of adapting to certain and unpredictable situations but also to see what new insights retrospective accounts may offer up that may elude conventional methods of data collection.

**Conceptual focus**

*Theorizing the immigrant experience*

Over the last several years, as new waves of immigrants have continued to enter New Zealand, the effects of large-scale immigration on the nation’s economy, infrastructure and society have been hotly debated. Regardless, the experiences of children of immigrants coming to New Zealand remains relatively under-researched. More exhaustive research is needed to better understand how the offspring of newcomers adapt to their new environment. The concept of ‘adaptation’ is used for this study; examining the processes of acculturation that immigrant children must navigate, or the unique educational and psychological consequences that emerge as they try to cope with adjusting to life in a new community. Employing theories of acculturation (‘integration’/‘assimilation’/‘incorporation’) allows me to explore how ethnic identity development may arise out of the interactions of two cultures coming into contact with each other. This will be discussed in more detail in Chapter Two. To do this, I draw extensively on the theory of ethnic identity development as advanced by Erik Erikson (1959, 1968) and others like James Marcia (1966), Jean Phinney (1990) and Jeffrey Arnett (2002), who followed him.

In some ways, Erikson’s work continues to be relevant because there are still many countries, including Australia, Canada and New Zealand, where programmes for ‘improving’ the lives of Indigenous minority students are based
fundamentally on an Eriksonian approach. This approach is used in many schools to help Indigenous students explore actively and to identify with their ethnic heritage. The idea is that if they explore, as opposed to have it told to them, then they will be able to work through issues by achieving a sense of ethnic identity. The aim of these programmes is for students to take on their heritage culture rather than forgetting and abandoning the local knowledge and traditions.

Erikson’s work is important for this study because it will allow closer attention to be paid to how South African boys explored self-identities and to see how these identities ‘fit’ with their current adaptation needs. As young immigrants explore their identities, they will question the dualities of their new settings. It also provides a framework in which I can explore the complex relationship between immigration and male identities at a time when adolescent boys may experience identity ambivalence and uncertainty.

From the 1960s onwards, James Marcia carefully studied Eriksonian theory and developed the identity status approach to studying the process of identity formation. Simply put, diffusion is characterized by lack of exploration and lack of commitment; foreclosure, by commitment without exploration; moratorium as exploration in progress; and identity achievement as commitment subsequent to serious exploration of alternatives (Marcia, 1966). It is obvious that the theory may offer up distinctly different outcomes for (a) all adolescents, (b) Indigenous minorities, and (c) immigrants. I will draw on Marcia’s four identity statuses to examine both outcomes and processes of ethnic identity formation among South African adolescent boys within this context.

Jean Phinney’s (1990) theory of ethnic identity construction was composed of the following three stages for shaping ethnic identity in a host country: (a) unexamined ethnic identity (unexplored positive or negative view of their ethnic group), (b) ethnic identity search or exploration (to search for what it means to be a member of an ethnic group), and (c) achieved ethnic identity (possessing a clear meaning of ethnicity within the individual’s life. Her model included the process
whereby the immigrant questions whether or not to retain his or her ‘ethnic label’ or select the label of the host society. Interestingly, Phinney suggests that ethnic identity construction is a continuous process and does not always lead to ‘achieved’ ethnic identity in late adolescence.

I will be specifically using the theoretical work of John Berry around acculturation. One of Berry’s most significant contributions to the study of acculturation has been his insistence on the need to consider the multiple types of responses that an individual can have to acculturation. While initially he wrote about *varieties of acculturation*, he more recently referred to it as *acculturation strategies* or *acculturation modes* (Berry, 2006a). What this means is that an individual’s choice of a strategy depends on such circumstances as their level of involvement with each culture they encounter as well as specific attitudinal and behavioural preferences and characteristics. Berry further argued that these four strategies may be determined by the amount of stress the newcomers may experience and how well they adapt psychologically and socio-culturally to their new environment.

I will also draw on Jeffrey Arnett’s work on hybrid identity development to illustrate that we cannot simply ignore that many adolescents (including immigrants) now grow up within a globalized world (Arnett, 2002). That is, transformations in identity are a result of how young people think about themselves in relation to their social environment. According to Arnett (2002) a different time now prevails where some people in the West are developing a so-called ‘bicultural identity’ which is often “characterized by a part of people’s identity remaining rooted in their local culture, while another part stems from an awareness of their relation to the global culture” (p. 777). The true propellant for why I wish to examine how immigrant boys are constituted by contemporary globalized discourses is to gain a better understanding of how migrating identities are constructed and lived out in a globalized arena. All of this is to suggest that the cultural awareness that today’s young people acquire comes into existence through living in a technologically connected world.
Central to my study is the notion that individual boys construct and perform masculinity in a manner that is not uniform or universally generalizable to all boys (Cornwall & Lindisfarne, 1994). As such, identifying individual factors and how they impact masculinity has been of great interest to me as a high school teacher. In this chapter I draw on the work of Simone de Beauvoir’s (1949, 2009) critique of ‘gender as origin’ or as an essence from which things are initiated. I use Judith Butler’s (1990) work where she suggested that gender is always a ‘doing’, but not a ‘doing’ by a subject who might be said to pre-exist the deed. In doing so, I wish to show how a continuing debate from different perspectives within feminism and pro-feminism has challenged unitary notions of masculinity as a monolithic unproblematic entity (Mac an Ghaill, 1996). The key message from feminist thought encourages the idea of gender as socially constructed.

I will use the work of R.W. Connell and Máirtín Mac an Ghaill to provide a theoretical frame for exploring the extent to which schools act as masculinizing agents. Secondary school enters the picture, Connell (1992) wrote, at this very critical stage of psychosexual development. Also, what is important to note is that the impact that schools have on the construction of gender has to be understood in this light. It is the indirect and hidden effects of schooling that play a powerful hand in the construction of certain forms of masculinities. Sports for example are a key element in the school’s ‘hidden curriculum’ and can be as pronounced as the ‘explicit curriculum’ when issues of school masculinity formation are examined. Connell (1995) suggested, “men’s greater sporting prowess has become … symbolic proof of superiority and right to rule” (p. 54). Thus, schools through sport not only reproduces the gendered nature of the social world, but sporting competitions become the principle sites where masculine behaviours are learned and reinforced.

The work of Mac an Ghaill (1994) has been a great inspiration for me and I will use his work with teenagers, in which he illustrated the role of masculinity in the
hierarchical power structures in schools, as a conceptual frame for this study. Importantly, he considered the ways in which multiple masculinities were played out against femininity and how existing power relations impacted student’s educational and social outcomes. Mac an Ghaill described a range of male groups within the school where he conducted his study in an attempt to provide a “conceptual map, on which to try to make sense of students’ masculine formation in terms of their own intercultural meanings within the local conditions of a secondary school” (p. 54). He identified specific versions of masculinities and categorized typologies of groups of working-class students that foremost described student’s relationships to schooling. Although his study was conducted twenty years ago, it can still provide an important framework for studying school masculinities.

**Conceptual tools**

**Social constructionism**

This study is solidly grounded in a social constructionist methodology aimed at looking at how the social world was being created around the young people under study, and how their accounts reflect the challenges of coming of age in a new country. I do this for several reasons. First, I principally rely on the basic idea of social constructionism that “as we communicate with each other we construct the world in which we live” (Gergen, 2009, p. 4) for understanding how gendered identities are constructed. Second, social constructionists argue that knowledge arises from social processes and interactions – while categories such as race/ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, and class being social constructs that may vary across time and culture. Therefore I envisioned that semi-structured one-to-one interviews would provide a way of understanding the complexities of migrating identity construction among South African boys.

Listening to the respondents’ accounts may well illustrate how they made meaning of the world and how they constructed the realities of their schooling
during adolescence. My study’s aim is to examine further how “schools exist as sites where styles of masculinities are produced and used” (Mac an Ghaill, 1996, p. 52). Although research in this area has predominately concentrated on students still at school, informed discussions with young men who have left school suggest that listening to their retrospective accounts may offer additional insights into how various spaces within school define and police ‘normal’ forms of masculinity. A significant example of the value of retrospective data was demonstrated by Connell (1989) in her seminal work with two groups of young adult males in Australia where she shows how life-history interviews located the school as a site for the differentiation of masculinities.

**Discourse**

One of the key assumptions of this study is that masculinity is shaped in and through discourse. I willingly utilize Michel Foucault’s (1972) theoretical description of ‘discourse’ as referring to a system of values and beliefs that produce particular social practices and social relations that are then perceived as ‘truths.’ I do this because his understanding of discourse is borne of anti-essentialism:

> We shall call discourse a group of statements in so far as they belong to the same discursive formation [...] discourse] is made up of a limited number of statements for which a group of conditions of existence can be defined. Discourse in this sense is not an ideal, timeless form [...] it is, from beginning to end, historical – a fragment of history [...] posing its own limits, its divisions, its transformations, the specific modes of its temporality. (Foucault 1972, p. 117).

Important for this study, discourse can be seen as a way of speaking or a network of rules that establish what constitutes a way of thinking and of shaping the world. Thus, the constitutive nature of discourse allows us to think about the various types of social practices, such as discriminatory language and other acts of social
interactions among boys and significant others. At the same time, a central tenet of my study is based on the social constructionist premise that knowledge is not just a reflection of reality but that ‘truth’ is a discursive construction, and that different regimes of knowledge determine what is true and what is false.

An obvious starting point for my study, therefore, is to take into account that discourse shape us all and like everybody else, the boys who were the subject of this study were also constituted within discourse. Thus, being constituted in discourse is a prerequisite for something to become meaningful and thereby possible to understand. Certainly, there may have been multiple knowledge regimes that operated in the lives of the respondents when they attended high school, and each knowledge regime may have inscribed on their bodies what (who) they were (Butler, 1990). Moreover, different discourses may have existed side by side or struggled for the right to define what the adolescent boys are like. Therefore, I take the view that it is very important for this study’s goal to turn to the reiterative power of discourse when examining the role that discourse play in regulating and constraining certain forms of migrating masculine identities (Butler, 1990; Mac an Ghaill, 1994, 1996).

Subjectivity

Another important conceptual tool for understanding the complex lives of young adolescent males is subjectivity. One of critical psychology’s main criticisms leveled at mainstream or conventional psychology is that it fails to consider the way power between social groups can impact individuals or groups of people. It does this, in part, because it tends to ignore subjectivity and is inclined to explain behaviour at the level of the individual. For instance, if researchers want to know about a fourteen-year-old boy and how he is coping with school, then they will give him their tests, look at what his teachers have to say about him, look at his school record, speak with his parents, and the last thing they will do is ask him how he feels and how he is doing and so on. From a vantage point afforded by such theorizing, it is proposed that there is a sense that mainstream psychology
may well fail to take into account what the individual has to say about their personal experiences.

Ironically, critics of mainstream psychology have frequently pointed out that while psychology has always claimed to put the individual at the centre of their enquiry, this appears not to be the case. For example, when researchers attempt to study young people and dismiss what the individual has to say about himself/herself as unimportant, problems arise around the understanding of the complexities of adolescence. That is, when mainstream psychologists collect large amounts of data from a huge number of people, they often tell stories about the average to inform how to deal with the individual. The individual under study is the least important source of information about himself or herself. Everybody else, including adults, psychologists, general practitioners, school records, teachers and the questionnaires individuals are requested to fill out are all very important, but dismiss how the individual interprets their lives and what they see as important or not. There is an entire ethnographical tradition, not least within the boundaries of education, which seems to ignore subjectivity since it is based on the premise that ‘the psychologist knows best’ and the individual story is ‘just an anecdote.’ This current study wish to challenge the assumption that nothing important can be said on the basis of a story from one person or a small groups of people.

Given the relatively limited individual-level qualitative studies about South African immigrants in New Zealand, I aim to pay greater attention to the complexity of the individual experiences and to consider what each interviewee has to say about his lived experiences. Each individual will then become a key source of information, rather than using the interpretive methods of so-called ‘subjective psychology’ and then overgeneralizing on the basis of a small group of respondents what can be assumed for every South African boy in New Zealand.
Discourse analysis

Fundamentally the word ‘discourse’ is the general idea that language is structured according to different patterns that people’s utterances follow when they take part in various domains of social life (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). Discourse analysis is the analysis of these patterns and is based on the understanding that there is much more going on when people communicate than simply the transfer of information (Gee, 2005). The aim of this study is to examine the ways in which the participants articulated their understandings of the world and how they retrospectively describe their lived experiences of adapting to life in a new country. While their experiences cannot be viewed as a transparent reflection of the ‘world of the immigrant boy’, it was considered to be a product of historical and culturally specific constructions of the world and therefore contingent (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002).

Because language use is context bound, I was interested in the participant’s actual words. I wanted to examine how South African boy’s subjectivities were constituted through situated language and social and discursive activities. Therefore, I will use an approach to analyse their utterances as proposed by Margaret Wetherell and Jonathan Potter. Central to their model is the view of discourses as ‘interpretive repertoires’ that are used as flexible resources in social interaction. Wetherell and Potter’s (1992) approach has been particularly useful and widely used as an analytical tool for researching discourses within everyday communications about culture and language. I was quite drawn to this model and deemed it appropriate for this study, because this approach shares the constructionist premise that language is a dynamic form of social practice that shapes the social world including identities, social relations and understandings of the world. A more sophisticated discussion for the reasons why I selected discursive analysis as a methodology and a framework for analysing the interview data will be given in Chapter 5.
The aims of the study

There are three broad aims for this study. First, I attempt to better understand the complexities of contemporary youth adaptation at a time when immigrants into New Zealand are coming from an increasingly diverse range of nations. One of the reasons for this is to offer insights into how personal, social and cultural factors might combine to shape male adolescent experiences, and how these insights may be of use to teachers who work with this age group, given it was not long since most of the people who come to New Zealand were coming from parts of the United Kingdom with relatively few coming from anywhere else. Thus, the overall aims of this study was to explore and interpret the meanings that a group of first (and so-called ‘1.5’) generation South African males with diverse ethnic (or ‘race’) and cultural backgrounds themselves attribute to their experiences of adapting to New Zealand’s social life during adolescence.

The second aim of my study is to provide those teachers who are working in culturally and ethnically diverse contexts with information about how immigrant boys interpret their actions compared with the dominant adult interpretation of adolescent males, so that the behaviours of certain boys may be understood better. Specifically, in what ways did the particularities (e.g. distinct values, attitudes, and cultural practices) that individual boys from a variety of ethnic and cultural backgrounds brought with them to the interface with New Zealand cultures mediate the construction of different masculine identities. Although a number of recent studies have taken up the theme of migration and masculinity (e.g. Adebani, Phatudi & Hartell, 2014; Kao, Vaquera & Goyette, 2013; Nguyen, 2011; Tecle, 2012) and have contributed significantly towards advancing understandings about the negotiations and fashioning of masculinities in new and changing locations, they do not facilitate a thorough exploration of the power that congeal the construction of migrating masculinities.

The third aim of this study is to examine in what ways the dynamics of school life mediated the conditions under which the boys acquired their identities, and what
are some of the tensions and contradictions within these masculine identity formations. Such insights may be of use to help teachers (re)think more carefully about what can be assumed about certain boys and what cannot be accepted as ‘meaningful’ and ‘true’.

Potential significance of this study

Shifting demographics, large-scale migration, and multicultural communities have created an unquestionably interesting but equally challenging time for host nations. In particular for what schools should be doing in terms of reacting to the influx of migrants and refugees at a time when mass migration raises recent concerns over social cohesion and calls for paying attention to how newcomers will function in their new locations (Papillon, 2012; Spoonley & Tolley, 2012). A potential significance of this study is that it particularly places the individual’s perspective of adaptation rather than an en masse perspective at the centre of current debates around how to deal with newcomers. A key factor here is the direct engagement of young voices may well provide a fresh new approach to examining the lived experiences of adaptation “from an immigrant perspective” (Ward, 2013, p. 393).

Methodologically, one of the main difficulties for studying adolescent boys, who are still studying at secondary school, is that the social context they are embedded in may be critically significant in influencing how, what and when they could or would say to a researcher (Mac an Ghaill, 1992, 1994). Working with young people who have left school already has huge methodological and ethical benefits for youth research for various reasons. These will be discussed later on in Chapter Six. Perhaps the most important feature of this study is its ability to offer young males a safe space to speak from, where they are not subjected to the conventional forms of surveillance, power relations and policing as compared with research conducted from a ‘within-school’ approach (Martino & Pallotta-Chiarolli, 2005).
The potential usefulness of this study lies in the fact that much of the analysis included an examination of how direct and peripheral factors mediated how the participants made meaning of their past experiences (how and what they know; then and now), and how they reconstructed adolescence from a position of young adulthood. My contention is that storytelling can assist in telling us about the often hidden lives of adolescent boys, hopefully offering more than what the existing research can do. With this mind, the text will probably not be able to tell teachers how to deal with immigrants in a general sense, but may be useful to help teachers better understand immigrant students and how to deal with a particular student (or groups of students), in particular, during one-on-one situations when they may experience some difficulty in their young lives.

**Outline of the thesis**

Chapter 2 focuses on identity. In this chapter I will be exploring the definitional frameworks identity, dimensions of measurement and methodology. I draw extensively on the theories of identity advanced by Erik Erikson (1959) and other identity scholars like James Marcia and Jean Phinney who followed him. The second part of this chapter focuses on the concepts of acculturation and aims to outline the theoretical work of John Berry and his theories around differing processes of acculturation in terms of integration, assimilation, separation and marginalisation.

Chapter 3 brings to this study the added dimension of gender. It begins by looking at the social construction of gender with a particular focus on examining ongoing research in the area of masculinity. In particular, the chapter explores the role of school practices in the formation of masculinities and examines some key arguments within the ‘boys will be boys’ debates. The aim of this chapter is to present a case that supports a closer examination of the interrelationship between social practices and masculinity.
Chapter 4 concerns aspects of the research context within which this study was conducted and reviews the historical, political and cultural features of both the sending and receiving countries. In the final section of this chapter, I examine some of the pedagogical discourses that are operating in the New Zealand educational landscape.

Chapter 5 deals with the four areas that framed the design, conduct, analysis and reporting of the interview data. In this chapter I present a broad overview of how Social Constructionism helped to shape the ways I look at understandings of the world and my assumptions of how knowledge is created. This discussion is followed by an outline of research procedures such as the interview structure, recruiting of the participants and transcription and analysis of the data.

In Chapter 6 I focus broadly on the biography of each of the twenty-one South African young men who volunteered their participation in this study. As has been noted earlier, the aim was to examine how the individual’s personal characteristics, together with other social and cultural factors may combine to shape their experiences. The chapter concludes by looking at the way some of the participants reconstructed adolescence from a position of young adulthood through their stories. Four narratives are presented.

Chapters 7 and 8 collectively present the analysis of the interview data and show how both the participant’s sociocultural locations and social practices were operative in the construction of the self and their world. The aim of these two chapters is to give the interviewees as much space as possible so that they are able to speak directly to those individuals who work with immigrant youth on a daily basis. I use both thematic analysis and discourse analysis to frame the interpretation and analysis of the young men’s self-stories as the bearers of discourse.
In the final chapter, I discuss the analysed data by bringing the scholarship of immigration, masculinity and schooling during adolescence together and allowing the research data to speak into the debates around the immigrant youth adaptation. Chapter 9 concludes with a consideration of the implications for teaching and learning in culturally and ethnically diverse contexts and suggests further avenues of research in the area of youth adaption.
Theorizing the immigrant experience

“Acculturation is dynamic because it is a continuous and fluctuating process and it is multidimensional because it transpires across numerous indices of psychosocial functioning and can result in multiple adaptation outcomes”

(Organista et al., 2010, p. 105)

Introduction

International research in countries with long histories of immigration (e.g. the ‘settler states’ of the United States, Canada, Australia and New Zealand) was once dominated by the classic assimilation discourse, which advocated the elimination of ethnic identity and the reconstruction of a ‘host only and English only’ immigrant identity (Rong & Preissle, 2009). Discourses of assimilation predict a straightforward, upwardly mobile progression into the host society when ‘foreigners’ complete their transformation. Classic assimilationists hold that the key for successful integration, and especially for their children to do well at school, is for newcomers to persevere in their new location and for them to willingly succumb to the new national identity of the host country. This mindset emphasizes self-motivation and self-sufficiency, claiming that children with immigrant backgrounds generally show satisfactory levels of psychological and social adjustment when they become more familiar with the host culture and major institutions, including schools (Farahani, 2010; Rumbaut, 2005).

Recent reports highlight how the influx of new labour migrants and refugees from a diverse range of countries is reshaping the ethnic mixes, not only of traditional host nations, but also countries that have not been notable immigrant-receiving nations (e.g. those of Continental Europe and to a lesser extent, Japan) (Faist & Kivisto, 2010). There are historical recordings of immigration into France but
mainly from its colonies. While the field of migration studies is expanding, one important challenge is to broaden research from mainly an adult perspective to include research efforts from a young people and to pay more attention to analyzing and explain the dynamics of youth adaptation from their vantage point. It is essential to note that the high level of migration, the diversity of new migrants, the new locales of settlement, the significance they attach to their identity and citizenship, and the potency of a globalized popular culture are all contributing to the quest for new theories to make sense of the immigrant experience in today’s changing world (Kivisto, 2010; Organista et al., 2010).

More recently, the meta-analysis by Nguyen and Benet-Martínez (2013) concluded that integration is associated with better adaptation. However, conventional accounts of ethnic identity shifts among immigrants suggest that adaptation is never solely a simple linear process. Adapting to a new country often depends on the socioeconomic status of the newcomer or the level of acculturation, but also hinges on the context of reception and the degree of discrimination experienced by subordinate groups (Rumbaut, 2005). This chapter brings the added dimension of psychosocial adaptations and self-identities to the study of youth adaptation. Since the social phenomenon of contemporary migration is too complex to be properly understood by a single theoretical frame, I draw on the theories of identity as advanced by Erik Erikson (1959), James Marcia, Jean Phinney and Jeffery Arnett to frame my enquiry. Chapter Two also includes an examination of the concepts of acculturation as outlined in the theoretical work of John Berry.

Adolescence and Identity Exploration

Erikson

Adolescence is widely recognized as a stage associated with a substantial change in the self (Erikson, 1959). Perhaps the most popular and influential framework for conceptualising the transformation of the self during adolescence has been
provided by Erik Erikson (1959). Indeed, he argued that adolescence as an important stage for identity formation and wrote about the formation of a personal sense of identity as one of the cornerstones of ego development. While Erikson’s theory of human development was highly influenced by psychoanalyst Sigmund Freud’s work, he centred his theory on psychosocial development rather than psychosexual development. Much like Sigmund Freud (1923/1961), Erikson believed that personality develops in a series of stages, but unlike Freud theory of psychosexual stages, his psychosocial developmental theory describes the impact of social experience across the entire lifespan.

I approach my early understandings of adolescent development using Erikson’s psychosocial developmental theory (1959). His theory grew out of an ego psychoanalytic developmental framework. The most important aspect of his approach to identity is its definition as an ongoing developmental process where he emphasized the role of culture and society. Erikson pointed out the conflicts that can take place within the ego itself, whereas Freud stressed the conflict between the primitive (unconscious) and the superego that incorporates the values and morals that are learnt from others. Extending on Freudian thoughts, Erikson focused on the adaptive and creative characteristics of the ego and expanded the notion of the stages of personality development to include the entire lifespan.

Table 1 illustrates Erikson’s eight psychosocial stages of development and provides insights into personality development extending from infancy through to old age. Each stage reaches its ascendancy during a broadly defined chronological period (e.g., the stage of Basic Trust - from birth to toddlerhood; Generativity during middle adulthood, etc.) and is assumed to have somatic, psychological, and social aspects, as well as a historical-cultural context. Erikson’s theory can be conceptualized as epigenetic. After all, each stage has both predecessors and legacies which is indicative of the relative plasticity of human development across the lifespan, and the usefulness of the contextual view of development in adolescence (Erikson, 1959).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approximate age</th>
<th>Ego quality</th>
<th>Psycho social crisis</th>
<th>Significant relationship</th>
<th>Existential question</th>
<th>Examples of what is important at this stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0–2 years</td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>Basic trust vs. mistrust</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Can I trust the world?</td>
<td>Feeding, abandonment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2–4 years</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Autonomy vs. shame and Doubt</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Is it okay to be me?</td>
<td>Toilet training, clothing self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4–5 years</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Initiative vs. guilt</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Is it okay for me to do, move and act?</td>
<td>Exploring, using tools or making art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5–12 years</td>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>Industry vs. inferiority</td>
<td>Neighbours, school</td>
<td>Can I make it in the world of people and things?</td>
<td>School, sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13–19 years</td>
<td>Fidelity</td>
<td>Identity vs. role confusion</td>
<td>Peers, role model</td>
<td>Who am I? What can I be?</td>
<td>Social relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–39 years</td>
<td>Love</td>
<td>Intimacy vs. isolation</td>
<td>Friends, partners</td>
<td>Can I love?</td>
<td>Romantic relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–64 years</td>
<td>Care</td>
<td>Generativity vs. stagnation</td>
<td>Household, workmates</td>
<td>Can I make my life count?</td>
<td>Work, parenthood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65–death</td>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>Ego integrity vs. despair</td>
<td>Mankind, my kind</td>
<td>Is it okay to have been me?</td>
<td>Reflection on life</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Erik H. Erikson’s eight stages of psychosocial development.

(Source: Erikson, 1959)

Identity formation during adolescence

During adolescence (usually age 12 to 18 but may well extend into the mid to late twenties, or beyond according to later research), the transition from childhood is most important as young people become more independent, and begin to look at the future in terms of career, relationships, and so on. Erikson put a great deal of emphasis on the adolescent period and felt that it was a crucial stage for developing a person’s identity as he suggested that the individual wants to belong to a society and fit in. Like Freud, Erikson maintained that the stages of
psychosocial development build upon the previous stage. In his definition of the concept of identity, he located the individual within the context of a life cycle scheme of development. Then, according to Erikson, life cycles are divided into chronological periods, each one of which is marked by a crisis in ego growth, a chance to move forward, to remain static, or even to regress. The outcome of this ‘maturation timetable’ is a wide and integrated set of life skills and abilities that function together within the autonomous individual. However, instead of focussing on sexual development (like Freud), he was particularly interested in how young people engage with their social contexts and how social interactions affect their sense of self.

My curiosity in identity development among minority teenagers, particularly immigrants, stems from reading Erikson’s (1968) seminal work, *Identity, youth and Crisis*. In this text, he located the search for and development of one’s identity as the critical psychosocial task of adolescence. Adolescence, Erikson argued, is a time of significant change: the body and the sexual organs mature, new expectations for social and academic adjustments arise with the transition to secondary school, self-image typically suffers, and life can be very stressful, especially in the earlier transition stage (Erikson, 1968). Typically the concern of this period for adolescents is to separate themselves from their parents, especially boys from their fathers, and to assume their identity. Identity development during adolescence, however, is experienced within a community of important others (Erikson, 1968). Increasingly adolescents may experience heightened levels of tension with learning ‘who they are’ during this crucial stage of psychosocial development.

*Cultural identity formation during adolescence*

The teenage years can be a time of identity crisis for some (not all) young people. Erikson describes adolescence as “a turning point of increased vulnerability and heightened potential” (Erikson, 1968, p. 96). The fundamental task of adolescence is identity exploration. Erikson suggested that the outcome of identity exploration is either denial or the assumption of a ‘healthy’ identity formation (Erikson,
Denial can take the form of defiance of authority or resignation and despair, which he termed diffusion. This sense of inner contradictions is predicted on the resolution of previous developmental stages. Identity formation during adolescence can thus be theorized as the result of a fusion of earlier identifications.

Alongside his work in psychanalysis, Erikson also explored the links between psychology and anthropology in order to better understand human personality. During his time at Yale University, Erikson carried out two important anthropological studies of the Lakota and the Yurok Native American tribes. He published the results of these studies in *Childhood and Society* (1950), the first account of his theory of psychosocial development. Erikson noted that the ‘new culture’ were in direct contradiction of the basic tenets of Native American culture and did not provide the necessary social substitutions for their traditional rituals that has served as a guide throughout life before being abandoned. Throughout his observations of these Native American tribes, Erikson became aware of the influence that culture and external events have on identity formation. As a result, Erikson’s work around identity exploration during adolescence continues to be relevant today and there are still a number of countries, including Australia, Canada and New Zealand, where programmes for ‘improving’ the lives of Indigenous minority students are based essentially on an Eriksonian approach.

Many New Zealand schools with high Māori populations continue to use an Eriksonian approach to raise Māori students’ educational achievement. The notion that when teachers create culturally-responsive learning spaces, where students are able to identify with their ethnic heritage and to actively explore it, they will achieve a sense of cultural and ethnic identity as opposed to have it told to them. From Erikson’s perspective, the positive influence of take on one’s heritage culture rather than forgetting and abandoning the local knowledge and traditions espouse a sense of ethnic identity and cultural pride in young Indigenous people.
Although most Māori students in New Zealand remain within the mainstream education system, increasing numbers (more than 7,000) are taking advantage of growing opportunities in Māori medium education (New Zealand Ministry of Education, 2013). These include Kōhanga Reo (Māori medium early childhood education services), Kura Kaupapa (Māori medium schools) and Kura Reorua (bilingual and Māori language immersion classes in mainstream schools). This is one of the most important developments in New Zealand education and has created a strong demand for Māori at all levels to accept increased responsibility for transforming their own conditions. Subsequently, by ‘getting out from under the influence of the reproductive forces of dominant society’ Māori found a way to get momentum towards change (Smith, 2003, p.1). The primary argument from proponents of Māori medium education is the notion that Māori students’ learning and educational development improves when they learn as Māori.

It is worth noting that Erikson’s work has been subjected to major feminist criticism for portraying an Eurocentric male model of normality (Archer, 1992). Gilligan (1982) questioned how one could assume a ‘normal’ model when one sex has been essentially invisible in the development of the theoretical postulates. Some of his later writings confirm what many feminists point out that he wrote about women as an ‘afterthought’ portraying them as deviant rather than normal. In spite of these shortcomings, I view Erik Erikson’s work as useful for my study because it will allow me to particularly pay attention to how South African boys explored ethnic identities and self-identities and to see how they navigated social interactions in order to ‘fit’ with their current adaptation needs. Given Erikson’s argument that psychosocial stages progress in a definite order that is linked to social expectations and bodily maturation, this approach would be most useful. Indeed, with respect to cultural maintenance and cultural shifts, it would be of huge value to examine the discursive points for change in ethnic and national self-identities among South African boys from an ethnic identity construction perspective.
Building on Erikson’s work, James Marcia (1966) developed the identity status approach to studying the process of identity formation as a result of twenty-five years of intensive research. He elaborated on Erikson’s model to include identity formation in a variety of life domains. According to Marcia (1966), identity construction involves a sense of oneself by having continued connections with one’s past, with having an active direction in the present, and by having some future trajectory or goal. Marcia’s four identity statuses occupy unique positions along dimensions of exploration and commitment. Identity statuses are both outcomes of the process of identity formation and of the structural properties of the personality, where each portrays a dominant mode of experiencing the world.

The four identity statuses are as follows:

1. **Identity diffusion**: Someone who has not genuinely explored alternatives and is uncommitted. The lack of exploration is the least developmentally advanced status, although, like all the other statuses, it has adaptive aspects, and may be the most adaptive mode of functioning under certain conditions.

2. **Foreclosure**: Someone who has not undertaken exploration, but is firmly committed. People who follow the foreclosure pattern adapt a single set of values and goals, usually to directions established in childhood. It represents a high level of commitment following little or no exploration. For some identity foreclosure is a developmental starting point, from which a period of exploration will ensue.

3. **Moratorium**: Someone who is in the middle of an exploratory period with commitments only vaguely formed and somewhat tenuously maintained. Marcia’s moratorium status refers to the process of forging an identity from the myriad of possibilities available. It is arguably considered a stage rather than a resolution of the identity formation process, although some people apparently remain in moratorium over many years.

4. **Identity achievement**: Someone who has undergone an exploratory period and is currently committed to a future direction and set of beliefs. It
represents an autonomous resolution of identity, incorporating a set of commitments adopted during a period of exploration (moratorium).

Marcia’s (1966) earlier work was devoted to the two primary dimensions of self-definition: an exploration of identity and a commitment to identity. At late adolescence, around ages 18–22 in the West, an individual may be found to be located primarily in one of four identity statuses based on defining criteria of exploration and commitment in the three domains of occupation, ideology, and sexuality (Marcia, 1966). Identity exploration and commitment, however, may not be restricted to these three domains as there may be more depending on contextual factors.

Marcia’s (2006) more recent research offered some evidence to suggest that ethnic identity achievement can be an ongoing process. This is permitted because
an individual may still be expected to undergo subsequent identity crises throughout the life cycle, as each stage presents its own challenges and necessitates a reformulation of the initial identity. Even if a person has successfully navigated the identity formation process of exploration and commitment, they remain open to new information potentially disequilibrating the identity structure and can confront successive life cycle identity challenges with increased openness and confidence. These successive identity reformulations are referred to as moratorium-achievement- moratorium-achievement (MAMA) cycles (Marcia, 2006; Marcia and Josselson, 2013).

Jane Kroger and her colleagues suggested that most moratoriums would likely have resolved positively providing that there were no issues with the fourth stage of psychosocial development of industry vs. inferiority during late childhood (Kroger, Martinussen & Marcia, 2010). Although, the most important process of identity development takes place during adolescence (Erikson, 1968), the previous stage of competence (‘industry vs. ‘inferiority’) is a time of when children learn what their culture deems as important. More than in the earlier years, they are involved in peer groups, putting them in a position to compare themselves to others (Kroger & Marcia, 2011; Santrock, 2007). When the comparison is positive, they are inspired to work (industry) and accomplish self-worth. Conversely, when the comparison is not favourable, they may well feel inferior to their classmates (Santrock, 2007). During these moments, self-efficacy develops and becomes significant. Self-efficacy is the attempt to assess one’s worth through comparison with others (Santrock, 2007). Marcia and Josselson (2013) also found that the majority of the young adults they studied, who battled with identity during early adolescence, have been found to move into identity achievement either during late adolescence or young adulthood. That is, even though some moratoriums make retrograde movement into foreclosure, these are a minority, as are those disturbed moratoriums that may be the few who fall into diffusion (Marcia & Josselson, 2013). They suggest further that other persons may remain in moratorium, especially those who experienced prolonged exploratory periods.
Understanding the dynamic and fluid nature of identity is important for understanding young people’s behavioural patterns. Both Erikson and Marcia remarked upon the importance of refraining from labeling adolescents in pejorative legal and psychiatric terms. They advised strongly against ‘diagnosing’ and treating teenagers as criminals, as constitutional misfits, or as derelicts doomed by their upbringing. Indeed, when society constructs young people in a negative way through language which is performative, performativity becomes the pronouncement of what will be performed (Butler, 1990). This, I argue, is an important point for my study because when the saying of something becomes the deed, young people may well put their energies into becoming exactly what a careless and fearful community expects (Erikson, 1968). In other words, if adult society fails to promote ‘positive’ identity development, young people (including immigrant) may turn to alternative sources of group identity such as youth gangs to express their own identity.

Jean Phinney

The construction of ethnic identities plays a significant role in the adjustment and well-being for adolescents with ethnic minority backgrounds (Phinney, 1990). Prominent identity scholar Jean Phinney (1990) argued that immigrant youths from ethnic minority groups face all the challenges of migration but have additional challenges if they assume that their cultural heritage is deemed as unimportant by their adopted society. Initially she provided a multi-dimensional theory of identity development that has become the ‘Holy Grail’ for measuring ethnic identity formation among immigrant groups. This is because multiple factors can influence ethnic identity and provides a frequently cited model that is applicable to various ethnic minority groups.

Furthermore, Phinney (1990) argued that the majority of ethnic minorities belong to groups that are lower in status and power in society. Accordingly, they are less well represented in society and often subjected to prejudice and discrimination,
and may hold values different from those of the larger society (Phinney, 1989). In this setting, and at the same time, immigrants have to make decisions about how to live within these dual cultural heritages and their status in their host society (Phinney, 1989). This serves to demonstrate that research on immigrant’s decision-making strategies around cultural identity formation is complicated by the complexities of social networks (Pries, 2004).

Phinney’s (1990) theory of ethnic identity construction was composed of the following three stages for shaping ethnic identity in a host country: (a) *unexamined ethnic identity* (unexplored positive or negative view of their ethnic group), (b) *ethnic identity search or exploration* (to search for what it means to be a member of an ethnic group), and (c) *achieved ethnic identity* (possessing a clear meaning of what their ethnic identity means for them). However, she argued that ethnic identity construction is a continuous process and does not always lead to an achieved ethnic identity. Her model is more like a moratorium-achievement-moratorium-achievement (MAMA) cycles (Marcia, 2006; Marcia and Josselson, 2013), and included the ongoing process whereby the immigrant questions whether or not to retain his or her ‘ethnic label’ or select the label of the host society. This ongoing back and forth (MAMA) cycle may often involve continuously repeated stages of re-thinking and exploring their ethnic identity (Phinney, 2004).

Scholarly opinions regarding the measurement of ethnic identity development are somewhat polarized between those who see huge amounts of statistical data as a viable measure vis-à-vis those who suggest that in-depth qualitative interviewing is the most appropriate method of increasing complex understandings. Interestingly, Phinney (2004) claimed that although surveys can be useful to offer a broad phenomenological picture, increasingly complex understandings of ethnic identity development might not be picked up by pen-and-paper surveys. For example, surveys may provide this current study with a broad picture of adaptation patterns among immigrant youth (Phinney, 2004). With respect to the overall aim of this research project, *to explore how the interfacing of cultures*
influenced experiences of adaption, I believe that surveys would fail to fully capture the complexity of the immigration process and to deliver a very rich and detailed description of the human experience of adapting to life in a new country.

Although Phinney started with one-to-one interviews, we witnessed a move away from interviews to questionnaires as a new approach to data collection for her recent studies (Phinney, 2004; Phinney & Ong, 2007). The argument she put forward for this new form of gathering data is that, questionnaires, according to her, will lead to more questioning, which in turn, will lead to better understanding, and that an increased understanding may well lead to more questions. However, I have decided that instead of relying on what I think is important in the lives of immigrant males, I want to offer them the opportunity to ‘speak their mind’ as it were. Of course there are advantages to using questionnaires. They may be useful for looking at differences in acculturation strategies, whereas interviews will enable me not only to focus on identifying ‘forms of identity’, but also on ‘how identities are constructed’ as they settle into their new country of destination.

Jeffrey Arnett

Several international studies have examined tensions arising from transnational migration. For example, Alexander (2006) argued that social identities in contemporary South Africa are fleeting, youthful and driven by consumer choice. In exploring identity formation through connections or ties between the place of origin and the place of destination, Dervin and Risager (2015) claim that identity and interculturality as continually constructed in interaction. While Kubota and Lin (2006) presented conceptual considerations and empirical findings from an essentially anthropological perspectives concluding that race, racialization and racism are inescapable factors impacting globalised identities. In a similar vein, Ludger Pries (2004) have analysed aspects of globalised identities and suggested that without recognising the changing relationship between’ geographic space’ and ‘social space’ “we will probably lose touch with a growing part of the reality of migration, and thus, be unable to sufficiently understand and explain it” (Pries
Despite increasing attention being paid to the influence of social context on issues of identity formation among immigrant youth, discursive constructions of transnational identities within a New Zealand context remains largely unexplored. Therefore, I tentatively argue that a potential cause of neglecting to explore identity formation among immigrant youths in New Zealand may be connected with the lack of sufficient perspective and perhaps the lack of required conceptual tools to engage in a rigorous analysis of the topic of transnationalism.

Jeffery Arnett’s pioneering work around the development of a ‘bicultural identity’ is an important starting point in dealing with the intrinsic complexities of approaching both the ideas of identity and globalisation in the same ‘breathe.’ Specifically, Arnett (2002) argued that the majority of young people worldwide have now developed a bicultural identity that combines their local identity with an identity linked to the global culture because of globalisation. The extent to which globalisation is likely to impact most people’s lives and hence on matters of identity is still up for debate. What is undisputed is that globalisation will undoubtedly be one of the dominant forces in the psychological development of the people of the 21st century (Arnett, 2002). He proposed that, increasingly, young people may be significantly affected not only by the sets of cultural influences in their immediate environment but also by a sense of belonging to a global community. Obviously there is a place for universal moral principles. However care must be taken about the ways in which young people in particular, may well question whether they feel a strong connection towards their heritage culture, host culture or indeed do they feel like a ‘cosmopolitan.’

Although, the aim of my study is to look at how South African boys are dealing with life in a new country, I would be remiss to ignore the influence of globalisation on shaping the immigration experience. To be able to understand the impact of the discourses that operates in the lives of South African boys, I believe that it is necessary to explore how migrant identities are constructed discursively. Given that many children, and adolescents in particular, now grow up with a global consciousness (Arnett, 2002), previous theorising, grounded in a binary
understanding of host culture / home culture influence, may require some conceptual modification (Ward, 2013). That is, the production, reproduction, transformation and dismantling of identities can now be seen as a result of how people think about themselves in relation to their place in a globalized society and their social environment (Alexander, 2006).

**Acculturation**

A great deal has been written about immigrant youth in various contexts. These stories are often connected with the choices of acculturation strategies they employ when adjusting to their new location (Nguyen, 2011). Acculturation is, arguably, one of the most frequently mentioned constructs in immigrant studies and has been associated with phenomena as varied as intergenerational family conflict, academic performance, depression, drug use, and juvenile delinquency. Pamela Organista and her colleagues (2010) argue that researchers often include some measure of acculturation in their research to analyse differences within ethnic groups and to understand the relationship of acculturation to psychosocial adjustment of immigrants. Therefore, it is important for this study to examine how acculturation relates to individual boy’s level of adaptability to new social situations given their diverse particularities. After all, acculturation as a conceptual tool can shed some light on how immigrant youth negotiate their cultural mores (values, customs, traditions) in the midst of either complementary or contrasting cultural influences (Berry, 1997).

**Understanding acculturation**

I think that in the first instance, it is essential to emphasise what is meant by *culture* for this current study. Definitions of culture vary significantly; nonetheless, they do tend to share a broad view that culture is an enduring product of and influence on human interaction (Vaughan & Hogg, 2011). Culture can be defined as the social habits of a community with shared meanings. Culture can
also be described as the collective programming of the mind that distinguishes the members of one group or category of people (Vaughan & Hogg, 2011). In this view of culture, two elements stand out that are important for my study. Shared activities and shared meanings. Exploring both these elements are vital in my efforts to better understand adaptation, especially given that South African boys may have emigrated from the same country but that they are culturally and ethnically highly distinctive.

Although definitions of acculturation generally apply to all individuals who travel abroad (including tourists, guest workers and refugees), my study is primarily concerned with acculturation strategies, not just cultural learning processes, as adopted by South African boys who were exposed to cultural contact over a longer period of time. I will employ the definition of acculturation as offered by Organista and her colleagues (2010) because it seems an appropriate conceptual base for analyzing the acculturation strategies for South African boys:

*Acculturation is a dynamic and multidimensional process of adaptation that occurs when distinct cultures come into sustained contact. It involves different degrees and instances of culture learning and maintenance that are contingent upon individual, group, and environmental factors. Acculturation is dynamic because it is a continuous and fluctuating process and it is multidimensional because it transpires across numerous indices of psychosocial functioning and can result in multiple adaptation outcomes (p. 105).*

David Sam (2000) describes acculturation as a concept that “encompasses all the changes that occur when individuals and groups of people belonging to different cultural backgrounds come into contact with each other” (p. 68). He suggested that the term is commonly used when discussing what happens to immigrants, refugees, and ethnocultural groups (particularly so-called ethnic minorities) when they come to live in another society. Having changed in recent years, the term acculturation have acquired several meanings as it became more and more
associated with concepts such as globalization, multiculturalism, integration, and assimilation. While acculturation is closely related to these concepts (see Sam and Berry, 2006b for a discussion), it should not be confused with them and must be understood as a two-way, rather than a one-way process. Thus, for current purposes, acculturation can be described as a continuous and dynamic process that is affected by the personal and social experiences of the individuals undergoing acculturation (Berry, 2006b; Organista et al., 2010).

John Berry

The process of acculturation often describe how individuals deal with the meeting between their original culture and that of the new society. A number of migration studies have focussed on the work of John Berry as a framework for theorising acculturation. Berry has led, if not defined, contemporary approaches to acculturation, where his earliest work concentrated on the nature of marginality and the distinction of assimilation and integration with Australian Aborigines (Berry, 1970; Sommerlad & Berry, 1970). He began to formulate questions about the retention of cultural identity and positive intergroup relations based on his experiences in Canada in the 1970s. By the mid-1970s, Berry created a new theory that identified patterns of relationships in plural societies that included integration, assimilation, rejection/segregation and marginality/deculturation (Berry, 1974; Berry, Kalin & Taylor, 1977).

Going back to his earlier writings on acculturation as varieties of adaptation, Berry introduced the forerunner of his current model. With assimilation, integration, rejection and deculturation identified on the basis of two questions pertaining to “the retention of cultural identity and positive relationships with the dominant society” (Berry, 1980, p. 14). By 1987, Berry and his colleagues introduced marginalization into the framework. By replacing deculturation, they set in motion the more familiar two-dimensional model of theorizing acculturation (Berry, Kim, Minde & Mok, 1987). Berry further refined this model with two core questions posed: (1) “is it considered to be of value to maintain one’s own
distinctive identity and cultural group characteristics?” and (2) “is it considered to be of value to maintain positive relations with my group and others within the society?” In a significant move, this later model saw rejection being substituted for separation.

**Berry’s two-dimensional model of theorizing acculturation**

There have been only minor differences in the presentation of Berry’s two-dimensional model over the last two decades. More recent graphic illustrations do not frame the fundamental issues in terms of questions, but merely refer to the issues as ‘cultural maintenance’ and ‘contact-participation’ or ‘maintenance of heritage culture and identity’ and ‘relationships sought among groups,’ which form the basis of four acculturation orientations (Berry, 2006a). That is, when individuals wish to maintain both cultural heritage and relations with other groups, integration results. Berry (2006a) further claimed that if neither is desired, marginalization occurs. Separation reflects a valuing of only cultural maintenance while assimilation occurs only if intergroup relations are desired. Despite slight variations in more recent presentations, Berry and his colleagues continued to apply the original version of the two-dimensional model for conceptualization to the study of acculturation attitudes (Berry, Phinney, Sam & Vedder, 2006).

What I took from Berry’s two-dimensional theorizing is the emphasis on cultural maintenance and cultural contact. First, using Berry’s theory to frame my study of acculturating adolescent boys is relevant because my study is set within the tensions between South African cultures and those of the receiving country. This includes both dominant and subordinate cultures. Second, the assessment of integration, assimilation, separation and marginalization may be equally worthwhile for understanding acculturation strategies because it has been used successfully in other similar studies as the preferred approach to measure acculturation attitudes across diverse immigrant groups in Canada, including Koreans, Hungarians, Portuguese and Greeks (Berry, 2007; Berry & Sabatier, 2011).
Research on acculturation, including acculturation strategies, changes in behaviours, and acculturative stress suggests that there are large group and individual differences in how people go about their acculturation (Berry, Trimble & Olmedo, 1986). In weighing up home and dominant culture, these acculturation theorists argued that immigrants could choose between these strategies.

**Figure 2. John Berry’s four paths of acculturation.**

(Source: Berry et al., 1986)

One of Berry’s most significant contributions to the study of acculturation has been his insistence on the need to consider the multiple types of responses that an individual can have to acculturation. While he initially wrote about varieties of
Acculturation, more recent writings refer to the type of responses as acculturation strategies or acculturation modes (Berry, 2006b). That is, an individual’s choice of a strategy depended on such previous circumstances as the person’s level of involvement with each culture as well as specific attitudinal and behavioural preferences and characteristics.

This current study is guided by the view developed by Ward (1996) that there are two distinct ways of adapting to acculturation. The first, termed psychological adaptation, refers to personal well-being and good mental health. The second, sociocultural adaptation, refers to the individual’s social competence in managing their daily life in the intercultural setting. In general, the fewest behavioural and attitudinal changes on the part of the individual can be found among individuals who have chosen the separation strategy and the largest number among those using the assimilation strategy (Berry, 2006b). Integration, and to some extent marginalization, implies a selective process of maintenance and rejection that involves a moderate level of behavioural changes. How much stress the newcomer may experience and how well they adapt psychologically and socioculturally to their new environment are often determined by the strategy the acculturating individual employs.

**Acculturative stress**

The challenges and difficulties experienced by acculturating individuals are generally labelled as acculturative stress or acculturational stress (Berry, 2006b; Organista et al., 2010). Acculturative stress occurs when the constellation of pressures to change, and the presence of unfamiliar external social and physical environmental conditions are producing stressful conditions on acculturating individuals (Organista et al., 2010). Stress associated with acculturation for adolescents can also follow when their parents’ motivation (feeling ‘pulled’ towards host country) are at different levels of acculturation compared with each other and may increase the likelihood of parent-child conflict (Organista et al., 2010). The success of coping with stressful conditions is related to an overall
sense of wellbeing and to physical and mental health correlates (Berry, Kim, Power, Young & Bujaki, 1989; Organista et al., 2010).

In terms of acculturative stress, Berry and his colleagues suggests that integration implies the lowest levels of stress while marginalization would be associated with the highest levels of stress (Berry et al., 1987). They claimed that by choosing an integration strategy, acculturating individuals can be expected to experience lower levels of personal stress since they are able to acquire the cultural characteristics of the new culture (as expected by members of the new culture or group) while continuing to value the culture of heritage (as possibly expected by parents, siblings, and friends). At the same time, assimilation and separation strategies would be associated with moderate levels of stress since they imply a selection process that may not be supported or appreciated by the individual’s relatives or friends.

As can be seen from the above discussion, marginalization can result in serious psychological problems for individuals resorting to or being forced to assume such a strategy. Berry (2006a) pointed out that the type of conditions that are involved when people are forced into marginalization is likely those in which the individual experiences cultural discrimination. This intensifies the likelihood of failed attempts at assimilation. Furthermore, he pointed out that individuals may not really have a ‘choice’ of acculturation strategy because this ‘freedom to choose’ primarily depends on the host society’s open and inclusive orientations toward ethnic and cultural diversity. The ‘choice’ of strategy is also hugely reliant on the value placed on multiculturalism by the host society and the immigrant’s perceptions of relatively low levels of ethnic prejudice and discrimination and a generalized sense of identification with the dominant culture (Berry, 2006a; Sam & Berry, 2006). It should, nevertheless, be noted that the acculturation process is not necessarily always stressful for some immigrants, especially those who closely resembles the characteristics and features of the host.
The issue of measuring acculturation

An understanding of the approaches used to measure acculturation is important for my study. Because, in some instances, the methodological characteristics of the various measures used in some migration studies became quite confusing to interpret when one is trying to analyze the findings of these studies. In some cases, it appears that the methodological limitations can be put down to poorly constructed instrumentation (Organista et al., 2010). It seems that measuring acculturation among youth studies have relied heavily on self-report paper-and-pencil instruments, where individuals are asked to indicate their attitudes, norms, or values or to report on the frequency or presence of certain behaviours.

The reliance on language use and proficiency items in most acculturation scales is unhelpful in gaining a more realistic view of migration for a number of reasons: (a) linguistic abilities or preferences are just a small, if not insignificant, aspect of immigrant life, and (b) changes in behaviour may reflect the effects of various circumstances and not necessarily be the most appropriate measure of acculturation. It is still quite common in quantitative studies to find questionnaires using acculturation scales to ask respondents to report how well they speak, write, or understand English and/or the language of origin.

Colleen Ward (2013) offered an invaluable and alternative insight into the issues surrounding the measuring of acculturation. She suggested that a tension exists in conceptualization and measurement around issues pertaining to the essence of ‘traditional’ and ‘mainstream’ or ‘ethnic’ and ‘national’ culture. With few exceptions, the issues have remained more in the realm of speculation than empirical evidence. For example, with international immigration growing on a worldwide basis, increasing globalization and transnationalism, and larger degrees of cultural mixing, it is becoming increasingly more difficult to define and assess these two cultural orientations (Ward, 2013). She pointed out that, in some instances, immigration, intermarriage and uneven fertility rates across ethnocultural groups mean that the culturally dominant group is no longer a majority.
As a South African, Apartheid and its enduring legacy is a timely reminder that there are other reasons the majority is not necessarily the dominant cultural group.

At the same time, the number of individuals who identify as being of mixed or multiple ethnic heritages is increasing. Social and political pressures may exacerbate the ‘clash of civilizations’ and suggest that religion may be just as much a defining feature of heritage identity and cultural maintenance as is ethnicity. These are important points for my study because previous studies have focused largely on understanding group-level factors that impact adaptation and settlement in a mechanistic manner and have paid little attention to understanding how individuals from a variety of ethnic and cultural background respond to the challenges of transitioning into a new environment. I will focus more on the issues that immigrant adolescent boys face when they come up against dominant cultural messages and discourses from the home country as well as those that operate in their new environment.

**Conclusion**

As noted above, adolescence is an especially important time for identity exploration. It is however, equally important to note that at this time, as opposed to previous generations, individuals do not necessarily ‘stand on the threshold of shifting from one-who-has-been-cared-for to one-who-is-to-care-for-self-and-others.’ There has been a dramatic shift in recent years in the rise of young people going into tertiary education and delaying the need to decide on and/or pursue occupational directions. In fact, Marcia (2006) has argued that by combining the psychosocial aspects with the cognitive and physiological changes during adolescence, one could see why adolescence is so widely considered a period of vulnerability and disequilibrating. In terms of the theoretical underpinnings of this study, it can be assumed that socially constructed identities may be the result of exploration, self-reflection, and integrative processes wherein the individual attempts to make the best fit between self-perceived needs and societal demands.
Focusing on the interplay between acculturation and adolescent development, and how they impact each other, may be useful for understanding adaptation. For instance, young immigrant’s cultural transition may be fraught with many potential pitfalls based on linguistic and cultural differences (Suárez-Orozco, Gaytán, Bang, Pakes & Rhodes, 2010; Vigal, 2008). Secondly, the children of immigrants may experience cultural shock; since they must reconcile the culture of the dominant society (schools particularly) and that of their heritage as they navigate their way through this new world (Vigal, 2008). Therefore, a fundamental question that needs answering is whether South African boys deal with developmental tasks in the same way as their national peers, and whether their acculturation experiences have special impact on how they resolve developmental tasks.
Theorizing masculinity

“gender enters the picture in an important way because of the different roles that boys and girls occupy during adolescence and the different ways in which they are socialized”

(Portes & Rumbaut, 2001, p. 64)

Introduction

Central to my study is the notion that individual boys construct and perform masculinity in a manner that is not uniform or universally generalizable to all boys (Cornwall & Lindisfarne, 1994). As such, I draw on the work of Simone de Beauvoir’s (1949) critique of gender as an origin or an essence from which things are initiated, and Judith Butler’s (1990) work where she suggested that gender is always a ‘doing’, but not a ‘doing’ by a subject who might be said to pre-exist the deed. I will also discuss literature that shows that gender is not programmed into an individual’s genes or something that is singularly ‘possessed’ or something that one ‘is’ but rather something that is continually ‘performed’ through sustained social interaction and a series of repetitive acts (Butler, 1990). Overall, the key message from the first section of the chapter encourages the idea of gender as socially constructed.

The second part of this chapter offers a detail discussion of gendered bodies as a theoretical framework for deconstructing adolescent boy’s actions and behaviours. Drawing heavily on the work of Paul Willis, R.W. Connell and Máirtín Mac an Ghaill, I will show how schools act as masculinizing agents, and how schools and cultural settings shape how boys construct and live out masculinities. Moreover, I will pay particular attention to how the ‘gender regime’ in schools impacts
migrating masculinities formation. Chapter Three concludes with an in-depth exploration of some of the large-scale discourses of ‘boys will be boys’ that operates in schools and that tend to govern both adolescent boys’ behaviours and how teachers should educate them.

**Gendered bodies**

Gender is constructed within discourse. This is what Simone de Beauvoir suggested in *The Second Sex* (1949) when she said that “one is not born a women, but, rather becomes one”. de Beauvoir firmly rejected the notion of a fixed essence in both a biological or philosophical sense and replacing them with contextual, functional definitions. Fundamental to her analysis is the belief that “every human being is always a singular, separate individual” (p. xvi). de Beauvoir registered the plight of women as simultaneously free and not free, as caught up in a mesh of relations and expectations, not of their own choosing. Accordingly, her writing illustrates that ‘becoming a women’ has no recourse to a body but takes on a manifestation from within a patriarchal point of view of foundational biological presuppositions.

de Beauvoir considered different modes of ‘otherness’ when she stated that discourse rather than biological facts define what a person is or what they can become (de Beauvoir, 1949). By differentiating these aspects of ‘otherness’, she pointed out the ambiguity and reciprocity of gender, suggesting that subjects are collectively rendered ‘other’ through repetitious habits that are institutionally reinforced. Although, class subjugation is less a matter of focus in de Beauvoir’s work, except insofar as she discussed the repetitious bodily movements of the factory worker, her work makes a powerful argument that the gendered body is marked within masculine discourse, and that gendered bodies and social meanings are constructed within power relations.
Building on the substantial contributions of de Beauvoir, philosopher and gender theorist Judith Butler in *Gender Trouble* (1990) called into question whether the construction of gender can be reduced to the master-slave dialectic analysis linked to the history of male dominance. Departing from de Beauvoir, she argued that gender is a social construction and occurs under cultural compulsion, rather than a collectively rendered of gendering through repetitious habits that are institutionally reinforced. Her ground-breaking text provided an alternative critique to gendering by showing that “there is no recourse to a body that has not always already been interpreted by cultural meanings” (Butler, 1990, p. 10). In her text, she introduced a distinction between sex and gender by disputing the previously held notions about the biology-as-destiny formulation of gender as seemingly fixed as sex (Butler, 1990).

Paying particular attention to the relationship between power and gender, Butler (1990) pointed out that the claim for universal patriarchy no longer enjoys the credibility it once did but that the notion of a generally shared conception of gendered roles has been much harder to displace. She further rejected ‘men’ as a grounded category while raising fundamental questions concerning power and gender identity formation. She later suggested that the masculine/feminine binary provides a framework in which the male/female binary can be easily recognized. Butler goes on to say that gender is constructed when the relevant cultural laws inscribed gender meanings to the subject. This makes for an argument that gender is both fluid and malleable. The work of Butler and de Beauvoir is important for my study because they show the separation of sex and gender as well as how gender is socially and historically constructed. Their work appear to be saying that the discourses that we are part of produce what we are.

However, as noted elsewhere (see Blair, Holland & Sheldon, 1995), not everybody agrees with this reasoning. John Archer and Barbara Lloyd (2002), among others, do not endorse this view and have not dismissed the existence of gender as a fixed entity. Although they have some reservations about the
sociobiological basis for gender, their work on the ‘psychology of sex differences’ suggest a biological explanation for some of the male characteristics such as aggression and violence.

**Masculinity(ies) as fluid and malleable**

In an effort to show how historical and contextual factors impact masculinity formation, I will now draw on the recent work of Stephen Whitehead (2006) to show how men’s roles (and those of women) have changed over time. The period during and after World War II witnessed the emergence of new forms of masculinities that became the objects of rigorous scholarly scrutiny. Unlike previous manifestations of gender as fixed, these ‘new’ masculine identities were fluid and represented configurations of social practices that were generated in particular situations and in ever-changing social contexts. These new forms of masculinities, where men took on ‘feminine roles’ in a sense revealed the complex patterns of everyday social interactions during a time when gender roles in the West became blurred when the gender roles of post-war men changed (Whitehead, 2006).

The post-war period (late 1940s to early 1950s) witnessed feverish social changes, especially with changes in production processes. Most noticeable was the shift in masculine roles that occurred when soldiers returned home. Sex role theory was enlisted to give some insights into, and make sense of these ‘never seen before’ masculine roles and how men expressed themselves in new and ‘feminine’ ways (Whitehead, 2002). Alongside changes in designated ‘male-only’ jobs, post-war men were now openly showing their emotions in western cultures. Social shifts in understandings of sex roles profoundly impacted how men and masculinity(ies) evolved during the 1950s and 1960s. This was particularly the case in respect of increases in divorce and unemployment, the demise of traditional industries and changing patterns of work, especially in western industrialised countries.
This period following World War II is generally viewed as the beginning of the 'men are losing their rightful place' debates that continue to be played out on a global stage. The changes in gender roles and the acquisition of new forms of 'softer' more feminine masculinities quickly became a major problem for the inflexibility of the gender stereotypes that, up until then, underpinned sex roles. Meanwhile, proponents of gender difference began blaming the acquisition of new models of masculinity on inappropriate male socialisation. One of their arguments is that any changes in gender roles and expectations are fundamentally nothing more than men and boys learning through socialisation new gender scripts appropriate to the changes in their social context.

Social learning theory is still widely being accepted as the most influential explanation for the acquisition of a gendered identity. The theory claims that by observing others perform gender-appropriate behaviours and being rewarded by approval for doing so, boys and girls come to try out the behaviours for themselves and experience its rewards first hand (Bandura, 1977). This enactment of ‘appropriate’ masculine and feminine behaviours in adolescent life is generally understood as an outcome of the process of socialisation. Connell (2009) suggested that gender identities are acquired by “various ‘agencies of socialization’, notably the family, the school, the peer group, and the mass media, took the growing child in hand. Through an immense number of small interactions, these agencies conveyed to the girl or the boy what were the social ‘norms’ or expectations for her or his behaviour” (p. 95).

Sandra Bem (1974) called for an androgynous male, where the individual exhibits both male and female characteristics. Famous for creating the Bem Sex Role Inventory, she proposed that men be given permission to be a ‘sensitive new age’ guy and be allowed to draw on their feminine side to exhibit ‘feminine characteristics. She claimed that androgynous people are more flexible, more creative, and less anxious than extremely masculine or feminine personalities. Her key argument for calling an end to the female-male polarity and the division of labour among the two genders is the ongoing promotion of unbalanced societies. For example, women were primarily in charge of childrearing, housekeeping,
health care and education. Women’s work has thus mostly been relegated to the private sphere of the non-monetised ‘love economy’. On the other hand, men have been in charge of higher socially desired position, dominating decision making and the monetized, professional public sphere. Contemporary unisex androgyny is challenging this division.

The twenty-first century has witnessed an enhanced overall shift towards contemporary frames of gender reference as global rather than being contained within particular societies and communities, thereby creating an awareness of different ways of doing gender globally are only going to increase (Milojević, 1998). Contemporary androgyny or unisex androgyny is seen as a psychological condition or characteristic, where men increasingly adopt traditional ‘women’s virtues’ while women increasingly adopts virtues traditionally seen as masculine (Luo, 2008; Milojević, 1998). Proponents of contemporary unisex androgyny are pushing for a growing acceptance that ‘women’ and ‘men’ are mostly socially constructed categories, putting forward an argument that those constructions change over time. Today we see the creation of a contemporary society in which every difference is able to find expression and where spaces are created for individual freedom and non-conformist persons (Milojević, 1998). This recognition of accepted multiple gender diversity is an important way of destabilizing gender in defying personal roles and functions within society.

The emergence of multiple gender diversities fundamentally challenges the societies we live in, where more democratic and fairer societies are ‘flattening’ hierarchies, creating more integrated and diverse human-human relatedness. In spite these advancements in challenging the idea of heteronormativity in which male/female genitalia = male/female identity = desired behaviour (Milojević, 1998). However, it is still mostly women that have entered the traditional male sphere and not vice versa. Likewise, the sameness of unisex androgyny is predominantly modelled upon a male norm (Luo, 2008; Milojević, 1998). In the context of this study, the androgous quality emerging from the combination of the effeminate male and the masculine female proves most intriguing. In the case of South African boys in New Zealand, it would be interesting to explore how they
navigate the all-consuming image of the ideal masculine male from their home country which always privileged the male over the female.

The discursive positioning of ‘underachieving boys’

‘Failing boys’

Three decades ago, the poor educational performance and culture of toughness among specific groups of boys (e.g. working-class and/or Black boys) were not considered a serious enough problem to draw any meaningful attention to the education of boys (Skelton & Francis, 2011). The ‘poor’ boys discourse only emerged around the time when girls started making ‘noticeable gains’ in the classroom and the workplace. The mid-1990s have witnessed the beginning of a ‘moral panic’ about boys being outperformed by girls and has its roots primarily in pop psychology and media-driven moral panic (Kimmel, 1994; Weaver-Hightower, 2003). In the United States, such discussions of ‘failing boys’ arguably hit their zenith with the publication of a number of reports and popular books about boys and their educational disadvantage.

Internationally, the popular media have been made similar claims, framing concerns with boy’s educational underachievement in terms of a crisis in which boys are the ‘new disadvantaged.’ Although the context has changed, this concern about boys being outperformed by girls has established itself in North America and the United Kingdom, and rapidly developed in many other OECD countries, including Australia and New Zealand. In the United Kingdom for instance, this globalized anxiety with boy’s apparent struggles in mainstream education was precipitated by the introduction of school league tables in 1992 which showed students’ academic performance at GCSE examinations (General Certificate in Secondary Education). These examinations, which mark the end of compulsory schooling at the age of 16, include a breakdown of results according to gender and suggested that overall girls had caught up with boys in mathematics and science
and are now outperforming them in almost every other subject area (Skelton & Francis, 2011). The media in the United States took up similar findings with wild speculations about a supposed ‘crisis’ in masculinity and about the various explanations for this apparent slump in boy’s educational performance. In fact, the rhetoric of the ‘failing boy’ has gained considerable attention across many OECD countries including New Zealand culminating in what can only be described as a ‘moral panic’ (Skelton & Francis, 2011).

Although such exposure certainly makes parents and teachers aware of the issue, I wish to clarify that popular psychology books and media calls for attention to boys is only a catalyst of the ‘boys turn’ (Kimmel, 1994; Weaver-Hightower, 2003). Feminist scholars then and now are taking an opposing view to ‘pop psychologists’ and had unsettled public thinking around the debates of boys and masculinity. They refuted claims of all struggling in school and in life in general and have argued that such claims are primarily based on essentialist understandings of boys and masculinity and generate more heat than light (Connell, 2009; Skelton & Francis, 2011). Connell (2009) concluded that the mass media love to turn the issue of the schooling of boys into a pro-girl versus pro-boy (or pro-feminist versus antifeminist) shootout. She argued that the educational issues of boys are far more complex and questioned the statistics that were used to often draw comparisons and to highlight the plight of boys. Christine Skelton and Becky Francis (2011) suggested that although it is clear from responses to current debates that many teachers and parents see the issues of boys as important, unfortunately, schools are launching ‘programmes for boys’ based entirely on assumptions that boys need help. They pointed out that many of these intervention strategies were aimed to ‘save’ boys from experiencing difficulties in school and life in general.

‘Boys will be boys’

Essentialist discourses of boys and masculinity are well accepted in many English-speaking countries as are claims that masculinity and femininity are
natural realities determined by both biological and psychological elements. These discourses, that valorised and celebrated boy's roguishness and antipathy for diligence, are heavily dependent upon biological theories of gender and maturational theories of development and hold that boys experience difficulty at school because of their biological makeup and developmental processes. Persistent and highly dominant discourses of essentialism claim that masculinity, together with femininity, is a biologically determined reality with singular psychological and behavioural tendencies (Biddulph, 2008; Gurian, 1996, 1999; Latta, 2008, 2010).

Pop psychologists, such as Michael Gurian and Kathy Stevens (United States), Steve Biddulph (Australia), and Nigel Latta (New Zealand) are explicitly essentializing boys and blame the ‘frilly content’ of the school curriculum and associated feminine classroom practices for all the problems boys are experiencing in schooling and life in general. They emphasise that boys should be taught differently from girls because their differences exist naturally, and are biologically driven and enduring. In general, claims from bestseller psychologists such as Pollack, Gurian, Biddulph and Latta rely heavily on arguments rooted in a ‘battle of the sexes’, biological determinism, and the notion that boys have a ‘toxic’, self-harming gender role to perform (Weaver-Hightower, 2003).

Internationally, pop psychologists often offered three distinctive explanations for the supposed biological differences between boys and girls. The first and most influential argument put forward by them is that of sex hormonal activity. This theory suggests that the development of boy’s masculine identity is the result of the production of a broad range of hormones (testosterone and androsterone) within the male body that promotes male characteristics. A familiar refrain in much contemporary media, popular and policy discussions is that boys are having a hard time at school due to hormones influencing the development of their adolescent brains, which in turn, gives impetus to their violent behaviour. High levels of androgens (male hormones) are commonly blamed for adolescent boy’s apparent decline in rational thinking and the increase in their high-risk behaviours. Despite such explanations sounding rather convincing, several
academic researchers (Burr, 1995; Connell, 2009; Davison, 2007) are challenging these one-dimensional views with justifies boy’s behaviours with their biological make-up. Admittedly some boys are having a hard time at school. However, by accepting unsubstantiated, murky myths of biological determinism we may fail to appreciate the degree to which boy’s lives develop within institutional structures that are carefully, if often unconsciously, arranged to produce particular outcomes (Davison, 2007).

The second perspective offered in the literature that explains the differences between boys and girls is that of brain lateralisation or brain specialisation. Brain lateralization claims that masculinity and femininity are determined by the particularities of the structure of the human brain. Some teachers seem to like ‘brain’ explanations for why boys and girls behave and learn differently. They often buy into discourses that suggest that boy’s brains compared with that of girls are specialised to perform particular functions better. Specifically, they argue that the right hemisphere of the boy brain (which controls the visual-spatial activities) is much more developed in adolescents, whereas in girls it is the left hemisphere (controlling verbal activities) that is more advanced. It is these generalisations about boys versus girls, and the ways their brains ‘allow’ them to learn which account for much of what is common in most secondary schools for subject and career choices. Many teachers persist with the idea that the ways in which boys learn are ‘soldered into the wiring of their brains.’ (Davison, 2007).

Moving beyond a simple physical understanding of evolution to explain boy’s ‘natural’ behaviours, essentialist discourses claim that masculine behaviours of boys are governed by innate instruction aimed at ensuring the survival of the species. Drawing on Darwin’s theory of evolution, and based on animal studies, Linda Nielsen (1996) in particular insisted that the social behaviours of men and boys are primarily determined by biological factors that have developed from their prehistoric past. She claimed that males were genetically programmed for aggressiveness and females for nurturance. Proponents of evolutionary theory happily connect male aggressiveness with animal behaviour and claim that violence and challenges for dominance are natural and, therefore, unavoidable,
implying that such aggressive behaviour is not just necessary but highly desirable in modern society.

Stephen Whitehead (2002) pointed out:

“In what might be termed the ‘everyday world’, those behaviours of boys that are violent, dysfunctional and oppressive are frequently excused or explained away as ‘natural’ masculine behaviour and being understood in common-sense terms as fixed and, thus, an inevitable aspect of social ‘reality’”. (p. 8).

This perspective questions the legitimacy of ‘common-sense’ understandings that boy’s violent, dysfunctional and oppressive behaviours are ‘natural.’ While what Nielsen (1996) said about contemporary Western industrialised societies being based on the premise of ‘survival of the fittest’ continues to provoke fierce opposition from a number of feminists and anti-violence activists, it in many ways legitimises violence in schools and other social contexts. This involves the potential for creating and maintaining violent and aggressive, volatile and destructive social relations as both normal and natural. Understandably, such narrow-minded approaches for explaining the complex world of the adolescent male and offering genetics as an explanation (or excuse) for the violent, dysfunctional and oppressive behaviours of boys affirms that not only is the medium the message, but also that the message becomes the medium. This premise then assumes that nonviolent boys are different and ‘unnatural.’

Let us take as an example a recent case reported by Hicks (2014) in the Huffington Post where a group of boys took one of their teammates to the football field and allegedly duct-taped him to a goalpost and started to take ‘potshots’ at him to ‘toughen’ him up. Once they were done, he was left still being tied up. A passerby heard the boy’s hysterical screams and together with an off-duty policeman helped to free him. His mother was traumatized by the event, and she contacted the school with her concerns about what happened. Many teachers at
the school were labeling this as bullying because it was especially cruel since the boy was seen to be homosexual. His parents were furious and were looking at criminal charges to be filed against the boys in question. However, a number of teachers thought nothing was problematic and that this incident was being blown out of proportion. One even suggested that: ‘Boys will be boys.’ Hicks’ (2014) reported that the school’s management agreed, and the case against the alleged offenders were subsequently dropped. Here we see that Foucault’s (1972) conception of discourse as: “a limited number of statements for which a group of conditions of existence can be defined” (p. 117), as the ascription of ‘what boys are like’ and gains meaning through the discourse of ‘boys will be boys.’

When teachers expect boys to be naturally violent and aggressive, they inadvertently limit boys’ capacity to be actively involved in negotiating their masculinities in socially acceptable ways. In other words, when boys are told how to behave, then such messages seriously limit their (and other boys) ability to break away from reified commonly-held assumptions of masculinity and femininity as natural realities. It seems that these discourses promote thinking about boys and masculinity in essentialist ways and persist with beliefs that solutions to the problems of boys in schooling, their public and their private lives can be found by promoting ‘manly’ behaviours. The danger here is in the needlessly exaggerating and reinforcing of sex differences. Perpetuating and legitimizing such stereotypes do not serve the interest of boys nor girls (Martino, 2014).

**Hegemonic masculinities**

Tim Carrigan and colleagues offered a turning point in the theoretical understanding of masculinity (Carrigan, Connell & Lee, 1985). In their article entitled *Toward a New Sociology of Masculinity*, they introduced the theory of hegemonic masculinity. The term ‘hegemonic masculinity’ is most importantly a means to recognize that all masculinities are not created equal (Kimmel, 1997). Making use of Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci’s (1971) notion of *hegemony*,
Carrigan and colleagues described hegemonic masculinity as the domination of one form of masculinity over another. By describing masculinities in this way, they implied that masculinities are fluid configurations of social practice generated in particular situations in the changing structure of social relations. Hegemonic masculinity is attained, at least in part, by [the threat of] violence as a means of occupying the dominant position in a hierarchy of masculinities (Carrigan et al., 1985).

The concept hegemonic masculinity continues to be used widely in critical studies of men and masculinity. Being both influential and controversial, it has come under fierce criticism for overlooking the interaction of race and class with gender. John Hood-Williams (2001) in particular argued that the addition of race would offer a different dynamic to negotiated masculinity. He claimed that “doing gender” might not be the only one way of looking at the accomplishment of masculinity and that imposed characteristics play an equally important role in gender display. Thus, it is important for my study to consider contextual factors, such as ‘race’/ethnicity, gender, sexuality, class and immigrant status, alongside acculturation and development, within the school context, as these factors may significantly impact the masculine traits that immigrant boys may exhibit.

The concept of hegemonic masculinity has since undergone refinement with a clear distinction between hegemonic masculinity (singular) and hegemonic masculinities (plural). Raewyn Connell and James Messerschmidt (2005) provided a reformulated conceptual feature of hegemonic masculinities, suggesting that masculinities are not only differentiated but that they stand against one another in relations of power. Despite their fluid character, power remains central in the lives of men and boys who occupy hegemonic masculine stances (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). Fundamental to their refined version, they argued that those individuals in positions of power are able to assert a position of superiority over others.
Connell (2005) emphasised the constructed nature of hegemonic masculinity(ies) and the centrality of power when we seek to understand the ways in which masculinity is practised. A major strength of her theorization of hegemonic masculinities lies in her persuasive description of the problems with previous ways of thinking about gender. She is particularly critical of sex role theory, noting that this approach to gender “has a fundamental difficulty in grasping issues of power” which leaves it unable to satisfactorily account for changes in the performance and meaning of hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 2005, p. 27).

Published in the early 1980s, Connell, Ashenden, Kessler and Dowsett published a timely and much needed text, *Making the Difference: Schools, families and social divisions* (1982), which brought back into focus the realities of the lived experience of the lived experience of young people, and provided sophisticated theorizing around class and gender relations within and between the family and the school. Connell and her colleagues suggest that social class and gender relations could be found within the dynamics of family, school, and industrial life simultaneously (Arnot, 2002). Influenced by Gramsci’s (1971) theory of power, the authors explored how both class and gender hegemonies (simultaneously but often in contradictory ways) shaped complex youth identities (Arnot, 2002).

In arguing that the family is a site of class and gendered practices, Connell and her colleagues “distanced themselves from both cultural deprivation and social and cultural reproduction theories through both their theoretical and methodological stance” (Arnot, 2002, p. 350). Significantly they disconnected themselves from simple neo-Marxist analyses of class by prioritising rather than marginalising gender relations. Class definitions, they argued, could not simply based on attributes and possessions (such as the level of income and the type of accommodation) and more on what “what people do with their resources and their relationships” (Connell, et al., 1982, p. 33). This shift away from definitions of class based solely on labour positions opened up the family as a site of complex gender and class relations:
It means that his father’s masculinity and authority is diminished by being at the bottom of the heap in his workplace, and being exploited without being able to control it; and that his mother has to handle the tensions, and sometimes the violence, that result. It means that his own entry into work and the class relations of production is conditioned by the gender relations that direct him to male jobs, and construct for him an imagined future as breadwinner for a new family (Connell, et al., 1982, p. 181).

Different masculinities do not sit side-by-side idly but are constantly interacting with one another (Connell, 1995). Typically, some forms of masculinity are more honoured than others, while other forms may be actively dishonoured and marginalised. For example, homosexual masculinities in many societies, including modern Western culture, are often represented as ‘unnatural’ or ‘not real men’, and are inevitably constructed as undesirable (Connell, 1995). Homophobia and the fear of discriminatory reactions (including physical beatings) against homosexuality still maintains a negative impact on how homosexual boys understand their sense of self and their social relation with both boys and girls.

More recently, hegemonic masculinities have again been subjected to sustained criticism. At the centre of these critiques are problems with conceptual ‘slippage.’ Conceptual slippage refers to the ambiguity about how well hegemonic masculinity resolves contradictions about what men do with power and how subordinate men and boys see themselves. Understanding the workings of hegemonic masculinity is of particular importance in the context of immigrant boys seeking to adapt to life in a new country. Because it is the coming together of the host culture’s expression of normative masculinity and any sense of a taken-for-grantedness of the heritage culture that may be problematic for transitioning into a new environment (Donaldson, Hibbins, Howson & Pease, 2009).

In sum, engaging with the concept of hegemonic masculinity may be of use for
my study because it invokes a framing that draws attention to the diversity within masculinities, but also offers some explanation for the construction of multiple masculinities (Beasley, 2008). The assumption is that hegemonic masculinity is not only about men’s power in relation to women, but about the conception of an ideal masculinity, the aim of which is the dominance of males over females and other subordinated and marginalised males as well. As a concept, it also offers my study a theoretical frame for examining how hegemonic masculinities are able to hold an authoritative position over other masculinities and these forms of masculinities are able to ‘dominate other types in any particular historical and social context” (van Krieken et al., 2000, p. 413).

**Schools as powerful agents in the making of masculinities**

This section draws on the three seminal works of Paul Willis (1977), R.W. Connell (1989) and Máirtín Mac an Ghaill (1994) to consider the role of schools as masculinizing agents and illustrate that much of routine school life embodies clear messages about ‘gender difference’ and about the appropriate social behaviours of boys and girls. Masculinity studies show a close association between masculine culture, masculine identity construction and the difficulties that some boy may experience in schooling and life in general (Connell, 2005; Epstein, 1998; Mac and Ghaill, 1992, 1994). They also provide an understanding of boys’ masculine presentations in schools by ‘thinking institutionally’, and by focusing on the ways in which social institutions inscribe to boys how to live out ‘appropriate’ masculine constructions (Connell, 1995; Mac an Ghaill, 1992; Willis, 1977).

Drawing on these studies is important because they support the idea that masculinity is not a pre-given and that masculine identity formation during adolescence is by no means a straightforward and predictable process of gender socialization (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990; Whitehead, 2006). The studies I am going to discuss are contextually varied but they all show that the social construction of school masculinities is embedded in the process of making sense
of the world. At the same time, they also highlight that conceptualizing masculinity and sexuality involves a dialectical process between the ‘real’ and the ways in which what is ‘real’ is interpreted by boys in their everyday encounters at school.

Paul Willis (1977)

British cultural theorist Paul Willis’ famous book, *Learning to Labour: How Working-class Kids Get Working-class Jobs* (1977), illustrated how the complex dynamics of social reproduction were sustained at an individual level. His ethnographic research was based on a group of working-class high school students in a British industrial town and shows the paradox, using a group of 12 working-class boy’s accounts of how subordinates agree with their social condition. Willis conducted his ethnographic research between 1972 and 1975 with ‘non-academic’ working-class males, which he refers to as ‘the Lads’, through their final two years at school and then their transition into the workplace. He used a case study approach with in-depth interviews and participatory observations. He ruled out right from the start that the lads were drawn to ‘grunt work’ because they perceived themselves as academically less talented, but that they had developed an antagonism towards the ‘work hard and move forward’ mentality of education at that time. The Lads developed what Willis termed as ‘counter school culture’, which openly showed its opposition to authority and a clear disdain of school and mental labour.

In *Learning to Labour* Willis described how working-class materials are organized in a particular form in relation to school and its structures of authority. He showed that the ways in which working-class boys accept working-class jobs was a “form of cultural reproduction that helps to contribute towards social reproduction in general” (Willis, 1977, p. 185). The Lad’s resistance to school was manifested, along with other things, in their rejection of what the school was trying to offer: formal knowledge and skills that they felt would not serve them in life and would only get them a desk position that would have demanded more of
them but was symbolically less rewarding. Moreover, they considered less manly employment as ‘feminine.’ Willis concluded that the Lads were well aware of the fact that what would ultimately determine the fate of their class was not the acquiring of skills, as held by the individualist ethos of British society at the time, but the requirements of the labour market.

Although published in 1977, Willis’ research on male working-class youth culture nonetheless can still provide an important insight into the construction of school masculinities. He showed that both the school environment and the political climate of the time were significant players in contributing to the school experiences of the students he studied. His study offers an important insight into the process of differentiation by which the boys distanced themselves from the school culture and school requirement, and how and why they develop their own counterculture. This counterculture, he argued, was built on a working-class repertoire of valuing practical knowledge, life experience and ‘street wisdom’ over theoretical knowledge. The Lads’ glorification of hard manual labor, displaying chauvinistic masculinity and challenging school authority, were an attempt to acquire non-formal control over the work process and attributing high value to the group (Willis, 1977). Taking a Marxist point of view, Willis noted that a paradox by showing how the working-class ‘Lads’ he studied were happy to go work in a factory and experience it as their own free choice, while this ‘choice’ worked to preserve their social condition and class oppression.

*R.W. Connell (1989)*

Research interest in masculinity construction during adolescence stems from both work of Willis and that of R.W. Connell. Connell’s (1989) much cited article, *Cool guys, swots and wimps: the interplay of masculinity and education*, in which she located the school as a site for the differentiation of masculinities remains significant for theorising masculinities at school. Her arguments were based on retrospective data from life-history interviews she conducted with two groups of young adult males in Australia: (a) “a group of young men from the working-
classes, recently out of school, growing up in the face of structural unemployment and in the shadow of the prison system” and (b) “a group of men mostly some years older and mostly from more affluent backgrounds, who are involved in ‘green’ politics, social action on environmental issues” (Connell, 1989, p. 293).

The interviews showed that the young men responded to a particular kind of masculinity during their time at secondary school in Australia. The differentiation of masculinities was not simply a question of individual difference that emerged during the everyday business of school or the path that a person has chosen. Rather it was a collective process that occurred at the institutional level and in the organisation of the peer-group relations. An important point was that the differentiation of masculinities might change over time. She further argued that the process of demarcating masculinities in secondary schools was to a large extent dependent on the structure of education provided within a system of academic hierarchy within schools (Connell, 1989).

The interviews also indicated that the prevailing academic hierarchy within schools seems to confer power relations in the form of academic ‘success’ and ‘failure’ to some students. The hidden effects of ‘failure’ or streaming were pushing groups of boys towards scholastic alienation and provided them a ‘valid reason’ for the construction of a combative, dominance-focused masculinity (Connell, 1989). It was the boys’ attitude towards school and their constructions of counter-school masculinities that had a direct and influential impact on both the experiences of schooling and for educational outcomes nonetheless. Based on the findings from the interviews, Connell (1989) argued that, although schools are powerful, they are not always the major influence on the construction of school masculinities. She claimed that factors outside the school, such as the sources of information about sexuality and gender available to boys that are “often narrow and reactionary” should be considered as equally potent in the shaping of young masculinities (Connell, 1989, p. 301). She points to the childhood family, the adult workplace or sexual relations (including marriage) as being more potent.
Although R.W. Connell’s research was conducted 25 years ago, and engaged young men who had recently left school, it continues to make a significant contribution to the understanding of masculinity and the schooling of boys. It shows how the indirect and hidden effects of schooling played a powerful hand in the construction of new knowledge about the schooling of adolescent boys. The participants themselves pointed out that their school’s ‘hidden curriculum’ was more pronounced than the ‘explicit curriculum’ when issues of school experience were discussed during the interviews. Her study shows that the lack of work opportunities was the major influence on the boy’s motivation to learn, affecting their relationships with their teachers and mediating how they constructed their masculinities.

Máirtín Mac an Ghaill (1994)

Using a case study methodology, which included in-depth interviews, Máirtín Mac an Ghaill (1994) explored the interplay of masculinities, sexuality, class, ethnicity and schooling in one secondary school in England. In his much-cited book, The Making of Men: Masculinities, Sexualities and Schooling (1994), he proposed that schools are micro-cultures of societies within which femininities and masculinities are resolved and lived out. Mac an Ghaill (1994) specifically examined how males become heterosexual males within the school environment, and how schools help in the production of a range of masculinities and provide an environment whereby adolescent males thus police sex/gender categories and various forms of masculinities.

The study also illustrated the role of masculinity in the hierarchical power structure in schools. Importantly, it considered the ways in which multiple masculinities are played out against other masculinities as well as femininities, and how it impacted student’s educational and social outcomes. From his ethnographic methodology he described a range of male groups within the school in an attempt to provide a “conceptual map, on which to try to make sense of student’s masculine formation in terms of their own intercultural meanings within the local conditions of a secondary school” (p. 54). He identified specific versions
of masculinities and categorized typologies of groups of working-class students that foremost described students’ relationships to schooling. Mac an Ghaill (1994) pointed out that the students did not necessarily use these categories themselves but illustrated powerfully that ‘doing boy’ can take on a variety of forms.

The categories identified were the Macho Lads, the Academic Achievers, the Real Englishmen and the New Enterprisers. The Macho Lads related to the more traditional working-class males who were anti-school and the academic ‘failures’ who deemed work as meaningless and authority as hostile. The Macho Lads support and provide evidence of the persistence of a particular form of masculinity that Willis (1977) described approximately twenty years earlier as ‘the Lads.’ The upwardly mobile Academic Achievers related to a group of academic ‘successes.’ Although, members of this group were at times, harassed by other boys as effeminate, they claimed that their academic interests were different to females in an attempt to affirm their own masculinity. The Real Englishmen were the newer middle-class who had aspirations for the professions and believed in their own natural talents, and thus believed they were ‘above’ members of the Academic Achievers, the New Enterprisers and their teachers. The New Enterprisers related to working-class students who were concerned with their future careers and took up the new technological and vocational subjects.

Mac an Ghaill’s (1994) groups, other than the White Real Englishmen, consisted of African Caribbean, Asian and White students. He suggested that the curricular conditions also had a major influence in the production of dominant and subordinated student masculine subjectivities, arguing that the vocationalisation of the school curriculum led to a hierarchical reterritorialisation for low-status and high-status vocational areas. Thus, students were able to deskill or up-skill through their academic achievements. However, Mac an Ghaill’s (1994) work also shows the complexity of student identity formation. He emphasised that the young people in his study had “diverse values, understandings and feelings as well as local cultural knowledge that they bring with them into the classroom” (p. 179), suggesting that young people are active makers of sex/gender identities. Interestingly, his research suggests that the concept that “male heterosexual
identity is a highly fragile socially constructed phenomenon” (Mac an Ghaill, 1994, p. 9).

**Homophobia**

Homophobia is a form of cultural prejudice that includes negative, fearful, or hateful attitudes and behaviour toward gays, lesbians, and bisexuals. According to Jodi O’Brien (2008) one reason why lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals are the object of so much cultural fear and loathing is that homosexual sex does not conform to the gendered or reproductive expectations of heterosexuality. She argued that expressions of homophobia include verbal assaults and derisive joking, negative stereotypical media representations, discrimination in employment, education, housing, medical research, legal defence, and custody rights, physical attack, and tacit approval of all forms of discrimination, including gay bashing (O’Brien, 2008). With respect to ‘othering’ and victimization, Noel Card and Ernest Hodges (2008) argue that peer victimisation among school age children is a common problem that predicts ‘othering’ and associated with serious social maladjustment for those considered different. Their longitudinal studies provide evidence that show several antecedents (physical weakness, low self-esteem, peer rejection, and few friends) as consequences of victimisation among adolescent gays.

In *The New Gay Teenager*, (2005), Ritch Savin-Williams presented the premise that gay people have historically too readily accepted the inevitability and desirability of divisions based on sexual categories. In interviewing American teenagers and emerging adults, he argued that it not a case of same-sex attractions disappearing; rather they appear to be on the upswing as young people more freely share with each other their same-sex feelings. He suggested that more and more young people were not embarrassed by their or other young people’s gayness and do not consider homosexuality as deviant. They look and see it all around them, on television, in movies, in songs, in cultural icons and in some instances among their own friends. In his book, Savin-Williams pointed out that ‘gay-bashing’ is rare in the United States and shows an encouraging downward
trend elsewhere. His study proposes that many teenagers are becoming pansexual in their outlook regarding their sexuality and for many of them, the line between what was once considered ‘gay’ and ‘straight’ is becoming blurred.

Ultimately, however, the ‘new gay teenager’ is a person who can be attracted to both girls and boys and have sexual relationships with both sexes without guilt Savin-Williams (2005). Mark McCormack (2012) agrees with Savin-Williams and suggests that new gay adolescent male is basically a pansexual or bisexual who rejects all gender categories. Both McCormack and Savin-Williams asked what has resulted in this ‘dramatic generational shift’ between the ‘older’ generation of gays, who maintained that sexual orientation is fixed and unchangeable, versus the new teenager who views categories of gender and sexuality as unimportant? In an attempt to answering this question, Savin-Williams proposed that it is probably the mass media, in particular the success of the entertainment industry, in presenting and ‘normalising’ same-sex desire. He concludes that the mass media has had an “incalculable impact on the ability of adolescents to understand their own emerging sexual desires” (p. 18).

Although recent trends indicate that acceptance of gays is increasing for those in Western cultures, especially those living in the urban middle-class (Barrett and Pollack, 2005), homophobia remains culturally entrenched in many conservative regions. Offering a counter argument, O’Brien (2008) suggests that most lesbians and gay men continue to live in a state of fear. She indicated that this is particularly true for minorities and those living in more culturally conservative countries. The acceptance of homosexuality may be increasing in part of the world, but homophobia remains deeply rooted in cultural beliefs about gender and supported by sexist assumptions that only heterosexual relationships are natural and normal in many conservative countries.
Feathering, flocking and peer-mediated juvenile delinquent

Hartup (2009) suggests that “social encounters of human beings occur within organised frameworks that comprise interlocking relationships embedded in interlocking social networks” (p.228). I wish to distinguish between peers and friends, where a peer is someone who has one or more common characteristics with the adolescent boy, such as gender, age or studying at the same school, while a friend focuses on close and intimate relations between the individuals and two or more other persons. Friendships are defined as interactions that endure over time and that transform the basis of reciprocal interpersonal expectations (Hinde, 1997). My interest in this topic stems from my observation of immigrant friendship groups in school and my fuzzy understanding of how they evolve and influence identity formation and behaviour during adolescence.

A significant question has emerged during my observation of ‘boys in trouble’ at one of the high schools I taught at in Auckland. It is about causal arguments contained in social learning theory and concerns about ‘feathering and flocking’ and deviant behaviours among boys and sometimes girls. The concept of feathering and flocking generally refers to an assumption that delinquent young people simply ‘hang out’ and socialize with other young people with similar mindsets and behavioural tendencies (Akers & Lee, 1996; Hamm, 2000). The literature shows that adolescent boys quickly learn the vernacular associated with their peer group in order to establish a sense of belonging but also help to transcend the boundaries of subcultural affiliations.

Warr (1993b) argued that peer associations precede the development of deviant patterns (or increase the frequency and seriousness of deviant behaviours once it has begun) more often than involvement in deviant behaviours produces associations with deviant peers. Alternatively, he appointed out, such associations are the result of escalations in individual developed delinquent behaviours. Warr further proposed that adolescents are commonly introduced to delinquency by

---

1 A brief methodological background description of ‘boys in trouble’ was presented in the Preface.
their friends and subsequently become more selective in their choices of friends. He proposed that ‘feathering’ and ‘flocking’ is only mutually exclusive and may be part of a “unified process” (Warr, 1993, p. 39). This is, of course, completely consistent with social learning theory. Elliot (1994) supported the process of ‘feathering and flocking’ as predicted by social learning theory:

[I]n the typical sequence of initiation of delinquent bonding and illegal behaviour, delinquent bonding (again, more specifically, association with delinquent friends) usually precedes illegal behaviour for those individuals for whom one can ascertain the temporal order. . . . Similarly . . . weakening of belief typically preceded the initiation of illegal behaviour. (p. 174).

Recent arguments put forward by Sukhu (2012) suggest that male violence may be linked to masculine gender and that adolescents are more susceptible to the criminogenic influence of delinquent peers when compared with older or younger males. However, it does not mean that all individuals experience peer-based risks in the same generalized way. As Peter McLaren (2011) has noted, individual differences affect how people interpret and respond to situational risk. To put it simply, it is the interaction between an individual and his environment that determines his course of actions (Earle, 2011; McGloin, Sullivan & Kennedy, 2012; Seidler, 1994).

The influence of friendships as sites for identity exploration is widely acknowledged in the literature and there is a probable ‘common sense’ attitude that exists in this regard. Yet, to date, few studies have looked closely at friends and friendship groups as intervening factors in identity formation during adolescence, particularly at points of great life changes such as migration. Therefore, in this study, I am going to explore the extent to which the choosing and rejecting of friends are entangled in cultural and ethnic identity building. I aim to look at how adolescents import many identities, characteristics, and
experiences into their peer relationships (McGloin & Decker, 2010), and how such factors may mediate conditions for bonding and peer-influenced delinquency (Dipietro & McGloin, 2012; McGloin & Nguyen, 2013).

South African perspectives on adolescent masculinities

Jason Bantjes and Johan Nieuwoudt (2014) advanced an argument that sometimes, disruptive behaviour in schools can be conceptualized as symptomatic of the institution’s gendered culture. They highlighted the notion of homophobia as a performance of gender in their description of an incident of extreme vandalism, violence and homophobia that occurred in an elite boys’ school in South Africa. The ‘incident of Mayhem’ describes the way in which a large group of students, at an independent monastic traditional boys’ school in South Africa, behaved in an unexpected and bizarre way. In a series of events, the boys wreaked havoc on the school campus, damaged property, tagged the school with obscene graffiti, desecrated the school chapel, insulted teachers, and disrupted the normal running of the school.

The authors were interested to find out what ‘appropriate’ performance of masculinity in an elite school in South Africa meant for the boys. Their enquiry took the form of a traditional ethnographical research where data were collected in narrative form and observations conducted to substantiate the narratives. The primary method of data collection was largely done through participant observation by the first author (Jason Bantjes) who was working at that time as a consulting psychologist at the school. At the date of the study, the school’s board had employed him for a period of five years when the incident took place, and therefore he had an extended insight of the cultural practices of the school. This privileged position as an insider to the institution meant that he had firsthand knowledge of the school’s rituals, cultural practices, and policies.

Thirty teachers (approximately half of the teaching staff) volunteered to be interviewed. These interviews were unstructured and those being interviewed
determined the content and direction. The interviews were audiotaped, transcribed and analyzed by Bantjes exclusively. Thematic content analysis was employed to identify common themes in the interviews. The interviews show how gender is performed within an elite boys’ school and how the incident of mayhem illuminates the gender regime of the institution in question. However, interviews with teachers failed to explain how and why the boys acted in such harmful and destructive ways. Conversely, the short interviews conducted with a small number of individual boys were much more revealing. Most of the boys were extremely forthcoming in their reflective accounts of their incident and suggested that they got involved because it was fun and exciting. The incident of Mayhem was seen as a climax of their final year at school. For some of them it was the most exhilarating night of their lives - being chased by security guards and coming onto campus in the middle of the night. It was pure excitement and fun for most of them (Bantjes & Nieuwoudt, 2014).

The study of boy’s behaviour in an elite school in South Africa is an important one for my enquiry because it highlights that the sexual content of Mayhem can in part be understood as an affirmation of heterosexuality, an act of homophobia, and an assertion of power. The pornographic images that boys put on notice boards and the graffiti they pasted around the school were all explicitly sexual, affirmed heterosexuality, and poked fun at homosexuals and effeminate men. Although, this is an example of a single study from one elite school in South Africa, it nonetheless shows how cultural conservative South Africa, and Africa as a whole, continues to be challenged for engaging men and boys in gender transformation. Gender configurations in many parts of Africa remain fraught with historically embedded meanings of what it means to be a real man.

**Immigration and masculinities**

Several studies have shown that migration is a profoundly gendered procedure and experienced differently for boys/girls and men/women (Farahani, 2010). Recent migration scholarship has contributed significantly towards advancing
understandings about the negotiations and fashioning of masculinities in new and changing locations (Adebanji, Phatudi & Hartell, 2014; Kao, Vaquera & Goyette, 2013; Nguyen, 2011; Tecle, 2012). By exploring the interplay between ethnicity and gender for immigrants, these studies offer many useful insights into the ways masculinities are enacted within the context of migration.

In an ethnographic study of Lebanese teenage boys from a working-class suburb of Sydney, Scott Poynting and his colleagues found that the boy’s intersections of masculinity and ethnicity, along with class relations, exhibited what they term, ‘contradictory consciousness’ characteristic of ‘common sense’ of the socially subordinate (Poynting, Noble & Tabar, 1999). Interviews conducted with friendship groups of the young immigrants show that the boys deployed forms of ‘protest masculinity’ when they experienced racism at school and elsewhere. Their study powerfully shows how the boys constructed masculinities within social relations of ethnicity and the experience of racism. It also illustrates how ethnic identities are implicated by ‘common sense’ understandings of masculinity and that specific forms of ‘protest masculinity’ are constructed and lived out in reaction to ethnocentrism inside and outside of their school. The boys actively displayed disrespect towards teacher and authority, which was in sharp contrast with the respect they afforded their parents. The authors called for more theoretically informed empirical work if an enhanced understanding of immigrant male identities is the aim. They suggested that a need exist for a follow-up study with the fathers (providers, heads of families) of immigrant youths in an effort to explore the extent to which immigration and settlement processes has on their identity constructions.

In bringing the formation of migrant masculinities into focus among young immigrant males from Lebanon and other Islamic nations living in Australia, Mills and Keddie (2010) argued that when immigrant adolescent males find themselves in a position of ‘powerlessness’ then they construct protest forms of masculinity that valorises violence. The interviews showed that masculine identity construction was regulated by contextual factors and illustrate clearly the
centrality of power in understanding the ways in which masculinity is practised. The young men spoke of feeling excluded from Australian society which resulted in sullen withdrawal from their new surroundings. This withdrawal is then followed by an intense resentment for authority and their host society, and then ‘explodes’ into angry and violent responses. Ironically, the young men who participated in their study argued that their public displays of violent behaviours are frowned upon by Australians, yet ‘footy players’ (rugby players) are expected to put in the ‘big hits’ when they play their contact sport.

In a discursive study of the adaptation experiences of Horn of Africa immigrant boys living in the Pacific Northwest of the United States, Tecle (2012) found that the participants involved in this study talked consistently about feeling like social outcasts in their school. But while claiming a sense of insecurity and alienation within their school environment, they also distanced themselves from stigmatizing discourses around Black youth as naturally violent. The study suggests that Horn of African youth are already shaped in terms of how they act, think, and perceive their experience and their world, yet they also interrogate and they react. Tecle (2012) pointed out that during the interviews, most of the participants were claiming difference by interrogating discourses produced for the ‘Other’, such as when they respond as Africans when it comes to resisting White student’s and teacher’s stereotypical representations.

By highlighting the link between gender and migration, Portes and Rumbaut (2001) suggested “gender enters the picture in an important way because of the different roles that boys and girls occupy during adolescence and the various ways in which they are socialized” (p. 64). This is shown in the findings from a recent study with Zimbabwean adolescent boys living in South Africa. The study indicates that immigrant boys constructed a cultural identity of ‘inbetweenness’ (Adebanji et al., 2014). The study with 12-19 year old males reveals that the familial dynamics predisposed them to ‘consume’ their home-base culture and not to be indoctrinated by the mainstream South African culture.
However, the boys’ masculine identity constructions were characterized by an adoption of South African materialistic popular culture and youth subcultures that interfered with their academic performances. The study also shows that in reaction to experiences of inequality, prejudice and discrimination, immigrant boys sometimes developed patterns of over-assimilation. Moreover, the boys’ behaviours were frequently followed by a rejection of the host culture outside of school when parental influence was dominant (Adebanji et al., 2014). Recent news reports out of South Africa suggest that Zimbabwean immigrants and their children are still being viewed by South African as undesirable / unwanted foreigners, who does not deserve a place in their newly adopted country. Instead of protesting, Zimbabwean youths living in South Africa seem to display ‘soft’ compliancy to the cultural status quo by submitting to their new cultural situation, enacting and reenacting received societal norms. The experiences of Zimbabweans living in South Africa were graphically depicted in the hit cinematic film District 9.

The preceding studies show that the ways in which immigrant boys, albeit in different locations, responded to discourses about them. They show the boys often responded by challenging the status quo in a variety of ways (Mac an Ghaill, 1992; Popoviciu, Haywood & Mac an Ghaill, 2006). These studies undoubtedly illustrated that, although some immigrant boys frequently constructed forms of resistant masculine identities, these constructions were not always anti-educational but in a sense always anti-institutional. As noted earlier, it is teachers in the most diverse locations that are at the forefront of (re)introducing the issue of migrating masculinities into education debates in New Zealand and elsewhere.

Conclusion

Although the role of gender cannot be ignored at any time during the lifespan, a focus on gender during adolescence is important because it is reasonable to consider the proposition that boys and girls experience adolescence quite differently. Many gender effects, however, interact with other important
developmental tasks, and have more to do with how boys and girls are perceived and treated than about sex differences per se. Thus, an important question to ask is whether the issue of ‘problem boys’ lies with the individual, how the individual navigates the discourses of masculinity, or whether or not the problem of misbehaving boys lays with the culture of practices of the particular school the boy are attending. If the issue is the individual boy, then he will misbehave irrespective of the location. This is a critical question in every sense. It raises further questions that demand some additional critical enquiry into the relationship between societal and culture expectations and the formation of masculinity (Whitehead, 2006).

I suspect that the dominant discourses of masculinity, such as sport, being macho, homophobia, and so on, are fairly similar in New Zealand and South Africa. This will inevitably affect South African boys in comparable ways. Therefore, a key concern of this study is to explore the relation between immigration, ethnicity and masculinity. The focus is to take a tentative look at the extent to which different South African boys learn, incorporate, and practice dominant discourses of masculinity in New Zealand’s social institutions such as communities and schools. Consequently, this study will explore the different understandings and meaning of masculinity for different boys, and the different ways of ‘doing’ masculinity for those boys in their different social and learning contexts. One can assume that an additional benefit of using reflective storytelling, and shifting the focus away from overgeneralizing of a singular expression of masculinity, may contribute to a greater understanding of the complex nature of masculinity.
South Africans in New Zealand: Same, same, but different

“However, without enlarging the conceptual framework to include recognition of pluri-local social spaces, we will probably lose touch with a growing part of the reality of migration, and, thus, be unable to sufficiently understand and explain it”
(Pries 2004, p. 31)

Introduction

Although the twenty-first century is being hailed as the ‘age of migration’, the movement of people crossing international borders is not new and it could be argued that migration has always been part of a long established process and enduring feature of global history (Herbert, 2008; Hochschild & Cropper, 2010). What is new, however, is that contemporary migration is a worldwide phenomenon that is growing in scope, complexity and impact, with more than 214 million people, about 3 percent of the world’s population, living outside their country of birth (United Nations Population Division, 2013). As a classic migrant-dependent society (Spoonley & Bedford, 2012), New Zealand is mirroring the global trend of increased immigration. Large numbers of South Africans are now calling New Zealand home. Although, both the magnitude of the flow and the size of this immigrant population are open to debate, newcomers from South African have become one of New Zealand’s largest foreign-born groups (Trlin, 2010). See Table 2 for a comparison of South Africans with other nationalities migrating to New Zealand.

Again, I wish to stress the importance of being sensitive towards the ethnic
diversity of South Africa’s population as this is of key significance for my study given that previous youth adaptation studies have focused largely on understanding group-level factors that impact adaptation and settlement in a mechanistic manner. Relative few studies have paid attention to the relationship between the historical, political and cultural features of both the sending and receiving countries. Therefore, this chapter is especially concerned with the specifics of the research context for the purposes of understanding some of the contradictions and tensions of ‘coming of age’ in a new country when cultures come together. The aim of the chapter is also to examine some of the dominant cultural messages and discourses that operated in South African boys’ lives as they negotiated and navigated their new environments.

South Africans: A fragmented people

As I pointed out in Chapter one, my study is an attempt to provide insights from the lived experiences of a group of males from a variety of South African ethnic and cultural backgrounds as they negotiated the ethnic and cultural diversity of adolescent life in New Zealand. From the discussion above, it is clear that the boys under study were characterised by their dissimilar racial, ethnic, cultural, linguistic, religious, and social backgrounds (see Figure 6). Therefore, in order to get a clearer picture of their dissimilar backgrounds, I deemed it necessary to filter any gaze of South African adolescent boys through the lenses of their home country’s present, historical and political past. In the first instance, I shall present a short discussion around South African’s population and the main ethnic (or ‘race’) groups that have been common thought to make up its population. This information will help the reader make sense of some of the terminology used in the rest of the text.

It was not long since most of the people who came from South Africa into New Zealand were predominantly White, with relatively few persons from other ethnicities. Today, new arrivals coming from South Africa vary considerably, and broad, taken-for-granted categories such as nationality, ethnicity, or religion often
conceal the diversity within what is an extremely heterogeneous group. From my observations, South Africans in New Zealand are generally grouped as Black, White or Indian with little or no acknowledgement or sensitivity for intra-group differences or other ethnicities such as ‘Coloured’. As I have noted earlier, any meaningful study that looks at the individual experience must consider giving thought to cross-border migration as connections or ties between the place of origin and the place of destination (Faist et al., 2013; Dervin & Risager, 2015). Thus, and for reasons of data needs and methodological considerations, I shall give an account of each ethnic (or ‘race’) group that make up South Africa’s population separately rather than ‘lumping’ all migrants from South Africa into one demographic category. The aim is also to introduce the reader to the historical and political history of the sending nation at the same time highlighting fundamental social and ethnic (‘race’) differences among the respondents.

South African’s population

South Africa is a nation of diversity, with nearly 52-million people and a wide variety of cultures, languages and religious beliefs. According to Census 2011, the country's population stands at 51.77-million, up from the census 2001 count of 44.8-million. Africans are in the majority, making up 79.2% of the population; ‘Coloured’ and White people each make up 8.9% of the total; and the Indian/Asian population 2.5%, and ‘Other’/unspecified population group makes up 0.5% of South Africa’s total population (South Africa's population, Encyclopedia Britannica, 2016). The following table graphically illustrates both the population make-up and diversity.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>41 000 938</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>4 586 838</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Coloured’</td>
<td>4 615 401</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian/Asian</td>
<td>1 286 930</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>280 454</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>51 770 560</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2. South Africa’s population by ethnicity (‘race’).*

(Source: Statistics South Africa, 2012)

**Population groups**

**Black South Africans**

Bantu-speaking people of South Africa By far the major part of the population classifies itself as African or black, but it is not culturally or linguistically homogeneous. Major ethnic groups include the Zulu, Xhosa, Basotho (South Sotho), Bapedi (North Sotho), Venda, Tswana, Tsonga, Swazi and Ndebele, all of which speak Bantu languages.

Some, such as the Zulu, Xhosa, and Bapedi are unique to South Africa. Other groups are distributed across the borders with neighbours of South Africa: The Basotho group is also the major ethnic group in Lesotho. The Tswana ethnic group constitute the majority of the population of Botswana. The Swazi ethnic group is the major ethnic group in Swaziland. The Ndebele ethnic group is also found in Matabeleland in Zimbabwe, where they are known as the Matabele. These Ndebele people are the descendants of a Zulu faction under the warrior Mzilikazi that escaped persecution from Shaka during the Mfeqane by migrating to their current territory. The Tsonga ethnic group is also found in southern Mozambique, where they are known as the Shangaan (Encyclopedia Britannica, 2016).
The Black population is made up of four broad groupings:

- The Nguni, comprising the Zulu, Xhosa, Ndebele and Swazi people
- The Sotho-Tswana, who include the Southern, Northern and Western Sotho (Tswana people)
- The Tsonga
- The Venda

**White South Africans**

White South Africans are predominantly descendants of Dutch, German, French Huguenots, English and other European settlers. Culturally and linguistically, they are divided into the Afrikaners, who speak Afrikaans, and English-speaking groups. The White population has been on the decrease due to a low birth rate and emigration. As a factor in their decision to emigrate, many cite the high crime rate and the affirmative action policies of the government. Since 1994, approximately 400,000 white South Africans have permanently emigrated. Despite high emigration levels, a few immigrants from Europe have settled in the country. By 2005, an estimated 212,000 British citizens were residing in South Africa. By 2011, this number may have grown to 500,000. Some White Zimbabweans immigrated to South Africa. Some of the more nostalgic members of the community are known in popular culture as ‘Whenwes’, because of their nostalgia for their lives in Rhodesia "when we were in Rhodesia (Encyclopedia Britannica, 2016).

White South Africans include:

- Afrikaners, descendants of Dutch, German and French Huguenot who came to the country from the 17th century onwards.
- English-speakers, descendants of settlers from the British Isles who came to the country from the late 18th century onwards.
- Immigrants and descendants of immigrants from the rest of Europe, including Greeks, Portuguese, Eastern European Jews, Hungarians and Germans (Encyclopedia Britannica, 2016).
‘Coloured’ South Africans (the label is contentious)

‘Coloured’, formerly Cape Coloured, a person of mixed European (White) and African (Black) or Asian ancestry, as officially defined by the South African government from 1950 to 1991. Individuals assigned to this classification originated primarily from 18th and 19th century unions between men of higher and women of lower social groups. For instance, between White men and slave women or between slave men and Khoekhoe or San women. The slaves were from Madagascar, the Malayan archipelago, Sri Lanka, and India.

In early 20th-century South Africa, the word ‘Coloured’ was a social category rather than a legal designation and typically indicated a status intermediate between those who were identified as White and those who were identified as Black. The classification was largely arbitrary, based on family background and cultural practices as well as physical features. Most South Africans who identified themselves as Coloured spoke Afrikaans and English, were Christians, live in an European manner, and affiliated with Whites. Many still live in Cape Town, its suburbs, and rural areas of Western Cape Province. Significant numbers also live in Port Elizabeth and elsewhere in Eastern Cape Province and in Northern Cape Province. In Cape Town and Port Elizabeth, ‘Coloured’ people represent the middle and working classes and are employed as teachers, clerks, shopkeepers, artisans, and other skilled workers. Those living outside the towns are mostly labourers on White-owned farms. A Muslim minority group of ‘Coloured’ people, the so-called Cape Malays, live mostly in separate communities and married among themselves for religious reasons (Encyclopedia Britannica, 2016).

South African Indians

The majority of South Africa’s Asian population is Indian in origin, many of them descended from indentured workers brought to work on the sugar plantations of what was then Natal in the 19th century. They are largely English-speaking,
although many also retain the languages of their origins. There is also a significant group of Chinese South Africans (Encyclopedia Britannica, 2016).

What follows next is a brief history of South African.

Colonisation and the need to ‘civilize’ the Indigenous peoples

The Khoikhoi and the San peoples were together known as the Khoisan. They were the first people to occupy the region known today as South Africa. Later on many different African tribes (speaking various African languages) migrated into the region mainly from East and Central Africa. These tribes lived together in relative peace and inter-tribal marriages were not uncommon. This all changed when the first Europeans arrived in Southern Africa during the late 16th century. The Dutch East India Company set up a post in Cape Town with the purpose of colonising the Southern tip of Africa to provide European trading ships passing by the area with essential supplies. In addition to European settlers taking land and livestock belonging to Indigenous peoples, they also imposed their culture and religious practices on the locals. As the colonised areas expanded and the need for a bigger workforce increased, slaves were imported from other parts of Africa and eventually from Asia and in particular Malaysia.

By the late 17th century, the British took over the Cape colony, spreading their culture of evangelism and a missionary spirit that believed in a need to ‘civilise’ the Indigenous peoples. Mostly due to the influence of humanitarian, John Philip, the British implemented Ordinance 50 (1828) suggesting equal civil rights to the African and Asian people (together referred to as the ‘people of colour’), and abolished slavery into a wage-labour economy. However, the ordinance was largely met with White resistance and ‘Coloured’ people continued to be treated with discrimination because of perceptions of their ‘inferiority’ or the quality of being perceived as inferior compared to the Europeans. Meanwhile, the Dutch began migrating to other parts of the region where they eventually formed new colonies of their own.
By the end of the 18th century, the discovery of diamonds and gold contributed to the Anglo-Boer War between the two competing groups of White colonists, the British and the Dutch (known as Boers or Afrikaners). The victorious British government combined all the colonies to build a White nation (4 colonies, including the Cape Colony, which had been under Dutch control prior to the war). On 31 May 1910, after negotiations between the White Boer Republics and the British, an Act passed in the British Parliament creating the Union of South Africa. This amalgamation of the various colonies under one rule defined the region as an independent self-governing dominion, as opposed to a colony controlled by a foreign power, and began to take measures to secure their White power and control over the Indigenous peoples. The new colonial masters introduced the pass laws that controlled movements of Blacks and kept them in service-orientated jobs that functioned to satisfy the needs of the Whites. Residential allocations, educational institutions and other public amenities such as public transport, beaches and toilets became segregated for ‘Whites only’ and ‘nonWhites only’ spaces. This was the dawn of Apartheid.

*Apartheid: Institutionalised racial discrimination*

The formation of the Union of South Africa was inspired by Afrikaner (Dutch) nationalism and the creation of the Afrikaner National Party (ANP). Whilst South Africa’s British got involved in the First World War, the Afrikaner opposition to this involvement gained the Afrikaner National Party significant support. Combined with their promise of securing White domination through their Apartheid or ‘separate development’ policies, the ANP eventually won the elections and took over the South African parliament. Winning the Whites-only election, the NAP officially launched the Apartheid regime (1948) that institutionalised racial discrimination. Some of Apartheid’s atrocious policies included: the Population Registration Act (1950) that assigned racial categories of White, Black and ‘Coloured’, where ‘Coloured’ meant being of mixed descent but included Indians and Asians at the time.
Where the word ‘homeland’ may conjure up for many images of one’s place of origin (or solace), with a sense of personal and cultural roots, the term has a different meaning in South Africa. The homelands, also known as Bantustans, (similar to First Nations reserves in Canada) were rural areas where Black tribes such as Xhosa and Zulu were forced to live and self-govern. The Apartheid government considered the homelands as separate nations (although no other countries in the world recognized them as such), refusing Blacks the right to share in their national identity as South Africans and instead considering them foreigners who were only to enter South Africa to work as migrant workers employed predominantly in the vast mining industries, farm labourers, maids and nannies. Failure to secure employment or causing ‘trouble’ resulted in immediate deportation. Some Blacks could reside legally in urban areas, providing they had ‘section 10 rights’ (an employer to vouch for you). In a sense, Black people were treated like migrant workers in their own country of birth.

Based on the premise that different cultures and lifestyles are incongruous, segregation was justified to avoid cultural conflict. Apartheid South Africa’s discriminatory policies and ideologies favoured Whites and enforced separate education systems for Blacks and other nonWhite groups. The 1953 Bantu Education Act was one of Apartheid’s most offensively racist laws. It removed the missionary control of schools and brought South African education under the control of the government. Blacks and nonWhites viewed the much-decried ‘Bantu Education’ as little more than moronic as its purpose was to make sure that children only learn things that would comply with the needs of the South African government. Baard and Schreiner (1986) argued that the ideological framework for a separate and unequal education system rather than a single public schooling system for all South Africans was crafted by in 1939 by the Minister of Native Affairs, Doctor Hendrik F. Verwoerd to ensure that the native is ‘Christianised’ and to help him [sic] culturally so that he [sic] can become independently self-supporting and self-maintaining based on Christian values’ (Baard & Schreiner, 1986). In what are now infamous words, Verwoerd explained the South African government’s new education policy:
‘There is no space for him [the ‘Native’] in the European Community above certain forms of labour. For this reason it is of no avail for him to receive training which has its aim in the absorption of the European Community, where he cannot be absorbed. Until now he has been subjected to a school system which drew him away from his community and misled him by showing him the greener pastures of European Society where he is not allowed to graze.’ (as quoted in Kallaway, 1984, p. 92).

Bantu Education served the interest of White supremacy. It promoted myths and racial stereotypes in its curricular and textbooks and denigrated Indigenous people’s history, culture and identity (Baard & Schreiner, 1986). However the idea of segregated education did not find expression with all White people. Several liberal Whites together with a small number of ‘Coloured’ and Blacks who enjoyed the financial means to emigrate showed their opposition to Apartheid by voting with their feet.

Mimicry

I wish to extend this discussion to include the concept of mimicry. I remember as a child how some ‘Coloured’ persons in my neighbourhood attempted to shape their subjectivity in an effort to become a more desirable subject of White through the act of mimicry. These individuals wanted to move up the discriminatory ladder of Apartheid South Africa by pretending to be a different subject. They were often referred judgmentally to as ‘play Whites’ or ‘White but not quite.’ Indeed, it seems that becoming ‘like but not quite’ is still embedded in ‘Coloured’ peoples’ negotiation of settlers ascribed Whiteness’ by altering their physical appearances. Mimicry in this context often involved taking on the form of language use, straightening hair, using skin-lightening products and adopting the cultural practices of the dominant group. The act of mimicry or attempts at ‘normalising’ the self, paradoxically enabled the minority White government to continue its grip on the country’s political and economic powers.
Couched in post-colonial critique, mimicry has been conceptualized as an act that reveals the inherent contradictions embedded in the effort to shape subjects according to political and cultural norms (Ram, 2013). By discussing the desire to become ‘White’, mimicry underscores the colonized subject’s aspiration to adopt settler’s customs and norms, as well as the concomitant inability to fully emulate settler ‘Whiteness’ (Bhabha, 1994; Butler, 1993). However, Ram (2013) argued that mimicry could become a subversive strategy that exposes how identities are constructed and stratified through power relations.

Notwithstanding that mimicry tends to be performed in order to benefit the individual, there may be an internal conflict between the individual’s desire to identify with the dominant group and inherent inability to become part of it. This may be triggered by an anxiety of being exposed as an excluded minority while trying to pass as a member of a hegemonic society (Ram, 2013). Exploring the various performances of mimicry may offer considerable insights into understandings of power relations and ways of how immigrant boys adapt to their new location.

Furthermore, as Mori Ram (2013) suggested, “more should be said on the way in which space itself, not merely the subjects within it - can become an object of and for mimicry” (p. 736). Put differently, as a performed act, mimicry can also be articulated by language, expressed in dress and uttered through gestures (Ram, 2013). This performance of mimicry among immigrant youth has been illustrated in several studies (Dronkers, van der Velden & Dunne, 2012; Levels & Dronkers, 2008; OECD, 2006; Suárez-Orozco, Suárez-Orozco & Todorova, 2008; Zhou, 2007). These studies found a connection between the speed and success of the adaptation process when immigrant youth learn to resemble the characteristics of the host culture. The quicker they learn to speak, dress and act like their host, the quicker and more successful their integration. This was the case for first generation immigrants across different countries. Either way, this is important for my study because mimicry is concerned with the construction of the self. As such,
I envisioned that a better understanding of the complex formation of the individual subjectivity may be gained by examining the relationship between mimicry and migrating masculinities. The central idea of sociocultural influences unfixes the very notion of identity as stable and rigid.

*South Africans immigrants in New Zealand*

It was not long since most of the people who came from South Africa into New Zealand were predominantly White, with relatively few persons from other ethnicities. Today, new arrivals coming from South Africa vary considerably, and broad, taken-for-granted categories such as nationality, ethnicity, or religion often conceal the diversity within what is an extremely heterogeneous group. From my observations, South Africans in New Zealand are generally grouped as Black, White or Indian with little or no acknowledgement or sensitivity for intra-group differences or other ethnicities such as ‘Coloured’. As I have noted earlier, any meaningful study that looks at the individual experience must consider giving thought to cross-border migration as connections or ties between the place of origin and the place of destination (Faist et al., 2013; Dervin & Risager, 2015). Thus, and for reasons of data needs and methodological considerations, I will discuss each ethnic (or ‘race’) separately rather than ‘lumping’ all South African immigrants into one demographic category.

The 1960s and 1970s witnessed a growing exodus of mainly liberal Whites who became disillusioned with Apartheid South Africa’s political state of affairs and could not see any long-term future for them and their children. New Zealand beckoned as an attractive new location. By 1986, the number of South Africans opting to live in New Zealand had risen to 2,685. This exodus is generally understood to be the first major wave of South African migrants arriving in New Zealand (Ministry of Culture and Heritage, 2004). Those who stayed behind referred disparagingly to such emigration as ‘the chicken run.’
In South Africa’s 1994 elections, the first in which all racial and ethnic groups could vote, the White minority government was ousted. Nelson Mandela became President of the new South Africa, which became affectionately known as the ‘Rainbow Nation.’ After the demise of Apartheid, Mandela’s government was unfairly burdened with an expectation that it would solve all of South Africa’s race relations and economic problems. Regrettably, the hopes held by a poor populace were largely unfulfilled, and crime and unemployment escalated. Middle-class South Africans living with burglar bars, fortified fences and guard dogs became the norm. With policies promoting Black employment, many government jobs went to poorly qualified Blacks; it did not take long for some Whites, ‘Coloured’s and Indians to start questioning whether they were wanted in the new South Africa (Ministry of Culture and Heritage, 2004).

Increased unemployment and an exploding crime rate caused a large number of highly qualified individuals to believe that there were too many people in the country and not enough jobs for everybody. This mindset of looking elsewhere for employment opportunities resulted in a second major wave of predominantly skilled South Africans arriving in New Zealand (Ministry of Culture and Heritage, 2004). Many Whites, ‘Coloured’s and Indians felt marginalised through the South African government’s affirmative action policies. Many South Africans viewed the intent of Affirmative Action policies as a breeding ground for racism and racist sentiments. They argued that only Blacks were benefitting from new educational opportunities. Thus, unfavourable employment conditions and corrupt practices, alongside unstable political scene, coupled with perceptions of the decay of the education system in South Africa, ‘pushed’ migrants out, and favourable economic and social conditions in New Zealand ‘pulled’ them out (Lee, 1966; Trlin, 2010). Push-pull in this context refers to a process whereby New Zealand generally offered South African immigrants economic prosperity and lifestyle changes in return for their skills and social investment (Lee, 1966; Molm et al., 2012). With its political stability and English-speaking culture, New Zealand seemed a desirable country for the ‘White Flighters’ to emigrate to and bring up their children (Bedford, 2004; Bedford and Ho, 2005).
In South Africa affirmative action legislation took effect in 1998. The aim of the legislation was to take positive or affirmative measures to attract, develop and retain individuals from previously disadvantaged groups. Groups were designated in the Act as ‘Blacks’ (including African, ‘Coloured’ (mixed race), Indians, women and people with disabilities. Despite South Africa’s affirmative action laws aiming to eradicate inequality by presenting ‘Blacks’ with opportunities to study in areas of medicine, engineering and other highly-skilled professions, there was a growing discontent among ‘Coloured’ and Indians that affirmative action has only enriched a select few Black people in the country.

Two of the most direct and vocal critics of affirmative action, Dan Roodt and Steven Friedman come from the ranks of those who had benefited from privilege in the past. In essence, they argued that affirmative action is both unjust because it ‘has always been an anti-white system’ (Roodt, 2006), and ‘sits alongside crime as the chief trigger for white apprehensions of doom’ (Friedman, 2006). Friedman further suggests that affirmative action have perpetuated racial identity in post-Apartheid South Africa, which was contrary to Mandela’s building of an egalitarian society.

South Africa’s political and economic climate and the promotion of a global, free-market economy (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2010) resulted in a third wave of migration flow to New Zealand in the first decade of the 21st century. However, unlike the previous two waves the present flows are closely associated with highly diversified and differentiated individuals. Contemporary immigration from South Africa continues to play an important and growing role in contributing to the population growth of New Zealand. Similar to other migrants, adapting to life in a new country they may have never visited may be a frightening experience for some South Africans; others may view moving countries as an exciting new adventure.

Unlike the ‘spring tide’ prior to the demise of Apartheid that was closely associated with mainly ‘invisible’ White high-skilled migrants, the ethnic makeup
of people arriving in New Zealand from South Africa have shifted since the mid
to late 1990s. Although migration statistics still ‘clump’ all South Africans
together, some researchers (Bedford, 2004; Sonn & Lewis, 2009; Trlin, 2010) as
well as official government websites (Te Ara – the Encyclopedia of New Zealand)
are now acknowledging the ethnic and cultural diversity with the group. Given my
personal experience of living in Auckland for almost twenty years and
maintaining contact with large numbers of South African groups through work,
church and other social events, I would argue that the people now coming into
New Zealand from South Africa unreservedly represent a cross-section of South
Africa’s population.

Characterised in the main by their highly diverse and dissimilar racial, ethnic,
cultural, linguistic, religious, and social backgrounds, it is roughly estimated that
there may be more than 40,000 South Africans now living in New Zealand home
(Statistics New Zealand, 2014). Despite these ‘official’ statistical figures, the
magnitude of the inflow and the size of this immigrant population are open to
debate. As Bedford (2004) pointed out, statistics fail to convey the true magnitude
of South African immigration as they do not include temporary migrants arriving
on visitor or work permits and subsequently approved for permanent residence.
Nor do they include persons choosing to travel or apply for residence with a
British or Dutch passport to avoid immigration difficulties in the late 1980s and
early 1990s before the end of Apartheid. As prominent migration researcher
Andrew Trlin (2010) pointed out “whatever the true scale of immigration and
growth, settlers from South Africa have become one of New Zealand’s largest
foreign-born groups” (p. 159).

While the visible ‘Other’ (Asians and Pacific people in particular) has been the
focus of numerous studies, relatively little is known about South Africans living
in New Zealand (Trlin, 2010). Their often-assumed “inherent lack of ethnic and
socio-economic distinctiveness” (Bedford, 2004, p. 355) and “their desire to
simply assimilate” (Louw and Mersham, 2001, p. 306) are often seen as two of
the more typical explanations given as to why South African immigrants are
ignored by researchers both in New Zealand and in Australia. The greater
attention given to the ‘visible other’ is easily justified by the reference given to
the hardship and difficulties they are experiencing in adjusting to their new
surroundings. On the basis of this lack of researching South Africans, Trlin (2010)
pointed out the shortcomings around some of the institutionalised ideologies that
dominate current migration research. He eloquently argued for a rethink around
the direction of migration studies in New Zealand:

“Blanket assumptions tend to belittle the difficulties faced
by ‘less visible’ and ‘invisible’ others; and to assume that
research on such groups will add little of value to our
knowledge about international migration, immigrant
settlement and related issues. But are the difficulties faced
by an ‘invisible’ group such as the South Africans so minor
that they escape the hardships, stresses and strains
experienced by other ‘visible’ immigrant groups? Does the
experience of such a group really add little to our
knowledge of international migration and immigrant
settlement, to a better comparative appreciation of the
experience of ‘visible’ groups or even to the informed
development and implementation of policies that enhance
benefits accruing to the country of destination?” (p. 160).

The handful of studies which looked specifically at the experiences of South
Africans in New Zealand may be somewhat guilty of ‘brushing over’ some of the
contextual features of the sending and receiving nations (Duxfield, 2013; Louw &
Mersham, 2001; Meares, Lewin, Cain, Spoonley, Pearce & Ho, 2011; Sonn &
Lewis, 2009; Trlin, 2010). While focusing on the immigrant experience at the
individual or immigrant community level, a number of these studies (I do stress
not all of them) seem to significantly ignore the importance of bringing the
historical, cultural, religious and economic interface between the two nations into
view. It is fair to say that the emphasis of these studies may not have been on
examining how the experiences of immigrants will be affected by the personal
and cultural histories they bring with them. However, by overlooking how the
immigrant’s particularities have a particular interface with the host country is
painting a partial picture of their experiences only. In my opinion, these studies
have, however, laid the groundwork for future research which brings the intersection of biography and host nation characteristics into play. As a consequence, the next section of this chapter will discuss the historical and present day features of New Zealand as an immigrant-receiving nation.

**New Zealand: A country of immigrants**

*Historical and political context*

New Zealand is a relatively small country of approximately 4.3 million people located in the South Pacific. Its pre-history commenced from the time when Rangitata Land mass separated from the ancient super continent of Gondwana 80 million years ago. Due to its isolation and remote location from Africa, from where humans emigrated, the islands remained uninhabited until being discovered and settled by Polynesian explorers between 950 and 1130 AD (Belich, 1996). Their descendants became New Zealand’s Indigenous people, now referred to as Māori. New settlements developed in relative isolation. The first Europeans arrived in the 17th century with Dutch explorer Abel Tasman sailing into New Zealand waters.

The first encounters between Māori and European were violent and led to bloodshed. After partly charting the coastline, Tasman left New Zealand without ever having set foot ashore, and one hundred years had passed before the next Europeans arrived. In 1769 British explorer James Cook and Jean de Surville, commander of a French trading ship both arrived by coincidence in New Zealand waters at the same time. Neither ship ever sighted the other (Sinclair, 2000). Whalers, traders and missionaries arrived during the late 1790s and established settlements mainly along the far north coast. The arrival of whalers and traders led to inter-racial marriages between themselves and local Māori. Early missionaries and traders initiated a linguistic, economic, cultural and religious transformation that departed from Māori traditions. This interaction also led to a flourishing musket trade. History records these events as the commencement of the devastating inter-tribal ‘Musket Wars’ with these new deadlier weapons.
A key date in New Zealand’s colonization was 1840 when the Treaty of Waitangi was signed between representatives of the British government and Māori chiefs of many (but not all) tribes (Spoonley & Bedford, 2012). The signing of Treaty of Waitangi on the 6th February 1840 marked a shift in the relationship between Māori and colonialists by establishing a formal relationship between New Zealand’s Indigenous people and the Crown. The Treaty was both an agreement concerning the legitimacy of British colonial possession and recognition of the rights of Māori by establishing an important “legal, political and moral framework [for Māori] to challenge the state” (Irwin, 1994, p. 335). Kathie Irwin (1994) pointed out that the cultural relevance of the Treaty continues to serve as a “bicultural development policy framework” (p. 336).

The literature suggests that New Zealand’s history around the relationship between Māori and Pakeha have not been characterised by partnership and Māori self-determination, but rather by political and social domination by the Pakeha majority. Pakeha is a Māori term for New Zealanders who are of European descent. In the historical context, it referred to the first British settlers who colonised the country. More recently the term refers inclusively either to fair-skinned persons or any non-Māori New Zealander.

New Zealand’s history has progressed through successive policies and initiatives that have imposed Pakeha language and knowledge at the expense of Māori (Bishop & Glynn, 1997a). The cumulative effects of these successive policies are that Pakeha hold both political and economic power in New Zealand. Although it cannot be assumed, it does appear from my observation of living here for almost two decades that the majority middle-class White culture is not the dominant culture in New Zealand. The dominant culture appears to be one of staunchness and a ‘she’ll be all right’ attitude during everyday interactions, often associated with ‘lower’ middle-class New Zealand. This dominant culture is not dictated by a particular ‘colour’ but rather by a lifestyle choice that embraces of sports, excessive alcohol consumption and the great outdoors. An important point that I
wish to raise here is that these cultural practices of rugby, braai (Barbeque) and beer are very similar to those found among all groups in South Africa.

Contemporary migration

With a population size of about four million people, New Zealand’s cultural and ethnic makeup is decidedly affected by net migration flows, including the arrival and departure of New Zealand and Australian citizens and residents; temporary migrants on visitor, work and student visas; and new permanent residents arriving under the New Zealand Residence Programme. Net migration flow can be understood as the difference between the number of permanent and long-term arrivals and the number of permanent and long-term departures. The departure of New Zealanders, particularly to Australia, is one of the main drivers of the country’s migration outflow (Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment, 2011). The free movement of New Zealand citizens and Australian citizens and permanent residents between the two countries makes it relatively easy for New Zealanders to seek opportunities in Australia and vice versa.

As a classic migrant-dependent society (Spoonley & Bedford, 2012), New Zealand is mirroring the global trend of increased immigration, where the proportion of overseas-born residents swelled from 19 percent in 2001 to 23 percent in 2013 (Statistics New Zealand, 2014). Immigration to New Zealand is often about weighing up economic opportunities versus lifestyle. Many immigrants come to New Zealand because they believe that Kiwis have a certain quality that they prefer – the ‘laid-back-attitude’, having their priorities in the right place with regards to work/life balance. The choice to live in New Zealand often comes with the recognition that newcomers have to ‘downsize’ their career and not earn to their full potential when compared with Australia where most people can earn significantly more. Newcomers who choose to live in New Zealand generally do so because they favour ‘the lifestyle, the people and the scenery’ above economic gain.
Recent migration figures indicate that New Zealand had gained record high 45,500 migrants in 2014. Statisticians claim that the year 2014 has seen the biggest ever gain in immigrants. Annual arrivals rose to 105,500 while departures fell 21 percent from the previous year to 60,000. Meanwhile, the net loss of 6000 people to Australia was down from 25,300 for the same period a year earlier (Statistics New Zealand, 2014). A change in the New Zealand Immigration Act (2009) has seen the establishment of a new immigration system that requires any person regardless of background, who is not a New Zealand citizen, and who holds a visa to be granted entry permission to stay in New Zealand for any length of time if they meet the criteria of residency as determined by the Minister of Immigration and the Office of the New Zealand Parliamentary Counsel. The changes in the Act were aimed at providing for easier access for migrants to work and live here. The Act sets out instruction (setting the rules and criteria for the granting of visas and entry permission), which was aimed at immigrants “contributing to the New Zealand workforce through facilitating access to skills and labour” (New Zealand Parliamentary Counsel Office, 2009, p. 26).

Speaking on immigrant selection, sociologist and leading immigration researcher Paul Spoonley, during a recent radio interview, pointed out that New Zealand’s immigration programme is based on attracting people with the right skills for a growing labour market:

*We have a mismatch between the kids that come out of school with low-level qualifications, and they find it very hard to get jobs. The whole labour market is moving up in terms of skill requirements and it is that shift – that higher-level skill that we need. We got to fill the gap with immigrants. We need to bring in people we need and not people who need us* (Spoonley, 2014, radio interview).

Paul Spoonley’s comments are directed at public concerns raised in the mass media about immigrants flooding into New Zealand (Spoonley, 2014). Responding to recent spikes in anti-immigration sentiments, he offers a sensible approach to analysing the need for immigration and immigrant selection.
Spoonley’s perceptive analysis of New Zealand’s immigration policy puts the emphasis on skilled migrants that can make a positive contribution to the New Zealand labour market and its economy and not people who may become a burden on the New Zealand taxpayer by being ‘unemployable.’ Spoonley (2014) argued that, despite the varied and multiple motivations for coming to New Zealand, the actual objective of economic reasoning essentially drives contemporary immigration.

Numbers tell only part of the migration story. The diversity of newcomers cannot be understated. New arrivals into New Zealand are not only increasing in scale but is also becoming more variegated and complex. Dating back only a few years, New Zealand has, “very quickly and, by and large, without a lot of fuss, became one of the most diverse countries the world over” (Spoonley, 2010, p. 34). Auckland is home to 150 ethnicities, with 40 percent of its residents born overseas, making it one of the most ethnically diverse cities globally alongside Vancouver and Perth (Spoonley, 2010; Statistics New Zealand, 2014).

Where do immigrants to New Zealand come from?

The most common overseas birthplaces for immigrant (in descending order) are now: England, People’s Republic of China, India, Australia, South Africa, Fiji, Samoa, Philippines, Republic of Korea and Scotland (Statistics New Zealand, 2014). The table below outlines the number and percentages of permanent immigrants by country of birth sourced from Statistics New Zealand 2014.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>Number of overseas-born living in New Zealand</th>
<th>Percentage of overseas-born people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>215,589</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>89,121</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>67,176</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>62,712</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>54,276</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>52,755</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>50,661</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>37,299</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>26,601</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>25,953</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Number and percentage of permanent immigrants by country of birth.

(Source: Statistics New Zealand, 2014)

The geography of immigration is also significant. Recent immigrants tend to overwhelmingly settle in major urban areas, with close to 80 percent settling in Auckland, Christchurch and Wellington. In 2013, 40 percent of all immigrants chose Auckland as their destination (Statistics New Zealand, 2014). This high concentration of new immigrants in a few urban centres has serious implications, both in terms of the allocation of resources and in terms of cultural expectations of this rapidly changing urban population.

The attitudes of New Zealanders towards immigrants and immigration

As the cultural and ethnic diversity of immigrants arriving in New Zealand has increased since 1986, the question of host attitudes has gained in importance (although not for the first time in the post-war period) Spoonley (2011) pointed to
the negative reactions towards Pacific Islands peoples in the 1970s and 1980s. The diversity of ‘visible’ immigrant flows to New Zealand has produced periods of significant public reaction, most notably from 1993 to 1996 (Butcher, Spoonley & Trlin, 2006). The ‘Inv-Asian’ articles in Auckland newspapers in 1993 marked the beginning of a moral panic about the numbers and ethnicity of immigrants, culminating in the 1996 General Election when New Zealand First (a political party) gained significantly from the anti-immigrant sentiments of part of the New Zealand electorate. Bedford and Ho (2005) argued that what should not be underplayed in these reactions is the speed with which New Zealand diversified its immigration flows with large numbers of ‘non-traditional’ immigrants (especially, but not exclusive from Asia) now calling it home. A common refrain from anti-immigration proponents is that immigrants fail to integrate into New Zealand society. They claim that immigrants, in general, refuse to adopt New Zealand cultural and social values (Bedford, 2006; Bedford & Ho, 2005).

In New Zealand a national survey of international students published recently identified that Chinese students were more dissatisfied with their experiences when compared to students from Europe, South Africa and North America and other Asian countries (Ho, Li, Cooper & Holmes, 2007). In general, these young people claimed to have been the victims of racism and discrimination and have chosen the separation strategy. The researchers found that few opted for using the assimilation strategy. Integration, and to some extent marginalization, were more common among the other participants and implied a selective process of maintenance and rejection that involves higher levels of behavioural changes. Although these students were temporary visitors, the New Zealand study nonetheless highlights the acculturation strategies different groups of young people when cultures come together. No such study has been conducted with any ‘less visible’ group of young people. A shortcoming this study hopes to remedy.
New Zealand’s educational landscape: Dominant discourses in schools

In the following section I will discuss the dominant discourses that operate in New Zealand schools. These discourses are powerful in the way they are able to draw a sharp distinction between how boys and girls should be educated. Targeting parents and teachers often does this. In thinking about the relationship between these discourses and pedagogical practice and to understand more fully the current debates about the ‘problems with boys’, I will now turn my attention to illustrate the complex ways in which these dominant discourses are playing out in the New Zealand educational landscape. Exploring how these discourses operate in schools is hugely important. By informing, regulating and defining, through language, pedagogical discourses create in a sense the ‘truth’ about what boys are like and how best to educate them. It is important that while these discourses may primarily be targeting boys’ schooling, they inevitably affect both boys and girls. Often, they are interrelated and cannot be studied in isolation. As Hine Waitere-Ang (2005) pointed out:

*Examining norms and processes of normalisation requires looking beneath what is accepted as ‘common-sense’ and ‘natural.’ Beneath the taken-for-granted are a number of interrelated, shifting ideologies and discourses that are often ambiguous, but that nevertheless act as powerful coercive forces that establish boundaries for inclusion and exclusion, success and failure* (p. 366).

*The ‘feminization of school’ discourse*

Debates around issues of boys and schooling, underway in various parts of the world, attribute the phenomenon of the ‘feminization of the school’ curriculum as causing boys to becoming the ‘new victims’ of the educational process. Gurian and Stevens (2005) targeted parents in the hope that they will jump on the de-feminization of education bandwagon by strategically presenting some damaging
statistics around boys and schooling. In their book, *The Mind of Boys* (2005), they suggest that adolescent boys in the United States receive up to 70% of the Ds and Fs given to all students; boys create 90% classroom discipline problems; 80% all secondary school dropouts are boys; millions of American boys are on Ritalin and other mind-bending control drugs; only 45% college students are boys, and three out of four learning disabled students are boys. They explicitly blamed the ‘frilly content’ of the school curriculum and associated feminine classroom practices for all the boys’ problems in schooling and school life.

Writing in an American context, their work somewhat implies that the national curriculum is ‘hostile to boys’ and that feminine pedagogical practices are sissifying boys and making them ‘vulnerable’ by creating learning contexts that undermine their manliness, which in turn, discourages them to learning and achieving at school. What is more, Gurian and Stevens draw exclusively on reports from the United States and then make bold, and globalised claims about girls are outperforming boys because contemporary education systems the world over favours girls over boys. This obviously untrue given the fact that many societies still prohibit girls from going to school. Also, it would be naïve to assume that their opinions about boys apparent falling behind in lessons, examinations, and ultimately, the job market are free from ideological impositions.

The ‘feminization of school’ discourse, which calls for the ‘de-frilling’ of schooling, is by no means apolitical nor is it exclusive to Australia, North America and Europe. The call for male teachers is a recurring refrain in educational discussions in New Zealand. The female numerical dominance of teaching (particularly in primary schools) is often linked with concerns about boys’ problems in schools (Epstein, 1998) and with their developmental needs. Only 2 percent of early childhood educators are male. One of the major solutions offered by policy-makers to tackle boys’ perceived underachievement in New Zealand is the call for more male teachers to address the gender imbalance in schools and to act as positive male role models. In everyday terms, there seems a consensus
among policy-makers which suggest that males are: (a) better at motivating boys, (b) superior at catering for boys’ interests, (c) critical at providing stable male figures for students who lack them at home, and (d) essential for role modeling appropriate masculine presentations. Educational researcher Sarah Farquhar (2013) it was time to try something different to bring men into early childcare and teaching. She argued that early childhood education is “an important foundation for children’s learning, future prospects and the success of New Zealand society and yet we continue to fail to role model gender diversity and include men in children’s care and early education” (Farquhar, 2013, p.4).

At first glance, the recommendation for more male teachers appears to be a sound endorsement for helping those individual boys who may struggling in school and life in general. However, some commentators have questioned the real motivation behind such proposals. In Australia for instance, Martino and Meyenn (2001) have for a long time taken an opposing view of the ‘de-feminization’ debate, and argued that the basic premise of such recuperative masculinity programmes are nothing more than a political stunt to effectively strengthen claims that the ‘frilly content’ of the curriculum encourages ‘weakness and appeasement’ among boys. Their argument goes that by examining the anti-feminist rhetoric through the lens of discourse analysis may show that large-scale discourses generally assume that adolescent male students are being corrupted by the feminine pedagogical practices.

Anti-feminist debates often rely heavily on beliefs grounded on the assumption that there is something essential about boys and the way they learn. That is, essentialist discourses tell a story of boys, who as a group are less well adapted to conventional ways of teaching. Operating in a language that is saturated with binary thinking, these discourses then position boys and girls as opposite and different (men are from Mars, women are from Venus) and as a consequence create knowledge about the balancing out ‘too much femininity’ in education. Too much Venus and not enough Mars. These discourses are designed to promote actively the ‘injection of more masculinity’ into the classroom in order to ‘help
save the poor boys from losing their manhood’ supposedly brought about by the gender imbalances in schools.

So, does the introduction of more male teachers into the classroom improve teaching and learning for boys? Kevin Davison (2007) argued strongly against such a move and offered considerable justification for his views on the so-called balance that is preferred. Davison (2007) pointed out that any educational initiative that favours girls must inevitably disadvantage boys. He also argued that efforts to ‘masculinize’ schools might not have the intended outcome of addressing the education of boys in ways that those who call for more male teachers hope. Rather it may instead reinforce hegemonic heterosexual masculine privilege within schools, disadvantaging both boys and girls and destroy decades of work by feminists to create more equal and just societies for all. While the stories of boys’ ‘underachievement’ are not always conspiratorial, they are often closely woven into institutionalized thought and processes that are powerful agents that work together in prohibiting alternative views of educating young people (Davison, 2007; Kecskemeti, 2011).

‘Culturally responsive pedagogies’

For some time now, the New Zealand Ministry of Education, and the popular media have expressed concerns about Māori students underachieving in school. Pedagogical discourses refer to a series of ongoing exchanges among academics, within education, the mass media and political arenas, which points to ineffective schools and poor teaching practices as key causes for the difficulties boys are facing in the classroom. Prominent New Zealand researcher and architect of the Te Kotahitanga professional development project Russell Bishop claimed that the greatest impediment to students’ educational achievements is the ‘deficit theorising’ by teachers. His argument was constituted by a professional development discourse aiming at raising the academic achievement of students and signifies a new professionalism in modern schooling in New Zealand.
Bishop and his colleagues suggested that for Māori students to succeed at school, teachers must first create culturally responsive learning conditions that value all students and respect their culture (Bishop, Berryman, Tiakiwai & Richardson, 2004). A common refrain such as: ‘continuing with the status quo will create a Māori underclass’ is central to arguments suggesting that New Zealand’s education system has underserved a disproportionate number of Māori students. Māori students make up around 22 percent of the secondary school population, but during 2009, 44 percent of the students who left school in year 10 and 33 percent of students left school in year 11 were Māori (Bishop, Berryman, Tiakiwai & Richardson, 2004; Bishop, Berryman, Cavanagh, & Teddy, 2007).

Te Kotahitanga is an iterative research and development project led by Bishop and sought to investigate, by talking with Māori students (and other participants in their education), what was involved in improving their educational achievement. The project commenced with a short scoping exercise that guided the subsequent longer-term project. The longer term project commenced with the gathering of a number of narratives of students' classroom experience by the process of Collaborative Storying from a range of engaged and non-engaged Māori students in four non-structurally modified mainstream schools. It was from these amazing stories that the rest of this project developed. In their narratives the students clearly identified the main influences on their educational achievement and told us how teachers, in changing how they related and interacted with Māori students in their classrooms, could create a context for learning wherein these students’ educational achievement could improve (Bishop, Berryman, Tiakiwai & Richardson, 2004).

On the basis of these suggestions from Year 9 and 10 Māori students, the research team developed an Effective Teaching Profile. Together with other information from the literature and narratives of experiences from those parenting the students, their principals and their teachers, this Effective Teaching Profile formed the basis of a professional development intervention, that when implemented with a group of 11 teachers in four schools, was associated with improved learning, behaviour and attendance outcomes for Māori students in the
classrooms of those teachers who had been able to participate fully in the professional development intervention (Bishop, Berryman, Tiakiwai & Richardson, 2004).

At face value, *Te Kotahitanga* professional development projects present themselves as likely to advance the academic performance of Māori students. However, the project has seen a number of commentators (Callister, 2007; Clark, 2006; Nash, 2005; Rata & Openshaw, 2006) questioning the assumed ‘extraordinary’ differences in Māori students’ academic achievement proclaimed by then Minister of Education Trevor Mallard (PPTA Annual Conference, 2004). Challenging the arguments put forward by Bishop and his colleagues that the implementation of the programme has vastly improved Māori achievement, particularly in low decile schools, Clark (2006) and Nash (2005) take an opposing view. Although both Clark and Nash concede that the project can act as a springboard for instigating effective pedagogy, they point out that most teachers are already engaged in creating inclusive classrooms.

Taking an entirely different view of Māori education, Elizabeth Rata and Roger Openshaw (2006) argued that racially-biased professional development projects, such as the *Te Kotahitanga* project, are based on culturalist premises and create social divisions and help to build boundaries between ethnically identified groups in New Zealand. Rata and Openshaw (2006), drawing on the work of Nash (2005) claimed that it is the students’ social class location that is the most important variable and should not be ignored when analysing educational outcomes. They vehemently argue that not all Māori boys are the same and that those located in the working-classes are the ones who are failing school, while the sons of the Māori elite are attending private schools and are doing very well in school and school life. It is important to note that the New Zealand government has ceased funding the project. However, the *Ka Hikitia Demonstration Report* (2014) pointed out several Phase 5 secondary schools in South Auckland and Franklin are self-funding *Te Kotahitanga* and claim that the achievement of Māori students (as measured by NCEA levels 1-3) improved to around three times the rate of Māori in the comparison schools. The main argument from my point of view is
that the issue with boys is not just about gendering but also about cultural learning styles and social class. The argument about boys learning best in collaborative groups is in essence categorizing boys and girls as essentially different entities. Although, the economic, social and political marginalisation of people in New Zealand is uneven as in most Western societies, and is based upon wider social divisions linked to class positions, ethnicity, Indigenous background, and gender relationships, there are strong claims of ‘equal’ educational opportunities for all students. Students are told repeatedly by their schools that the game of education is being played on a level playing field, with ‘equal opportunities’ for every learner to ‘be whatever they want to be’, and that the ‘world is their oyster.’ These claims are extended to all students including Indigenous, immigrants and refugees and suggest that if young people ‘don’t make it, it’s their own bloody fault.’ All this is bound to have an impact on the self-image and identity of those who ‘don’t quite make it’ because generally, their educational failure is located as extrinsic to themselves. These are common refrain that can be heard in classrooms and during assemblies in most New Zealand schools. This contradicts current practices where parents will put their kids on a bus and let them travel across town (or boarding school) to attend a school that in their opinion (and often that of the local residents) would provide their child with a better chance at educational success.

**What the study is about**

All immigrants face considerable disruption in their lives. They leave their family and friends behind and enter a foreign environment where some newcomers may face great obstacles in becoming integrated into their host society (Kao, et al., 2013). Despite these difficulties, most immigrant parents work hard and sacrifice with the hope that the education their children will receive in their new country will act as a powerful enabler of personal development and upward social mobility (Alba & Nee, 2003; Portes & Rumbaut, 2001; Kao et al., 2013). Against the backdrop of coming to a new country, the study of South African boys in New Zealand is about exploring the ways in which the particular historical and present-day cultural landscapes of South Africa and New Zealand meet to influence how
South African adolescent males negotiate and navigate dominant discourses that operate in their environment.

Overall the study aims to explore how the individual, personal and cultural histories that South African boys brought with them have a particular interface with New Zealand society and how it influenced their experiences of adapting to life in a new country. Thus, the main goal is to understand: How personal, social and cultural factors may combine to shape male adolescent experience in schooling and everyday life; how immigrant boys fit into their new social and learning landscape; how the stories about them influence the ways in which they ‘do boy’; how they react, including alternative forms of resistance, against the stories and discourses that they are up against; and why some boys are handling adolescence with relative ease while other are experiencing adolescence as a most troubling time. As Jane Kenway already argued some twenty years ago:

_It is not sufficient to unpick and understand the strategies of resistance that different groups of males employ. It is also important to try to understand the male identities which inform these behaviours and to do so from a historical perspective. Clearly, there is a lot of theoretically informed empirical work to be done on these questions before we are able to translate our new knowledge into action in schools._ (1995, p. 77).

Although much has happened since Kenway put out her argument, my study would be taking into account the intersection of identity and masculinity during adolescence. It is not only concerned about why some South African boys struggled to fit into their new environment but equally why some boys were doing well, especially against some quite powerful odds. Also, I was mindful that the experiences of South African boys will not only be affected by the personal and cultural histories they bring with them, but how these have a particular interface with the host country and the discourses that operated in their environment.
As the research focused explicitly on youth adaptation, I formulated the following subsidiary research questions to help narrow the exploration of how individual factors interfaced with the dominant New Zealand culture. The focus of these questions was to explore the ways in which South African boys negotiated, navigated, resisted, contested and challenged the dominant discourses and stories about them that operated in their environment during adolescence.

1. How do South African young men, who left school within the last five years, retrospectively describe their experiences of adapting to life in New Zealand?

2. What challenges and opportunities did the participants recall as having had a significant influence on their experiences of living and learning in a new country?

3. In what ways were the participants’ experiences of ‘doing boy’ similar and different and how did these relate to their particular South Africanness?
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Research design: conceptual tools and procedures

“Our knowledge of the world should not be treated as objective truth. Reality is only accessible to us through categories, so our knowledge and representations of the world are not reflections of the reality ‘out there’, but rather are products of our ways of categorising the world, or, in discursive analytical terms, products of discourse”
(Burr, 1995, p. 3)

Introduction

In this chapter, I present the methodological ‘package’ that I put together for this enquiry, outlining the approach I took in framing the design, conduct, analysis and the reporting of the ‘findings’ of my study. The research package that I share is a theoretical and methodological whole – a complete package (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). Firstly I will present the philosophical (epistemological) premises regarding the ways that I look at understandings of the world and how knowledge is created. I will introduce social constructionism and discuss why I chose it to underpin what I could say about the data, and how it informed how I went about theorising the meaning behind the participant’s stories. Situating my study within a social constructionist frame, I took the epistemological position that posits that knowledge is socially produced and reproduced (Berger & Luckmann, 1966; Braun & Clarke, 2006; Burr, 1995, 2015; Gergen, 2009).

Secondly, I present the rationale for the research methodology and the methods I used for the design and carrying out the research. I was also aware that choosing an appropriate methodology was of particular importance when working with
people, especially for research about/for/with young people given the social and ethical implications of such enquiry (Haywood & Mac an Ghaill, 1998; Drake & Heath, 2011). While there are a plethora of research methodologies, my methodology decision for this study flowed from the overall focus of the study, and for answering the research questions (Crotty, 1998; Drake & Heath, 2011; Stake, 2005). Following this, I offer a description of the methods and procedures that I followed for the recruitment of participants and how I went about collecting the interview data.

Next, I outline my approach for analysing the data, with special focus on the procedure and method I followed. I drew heavily on Virginia Braun and Victoria Clarke’s (2006) description of thematic analysis. Their approach offered me an accessible and theoretically flexible tactic for conducting data analysis from a constructionist perspective. The focus of thematic analysis for this project was primarily on capturing how meaning and experiences were socially produced and reproduced, rather than inhering within individuals under study (Burr, 1995). In employing a second layer of analysis, I paid particular attention to the role of discourses as ‘interpretative repertoires’ as flexible resources in social interaction.

Acknowledging my own epistemological positioning was important for making sure that the analytical framework and methods I decided on ultimately match what I wanted to know (Braun & Clarke, 2006). In this section, I offer the reader some clarity around why I chose to adopt a social constructionist framework for this study and allow sufficient insights into how I conceptualised the research project and how any assumptions about knowledge creation informed the way data were analysed. Here, I drew especially on the work Margaret Wetherell and Jonathan Potter in relation to discursive psychology, since it has provided some useful analytical tools for research within social psychology. Chapter 5 concludes with a discussion on the ethical considerations and my stance towards reflexivity in relation to the research process and knowledge production.
Research epistemology is concerned with the nature and forms of knowledge creation and usually determines the conceptualization of a research project (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The term epistemology comes from the Greek word epistêmê, their term for knowledge. Put simply, epistemology is the philosophy of knowledge or of how we come to know. The literature identifies several epistemological orientations towards the ways of looking at how knowledge is produced: Positivism, Post-Positivism, Interpretivism, Constructivism, Social Constructionism, and Postmodernism to name a few (Alvesson & Karreman, 2011; Cresswell, 2007; Merriam, 2009; Neuman, 2003; Sarantakos, 2005; Willig & Stainton-Rogers, 2008).

Each orientation, with its core set of beliefs, assumptions and modes of thinking, informs what can be assumed about the nature of reality and how knowledge is created. Positivism presumes that there is a real world ‘out there’ with verifiable patterns that can be observed and predicted assumes that reality exists ‘out there’ and that it is observable, stable, and measurable (Alvesson & Karreman, 2011; Merriam, 2009; Patton, 2002). Working from this perspective, researchers employ research methods that they believe can measure and describe ‘reality’ accurately and establish ‘truth.’ As such, positivists, in general, separate themselves from the world they study.

In a positivist view of the world, this research would inevitably look vastly different because using such an epistemology commonly asserts that only verifiable claims on reality, based directly on experience that can be logically deduced from theory, operationally measured, and empirically replicated, may be considered as genuine knowledge of truth. ‘Positivists’ insist that any claim for “universal knowledge must be through empirical verification of logically deduced hypotheses with the main concepts and variables operationally defined and carefully formulated to permit replication and falsification” (Merriam, 2009; Patton, 2002, p. 92).
In general, positivists see science as the way to discover the truth, to understand the world well enough so that it might be predicted and controlled (Willig & Stainton-Rogers, 2008). An investigation of the adaptation experiences for South African boys in New Zealand would use deductive reasoning to postulate theories of acculturation that can be tested, drawing on the idea that observation and measurement is the core of research endeavour (Merriam, 2009; Patton, 2002). A key approach of this research approach is the attempt to discern natural laws through direct manipulation and observation (Merriam, 2009; Patton, 2002).

**Social constructionism**

This study, however, is located squarely within a Social Constructionist epistemology. Vivien Burr (1995, 2015) warned about the difficulty of giving one description that seeks to cover all social constructionist approaches, since they are so manifold and diverse. This notwithstanding, she built on the work of Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann (1966) and Kenneth Gergen (1985) and she listed the key four premises shared by all social constructionist approaches:

- **A critical approach to taken-for-granted knowledge**
  
  Our knowledge of the world should not be treated as objective truth. Reality is only accessible to us through categories, so our knowledge and representations of the world are not reflections of the reality ‘out there’, but rather are products of our ways of categorizing the world, or, in discursive analytical terms, products of discourse (Burr, 1995, 2015; Gergen, 1985).

- **Historical and cultural specificity**

  We are fundamentally historical and cultural beings and our views of, and knowledge about, the world are the “products of historically situated interchanges among people” (Gergen 1985, p. 267). Consequently, the ways in which we understand and represent the world are historically and culturally specific and contingent: In other words, our worldviews and our identities could
have been different, and they can change over time.

This view is *anti-essentialist*: That is, the social world is constructed socially and discursively implies that its character is not pre-given or determined by external conditions, and that people do not possess a set of fixed and authentic characteristics or essences.

- **Link between knowledge and social processes**

  Our ways of understanding the world are created and maintained by social processes. Knowledge is created through social interaction in which we construct common truths and compete about what is true and false.

- **Link between knowledge and social action**

  Within a particular worldview, some forms of action become natural, others unthinkable. Different social understandings of the world lead to different social actions, and therefore the social construction of knowledge and truth has social consequences.

The idea that knowledge and identities are always contingent *in principle*, is particularly linked to Vivien Burr (1995, 2015) who said that language, in a sense, is used as a tool and a navigation device that allows members of a culture to coordinate ongoing relations and that they are always relatively inflexible in specific situations. Specific situations place restrictions on the identities that an individual can assume and on the statements that can be accepted as meaningful.

The key premises of social constructionism have roots in French post-structural theory and its rejection of discourse as a closed entity. Rather, it claims that owing to the fundamental instability of language, meaning can never be permanently fixed. So, as Jørgensen and Phillips (2002) suggested, a keyword of social constructionism is *discursive struggle*. Different discourses – each of them representing particular ways of talking about and understanding the social world –
are engaged in a constant struggle with each other to achieve hegemony, that is, to fix the meanings of language in their own way (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). Hegemony, then, can provisionally be understood as the dominance of one particular perspective over another.

People behave according to social conventions brought about through society’s ‘large-scale discourses’, which concrete language are able to convey. Within a pattern of language activities, people are forming a kind of knowledge that describes their situation to each other. In this sense language is used as a tool; a navigation device that allows members of a culture to coordinate ongoing relations among them (Burr, 1995, 2015). The established meaning of a word or utterance in the process of social relations, thus, was not seen as fixed but as giving meaning within a specific social and cultural context. What is created through language such as knowledge, meaning, therefore, is perhaps only one of multiple possibilities (Gergen, 2009).

This study, therefore, is not about discovering knowledge about adolescent boys as a grand narrative that might be categorized as a ‘taken-for-granted’ absolute truth, but rather being mindful that there are various possible alternatives of ‘reality’ that they may take up. Obviously, this requires an overview that although ‘realities’ and knowledge are considered socially constructed, meanings are contingent on contextual factors. As Kenneth Gergen (2009) pointed out, people perceive and conceptualize knowledge or ‘reality’ within a particular culture or context, where meanings are produced through these contexts.

The idea of anti-essentialism and the invitation to explore possibilities of interpreting the world was what first attracted me to social constructionism. Giving attention to social constructionist ideas about concrete language use and the making of meaning through the conditions that regulate the conception of truth was an important first step for this study. Taking a social constructionist approach was deemed the most appropriate for meeting the aims of this study.
because it allowed me to adopt a critical stance towards often taken-for-granted assumptions and generalisations about adolescent boys. That is, in my efforts to gain a deeper understanding of the complexities of immigrant youth adaptation, my orientation to knowledge creation drew my attention to how dominant discourses and power/knowledge are intimately intertwined with the way adolescent boy’s realities are rendered and lived out (Foucault, 1982, 1985).

Discourses as closely connected with power/knowledge, in a sense, create the social world of the adolescent boy. Thus, taking a social constructionist approach, I was able to explore the particular ways in which the world of the adolescent boys is socially formed and regulated and how they are talked about, and how discourses rule out alternative ways of being talking about boys.

**Discourse(s)**

I drew on the work of Michel Foucault (1972, 1978) as he inspired people to think about how sex and gender are socially constructed in discourse. Discourse(s) contributes centrally to producing the subjects that we are, and the objects we can know something about (including ourselves as subjects) (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). The word ‘discourse’ has been put to a proliferating number of definitions, but for present purposes can be understood as referring to:

“a group of statements which provide a language for talking about a topic and a way of producing a particular kind of knowledge about a topic. Thus, the term refers both to the production of knowledge through language and representation and the way that knowledge is institutionalised, shaping social practices and setting new practices into play” (du Gay, 1996, p. 43).

Vivien Burr (2003) described it as “a set of meanings, metaphors, representations, images, stories, statements and so on that in some way together produce a particular version of events” (p. 64).
Both these definitions illustrate the dynamic nature of discourse - discourse as producing knowledge through language and discourse as representing the way that knowledge is shaping social practices - are fundamental for understanding the impact of discourse in shaping young adolescent subjectivities and setting the rules of the game of ‘doing boy’ through language.

Language, then, is not merely a channel through which information about underlying mental states and behaviour or facts about the world are communicated, but a ‘machine’ that generates, and, as a result, constitutes, the social world (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). This also extends to the constitution of social identities and social relations. These cannot be seen outside of discourse because everything is constituted by discourse (Butler, 1993; Foucault, 1980). As Foucault (1980) suggested that “discourses are not about objects; they constitute them and in the practice of doing so conceal their own intervention” (p. 49). That is, the participants created representations of their reality through language that were never mere reflections of a pre-existing reality but contributed to how they constructed the reality of their lived experiences.

That does not mean that their individual realities did not exist, because the meanings and representations they offered were real and ‘truth’ for them. Most people do work with the concept of ‘truth’ in an uncomplicated way. They see truth as fairly cut and dry. Because truth is ‘unattainable’ (Foucault, 1980), it would be fruitless to ask whether something is true or false. Instead, the focus of my study is on how effects of truth are created in discourses and to look at the ways discursive processes, through which discourses are constructed, give the impression that they represent true or false pictures of the realities for South African boys.
Methodology and Method

Research methodology

Although research data documenting immigrant children’s educational performance contribute to our understandings of migration, they continue to be dominated by quantitative approaches and cannot fully explain the complexities of adapting to life in a new country based on individual-level determinants (Levels & Dronkers, 2008; OECD, 2006, 2009; Suárez-Orozco et al., 2008; Zhou, 2005). The majority of these studies are essentially concerned with educational performance and ascribes to the conception that by questioning large numbers of people about a certain topic or issue, researchers are then able to apply the average of the findings to the individual. Moreover, such approaches often regard the individual and society as separate entities. As a consequence, the quantitative researcher then applies the existence of a dualism between the individual and society to any conclusions they had drawn. The social world is treated as information to be processed, and young people understood as isolated information processors who, by way of cognitive processes, observe the world and thus accumulate knowledge and experience that govern their perception of the world.

A quantitative approach to the study of South African boys in New Zealand may have offered up a different set of data and would undoubtedly have excelled at identifying statistical significance compared with a more qualitative approach. But what would have eluded such quantitative approach might have been its inability to emphasise how the “intersection of social context and biography” (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007, p. 9) come together to inform the adaptation experiences for immigrant adolescent boys. What is important is that I opted for a qualitative methodological approach because it matched what I wanted to know, and what I hoped to find would have been difficult to quantify and to describe in a numerical way.
To complicate matters further, I did not subscribe to a ‘naïve realist view’ (Braun & Clarke, 2006) of qualitative research where I could simply ‘give voice’ (Fine, 2002) to my participants. As Fine (2002) argued, even a ‘giving voice’ approach “involves carving out unacknowledged pieces of narrative evidence that we select, edit, and deploy to border arguments” (p. 218). It is for this reason that I chose a qualitative methodology that is very much akin to a constructionist framework, which examines the ways in which meanings, experiences, realities and so on are the effects of a range of discourses operating within the lives of young people.

Therefore, a qualitative social constructionist approach was deployed because I felt strongly that such an approach would allow me to conduct a detailed exploration of the inner cultural worlds of South African adolescent boys with diverse biographies and how they navigated and negotiated the ethnic and cultural diversity of adolescent life in New Zealand during adolescence. This approach carries with it an assumption that ‘the world’ and ‘reality’ is socially, historically and contextually specific and consequently contingent, and was deemed the most appropriate to make this transparent.

Method for collecting the qualitative data

In my study I used a method of data collection that endeavoured to capture the unobservable: feelings, thoughts, assumptions, beliefs and reasons behind the talk. In-depth interviews were envisioned as more desirable, valid and meaningful for answering the research question than observational data. Furthermore, I thought that working with young men who have left school rather than observing boys who are still at school, would open up new possibilities for understanding boys better (Potter, 2012; Potter and Hepburn, 2008), and to see if there is anything new about adolescent boys that has not been captured by conventional research methods. In a sense, I envisioned that young men who left school could potentially be more forthcoming in their recollections given that they would be speaking from a ‘safe’ and perhaps less intimidating space.
As mentioned before, social constructionists propose that the way in which we understand the world is not a reflection of a world ‘out there’, but of understandings of the world that contingent. In order to fully capture the complexity of the immigration process, it is important to note that the participants’ understandings of the world then and now could have changed because understandings of the world are created and maintained through social interactions between people in their everyday lives. That is, the social world is socially constructed, and its character is not pre-determined or pre-given, and that discourses create a world that looks real or true for the speaker. Indeed, as Jonathan Potter (2012) pointed out that the “interviewees are regarded as active participants in a conversation, rather than as ‘speaking questionnaires’” (p. 165). It is through language that they give meaning to their experiences by virtue of ‘constructing their lived reality’ (Potter, 2012).

**Recruiting of the participants**

I decided to use the stories of South African males, who left school within the last five years, in which they retrospectively described their experiences of adapting to life in New Zealand, rather than boys who are still at school for ethical and methodological reasons. As Mac an Ghaill (1994) pointed out, “methodologically, one of the main difficulties of studying school masculinities was that the social context seemed to be critically significant in influencing how, what and when young men (and male teachers) felt they could or would say to me” (p. 96). Another important reason for opting to recruit those who have left school already was the ability to offer them a safe space to speak from. A place away from school where they are not subjected to the conventional forms of surveillance, power relations and policing as compared with research conducted from a ‘within-school’ approach (Martino & Pallotta-Chiarolli, 2005).

The process I used to locate and recruit the research participants was important for controlling the characteristics of potential participants relevant to the objectives of the study. Stipulating these characteristics helped to set the boundaries of the
sample, restricting it by demographic features (gender, e.g., males), socio-cultural factors (ethnicity, e.g., South African) or specific characteristics (e.g., left school within the last five years). Secondly, I used a purposive approach to sampling for locating and recruiting participants for my study. I used purposive sampling because, as a non-probability form of sampling, I did not wish to recruit research participants on a random basis.

Therefore, the goal of choosing purposive sampling strategy was to sample cases/participants in a strategic way, to allow me to choose participants who illustrated the characteristics that served the purpose of the project. Although a purposive is not a random sample, it is not a convenience sample either. The rationale for purposive sampling reflects not only the purpose of the study, but also demanded that that I think critically about potential participants and their relevance to the research questions (Bryman, 2012; Punch, 2005; Silverman, 2000). Given the multicultural and multiracial nature of South Africa as well as a history of exclusion and oppression, it was important for me to interview a diverse group of young men, to allow for different and possibly competing accounts of the reality of their adaptation experience.

The recruiting process was kicked off by writing a formal introductory letter to the chairperson of several ‘South African’ social groups, which represented the four ethnic groups, to seek permission to address a gathering of the members for the purpose of recruiting volunteers for the study. I approached several church groups with high South African memberships. I also wrote to the South African Club, South Africans in New Zealand and the Protea Group. The existence and group representation of these four ethnic groups were discussed previously in Chapter 4. The introductory letter gave the chairperson an in-depth description of the goals and methods of the study. When permission was granted, I personally addressed the group members to ask for volunteers. An explanation was given to prospective participants about the nature of the study and their possible involvement in it. The interest and response towards the study were overwhelming, with many ineligible persons (e.g., female, older males)
expressing their disappointment at ‘missing out on an opportunity to tell their story.’ An opportunity for future research with these groups exists.

The selection of research participants was on a ‘first come-first serve’ basis within the different social groups. These groups represented different ethnic groups within the wider South African group. For example, the Whites belonged to an almost all-white social group, while the ‘Coloured’ all went to the same youth group at the church they attended. Invitation letters (see Appendix A) containing information with regards to the nature of the study, details about the research participant’s involvement and my contact details were left for potential participants to collect. In the end, the participants represented males from different racial groups as I actively attempted to ensure a heterogeneous representation during the recruitment process. A homogenous sample would have failed to capture the diversity of the secondary school experience.

Potential participants who made contact with me and expressed their willingness to be involved in the study were sent, via email, an Information Sheet (see Appendix B) and Consent to Participate Form (see Appendix C). Research participants were asked to complete the Pro-forma prior to the interviews. This ensured that the research participants had sufficient time to provide routine data on their demographic characteristics. A somewhat short Interview Schedule consisting of a series of headings and a few prompts was used by me to allow the research participants to elaborate on their responses. I only used the accompanying prompts when the conversation was not forthcoming. I did not explore any topic of a sensitive nature unless the research participants themselves mentioned them. Sensitive topics for current purposes could potentially include, but not limited to, self-reporting of physical and sexual abuse, criminal acts, victimisation at home, school or elsewhere, exposure violence, victims or perpetrators of violent and/or sexual crimes, severe delinquency, or any topic that may cause high rates of distress or anxiety. In the event of any sensitive issue being brought up by the participants, I said I would comply with agreements made under section 9(4) (a) of the University of Waikato’s Ethical Conduct in Human Research and Related Activities Regulations 2008.
The interviews

The interview process was iterative and started with carrying out a small number of pilot interviews. Each pilot interview acted as an important first step in trying to inform and open up some key ideas that could be covered in subsequent interviews. In other words, an iterative approach to data collection allowed for in-depth analysis and refining of the data collection process as well as the data collected to inform the next interview. Based on the results of the first few interviews, my supervisors and I agreed that some of the questions were too leading and as a consequence I was ‘putting words in their mouths.’ Subsequent changes and refinements were made to the interview process and the way the questions were phrased with resulted in a more efficient interchange of views. The iterative nature of the pilot interviews ultimately improved the quality and functionality of the data collection phase.

Research participants, once they consented, were involved in an in-depth semi-structured one-to-one interview. The aim of conducting qualitative interviews was to collect ‘rich’ data from the individual’s personal recollections of their lived experiences, rather than “discovering accurate representations that truthfully map the world” (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2008, p. 186). As each interview involved potentially sensitive and upsetting topics, I made a concerted effort to establish rapport with every young man at the commencement of the interview. Building a good rapport with each participant was an important way of maintaining my neutrality concerning what the participants told me.

Twenty-one young men volunteered to talk about their adaptation experiences of adapting to life in New Zealand. I will introduce them in the next chapter. In terms of the number of interviews, Kvale (2007) argued for fewer in-depth interviews by suggesting that qualitative researchers should not apologise for a small sample “as bigger isn’t always best” (p. 81). Supporting this line of reasoning, he also suggested that qualitative researchers must conduct as many
interviews as necessary to find out what they need to know and that researchers
could benefit from doing fewer interviews with more time for in-depth analysis.

Kvale (2007) used a term called saturation to help researchers determine the
number of participants they need to satisfy for the purpose of a study by
interviewing enough people to answer the research questions. Usually, in
discourse course analysis, saturation is framed as a point during the interviews
where the researcher goes beyond simply identifying surface meaning themes and
focused on examining the underlying ideas, assumptions, conceptualization,
contradictions and ideologies that are theorized as shaping or informing action.
That is, saturation occurs when there is sufficient data to make, warrant and
justify a number of arguments in enough detail (Mendoza-Denton & Ayduk,
2012).

I found saturation point after conducting 21 in-depth interviews when I failed to
capture anything important and new about the data in relation to the research
question. Saturation point occurred for this study when the stories had ‘nothing
else’ to say which departed from the dominant stories of adolescent boys. For me,
the ‘keyness’ of the themes that emerged from the stories had sufficient and
important elements that allowed me to unpack the various versions of ‘reality’ for
adapting to life in a new country for South African boys. A key theme that
emerged from the data was: “a sense of belonging and the need to fit in.” As a
result I explored the masculine identities formations that informed the behaviours
of these boys. So, after 21 interviews, ‘fitting in’ became the ‘story’ that each
theme was telling and tied all the other themes together into the broader ‘overall
story’ that I was going to tell about the data in relation to the overall research
question of why adapting to life in a new country seems to be highly varied for
newcomers.

Kvale (2007) distinguished between two metaphors for interviewing: mining and
travelling. Mining is a way of discovering what is already there while the
travelling metaphor perceives the interview as a journey. Having taken a Social
Constructionist approach to understanding the constructed nature of knowledge, I saw the interviewees and myself as co-travellers on a journey back in time to when they attended high school. Kvale (2007) pointed out that interviews are sites of construction of knowledge, where the “inter-view, an inter-change of views” (p. 21) is an active process of constituting knowledge through social interaction where meaning is created. The interviewees were not seen as a mine to be excavated to retrieve ‘hidden treasures’ but as people who bring alternative possibilities and varied ideas. Interviewing in this regard was conducted in a respectful manner.

Michael Patton (2002) argued that neutrality means that the person being interviewed could tell the interviewer anything without engendering either favour or disfavour with regard to the content of the participant’s response. Neutrality for current purposes meant, at the very least, acknowledging the participants as fellow collaborators in this inquiry (Fine, 1994). The style and focus of the semi-structured interviews were quite similar to that of a narrative type interview, as advocated by Barbour (2008), and focussed on the personal storytelling of the interviewees. It was ultimately the participants’ prerogative to decide which aspects of their story to emphasize and which to leave out.

Given the aim of this study was to look in detail at the stories and discourses that operate in the lives of adolescent boys and how young males from a variety of South African ethnic and cultural backgrounds talk to how they navigated and negotiated the ethnic and cultural diversity of adolescent life in New Zealand during adolescence, I audiotaped each interview in order to give me the opportunity to listen repeatedly to the recordings. By repetitive listening and becoming immersed in the raw data, I transcribed the recorded data myself and then sent back some extracts which were unclear to the participants for their verification and/or amendment. Asking participants to verify the meaning of their utterances was an important step in establishing trustworthiness for this study because it confirmed my interpretation of the data. All audiotapes, interview transcripts and other documentary evidence I kept in a locked filing cabinet. Written data was stored in password-protected computer files. This ensured
While often seen as a behind-the-scenes task, I reflected heavily on the transcription method I was going to use for my study and the possible impact this decision may have on the outcome of my research. Reflection for me was an intentional endeavour to ‘think about the consequences of misrepresentation’. Interview transcription is a powerful act of representation and choosing the most appropriate technique was an important step to ensure that the respondents’ utterances were able to demonstrate the ways in which they negotiated, navigated, adjusted and resisted the discourses that operated in their lives and the ways of talking about them that were ‘out there.’

Interview transcription is practiced in multiple ways, often falling on a broad continuum with naturalistic transcription conventions on the one hand and denaturalistic transcription on the other (Kvale, 2007). Naturalistic transcription involves the detailed capturing of every speech utterance with a view of representing a “discovered real world” (Kvale, 2007, p. 52). Therefore, this method of transcription reflects a verbatim depiction of speech. In a denaturalistic approach to transcription, the view is that contained within speech are meanings and perceptions that construct our ‘realities’ (Kvale, 2007; Oliver, 2005). That is, capturing meaning making as created and shared during the interviews but with much less emphasis on linguistic style or the mechanics of their speech utterances.

Rather than choosing one approach that might obfuscate the substance of the recorded interview data and running with it, the current study utilised a transcription technique that drew on both methods. Transcription practices for this study involved the standardising of the raw interview material by including the idiosyncratic elements of speech (e.g. stutters, pauses, slangs, involuntary vocalisations) but removing information such as turn-taking, overlapping and response tokens as extraneous. I deemed such extraneous information as having the
potential to make the extracts difficult to read and to obscure the goals of the study. This practice of taking a dualistic approach and working with “language above the sentence” (Cameron, 2001, p. 13) by examining the meanings and perceptions contained in the respondents’ stories. Importantly, as Deborah Cameron (2001) pointed out, taking a dualistic approach when working with spoken words can be a significant for capturing both the fine-grained socio-cultural features of the data in as much detail as possible to provide a rich account of the respondent’s adaptation experiences and to allow the reader to capture both the person behind the words and what the words are trying to do.

Reflecting on the interviews

I enjoyed the interviews immensely and mostly felt incredibly at ease during the interviews since none of the young men were reluctant to speak on sensitive topics around their lived experiences. As an ‘insider’ researcher (South African immigrant, secondary school teacher), I was cognisant of the fact that the social location in which the interviews were conducted were closely matched and eliminated power hierarchies and created trust and rapport. Conversations generally developed as an active process of constructing knowledge where meanings and realities were constructed between two immigrants engaging in dialogue. It remained my task throughout the interview process to acknowledge each individual person who offered up their time to tell their story as someone who brought a wealth of experience, knowledge, alternative possibilities and varied ideas to the meeting. The interviews generally remained semi-structured and open-ended to allowed me to cast a broad and theoretically relevant net and for spontaneous and unexpected responses to emerge.

I have anticipated that my particular South Africanness and carrying the label of a so-called ‘Coloured’ person (so-called because I personally do not identify with such crude and racialized labelling) might have had some impact on how and what discussions around race and ethnicity took place. In particular, I felt that the ‘Coloured’ participants were generally more at ease and that their responses might
have reflected awareness that our ethnic backgrounds were similar. Conversely, although they did not tell me this, I got the impression that many of the White participants were more careful and tentative about what they said as not to offend me, or for fear that they could be labelled racist. This is what I expected. Interestingly, there was no reluctance from any of the participants when they talked about their particular South Africanness, and it surprised me somewhat just how openly they spoke about issues around masculinity, race and ethnicity. It became obvious every early on during the data collection phase that gender, race and ethnicity is still a very real and sensitive issue for the South African males that I interviewed.

Undoubtedly, being a male interviewer played a significant role in both the dynamics of the interviews as well as the responses from the interviewees. Being a male might have facilitated the establishment of instantaneous rapport with all the young men where a female interviewer may perhaps have encountered a different interview. In addition, it appears that in a male-to-male interview, perceptions of a shared understanding of what it means to be a teenage boy were an expectation. For example, the phrase some of the young men often used phrases like: “you know what I mean” and “you know what it’s like” that some of the young men used during the interviews is a common phrase used in oral discourse to indicate assumed solidarity or at least shared understanding between the speaker and myself (Graff, 2010).

Switching off the recording device at the end of each interview had an interesting effect, where a number of the participants became even more talkative and elaborated further on what was talked about during the interviews. Some interviews ended with spontaneous conversations erupting as we left our meeting place so that I wished I could have recorded these. Overall, the data collection phase has been the most enjoyable part of this entire research project. Every participant mentioned that they enjoyed being interviewed; with a number of them declaring that this was the first opportunity they were given to talk about their experiences of adapting to life in New Zealand.
Data Analysis

Data analysis for current purposes was a two-level process and was directly associated with the overall aim of this thesis: to explore in detail how males from a variety of South African ethnic and cultural backgrounds talk to how they navigated and negotiated the ethnic and cultural diversity of adolescent life in New Zealand during adolescence. In the first instance, I employed thematic analysis (level 1) as a flexible and useful research tool, given its potential to provide a rich and detailed, yet complex account of the research data. Thematic analysis was deemed very helpful for this study because it involved identifying, analysing, and reporting patterns (themes) within a data item (Braun & Clarke, 2006). This meant that I was able to capture the contradictions and tensions within but also across the retrospective accounts of how South African boys described how they navigated and negotiated the dominant Western discourses of adolescent boys that have commonplace in the literature. This bedrock phase of data analysis involved a close scrutiny of ‘everything else’ that has not been captured by previous research, especially those accounts which departed from the dominant stories of adolescent boys.

Level two of the data analysis followed a process discourse analysis. I focused mainly on the work of Wetherell and Potter (1992), since their approach has been central for the development of particularly useful and widely used analytical tools for researching discourses within everyday communications about culture and language. Central to Wetherell and Potter’s model is the view of discourses as ‘interpretative repertoires’ that are used as flexible resources in social interaction. Using this process of discourse analysis, I was able to focus on examining any extraordinary statements that may suggest that there are ‘other things’ going on in the lives of immigrant adolescent boys. The purpose was to gain a deeper understanding of contradictions within talk about social action and the construction of the self. Moreover, how these understandings worked to support how the world of South African boys were socially constructed and organized.
Thematic analysis

Thematic analysis is often not explicitly claimed as a method of analysis, when, in actuality, a lot of analyses are essentially thematic, but not ‘branded’ as such (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Although it is widely used in qualitative research, there is no clear agreement about what it is and how to go about doing it (Attride-Stirling, 2001; Braun & Clarke, 2006). I used a version of thematic analysis as proposed by Braun and Clarke (2006) as a “method for identifying, analysing, and reporting patterns (themes) within data” (p. 6). They pointed out that the aim of thematic analysis is to capture any key themes that are prevalent in the data and capture anything important about the data in relation to the research question.

This approach differs from other analytical methods. Unlike ‘thematic’ discourse analysis, thematic decomposition analysis, interpretive phenomenological analysis or grounded theory, that share a search for certain themes or patterns across an (entire) data set, this approach differs by searching for themes within a data item such as an individual interview (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Thematic analysis for this study employed a constructionist method, which suited the aims of this study well. I was able to use this approach to analyse the ways in which South African males retrospective accounts offered insights into how meanings, realities and experiences of adapting to life in New Zealand were the effects of a range of discourses which operated within their environment (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Taking this approach also provided me with a more detailed and nuanced account of individual themes, as well as groups of themes within the data.

The flexibility of thematic analysis in terms of offering variability in how the method of analysis was applied was hugely beneficial for this study. For instance, there was no hard-and-fast answer to the question of what proportion of the data set needs to display evidence of a theme to be categorised as a key theme. Therefore, I was able to look beyond prevalence in a quantifiable measure to examine those utterances which captured something important in relation to the overall research questions (Braun & Clarke, 2006). In other words, the key themes
were not necessarily the most prevalent across the data set in terms of the proportion of space they occupied. Moreover, they did not ‘emerge’ during analysis either. Rather, the ‘keyness’ of the themes for this study was those themes that, together with the number of different speakers who articulated them, captured important elements that allowed me to unpack the various versions of ‘reality’ for adapting to life in a new country for immigrant boys.

An important point made by Braun and Clarke (2006) is that themes do not ‘emerge’ from the data, because assuming that themes just magically ‘emerge’ or that they are being ‘discovered’ negates the active role of the researcher in the analytical process. Thematic analysis for this study involved theorizing rather than describing the data. It went beyond simply identifying surface meaning themes and focused on examining the underlying ideas, assumptions, conceptualization, contradictions and ideologies that are theorized as shaping or informing action. Analysis within a social constructionist framework, was very useful in going beyond describing what a participant has actually said to interpreting what was said by attempting to theorize the significance of the patterns and their broader meanings and implications in relation to previous literature (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Patton, 2002).

Discourse analysis (discursive psychology)

Traditionally, the field of social psychology has been dominated by the cognitive paradigm which explains social psychological phenomena in terms of cognitive processes – thinking, perception and reasoning (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). Marianne Jørgensen and Louise Phillips (2002) argued that the conception of self and mental processes are central to social psychology and that social cognition is the main area of research conducted in this field. That is, how individuals understand the world through mental processing of information about it. In cognitive approaches, the focal point of seeing the world as an external product of underlying mental representations is central to understanding written or spoken language (Edwards, 1997; Edwards & Potter, 1992). As Derek Edwards (1997)
puts it, words “map onto, carve up, bring into being, categorize and explain the things they describe” (p. 51). It is not surprising, then, that the individual and society are regarded as separate entities, thus implying the existence of a dualism between the individual and society. The main premise in cognitive psychology is that the individual handles the mass of information about the world through the use of cognitive processes which categorize the world in a particular way.

In contrast, discursive psychology treats the written and spoken language as constructions of the world orientated towards social action (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). It rejects the cognitive attempt to explain attitudes and behaviour in terms of underlying mental states or processes. Instead, as Jørgensen and Phillips (2002) argued, “understanding psychological processes, including processes of social categorisation, as private, mental activities produced by individual information processing, social constructionists understand them as social activities (p. 102). Furthermore, they pointed out that social constructionists do not view attitudes, identities and social groups as that which the individual ‘owns’ or ‘belongs’ but as products of social interaction. Accordingly, discursive psychology’s view of understanding the self and identity is solidly grounded in a social constructionist perspective.

Discourse analysis for this study draws heavily on the work of Wetherell and Potter’s (1992) model of discourses as ‘interpretive repertoires’ that are used as flexible resources in social interaction. It shares the constructionist premise that language is a dynamic form of social practice that shapes the social world including identities, social relations and understandings of the world. The purpose is to gain insights into questions about social action and the construction of the self, the ‘Other’ and the world. Wetherell and Potter’s model is useful because it views discourses as socially constructed in relation to social interaction, and how discourses construct understandings of the world, and how these understandings work ideologically to support forms of social organisation based on unequal relations of power (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002).
In particular, their book *Mapping the Language of Racism* (1992) was central to my understanding of discursive psychology. Their account of one of the most extensive studies within discursive psychology offered me a useful model to follow for analyzing the discourses embedded within the participants’ talk as ‘interpretive repertoires’ that they used as flexible resources in social interactions. In their investigation of Pakeha discourse in New Zealand, Wetherell and Potter (1992) use the expression ‘interpretive repertoire’ instead of discourse in order to emphasise that language use in everyday life is flexible and dynamic. They suggest that an interpretive repertoire consists of “broadly discerning clusters of terms, descriptions and figures of speech often assembled around metaphors or vivid images” (p. 90). Each repertoire provides resources that people can use to construct versions of reality. This is an important point given the constructionist approach that frames this study. Because discourses as interpretive repertoires are flexible resources which, at one and the same time, can represent distinct ways of giving meaning to the world and be malleable forms that undergo transformations on being put to rhetorical use (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002).

The aim of the discourse analysis was not to categorise South African boys (for example, as deviant, ‘Other’, victims or racists) but, rather, to identify the discursive practices through which the categories and identities are constructed. Also, analysing the discourses embedded in the participant’s talk was not aimed at describing an external world ‘out there’ as do cognitive approaches. Rather, the emphasis was on examining the flexibility of ordinary language use and the way interpretive resources are organised to create a world that looks real and true for the speaker. Discourse analysis from a social constructionist premise was thought to be a useful for my study because it was deemed a channel for transparently communicating lived experiences through language use in everyday talk (Wetherell & Potter, 1992).
Procedure for Analysing the Data

It is not uncommon in qualitative research to find insufficient detail given when reporting the process and detail of data analysis (Attride-Stirling, 2001). The argument goes that if little is known about how researchers went about analyzing their data, or what assumptions informed their analysis, it will then be difficult to evaluate the research findings, and to compare and/or synthesize the research with other studies on that topic. A lack of clarity around the process and practice of the method used for a particular piece of research can also impede other researchers from carrying out related projects in the future (Attride-Stirling, 2001). Attride-Stirling (2001) argued that qualitative researchers must be clear about not only what they are doing and why, but also include the often-omitted procedures about ‘how’ they went about analysing the data. It is for these reasons that I deemed it necessary to clarify the process of data analysis for this study.

Thematic analysis: a six-phase process

Thematic analysis for this study draws on Braun and Clarke’s (2006) six-phase process of analysis. It is important to note that the outline they provided for conducting thematic analysis should be seen as a useful guide only, rather than a set of rules to be followed. Therefore, analysis of the data was not a linear process where I simply moved from one phase to the next. Instead, it was a much more recursive process, where I moved back and forth as needed, throughout the phases. Moreover, the basic precepts of Braun and Clarke’s process fitted well with the aims of my research questions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>Description of process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Familiarising yourself with the data</td>
<td>Transcribing the data, repeated readings of the data, noting down initial ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generating initial codes</td>
<td>Coding interesting features of the data in a systematic fashion across the entire data set, collating data relevant to each code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Searching for themes</td>
<td>Collating codes into potential themes, gathering all data relevant to each potential theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing themes</td>
<td>Checking if the theme work in relation to the coded extracts (level 1) and the entire data set (level 2), generating a thematic ‘map’ of the analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defining and naming themes</td>
<td>Ongoing analysis to refine the specifics of each theme, and the overall story the analysis tells; generating clear definitions and names for each theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producing a report</td>
<td>The final opportunity for analysis. Selection of vivid, compelling extracts, relating the analysis back to the research question and the literature, producing a scholarly report of the analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4: Phases of Thematic Analysis (From Braun & Clarke, 2006)*

**Phase 1: Immersing myself in the data**

I immersed myself in the data to the extent that I was familiar with the depth and breadth of the content. Braun and Clarke’s (2006) suggested that immersion
usually involves ‘repeated readings’ of the data in a meaningful and active way. Because I conducted the transcription of the interview excerpts myself; I was able to listen to the audio recordings repeatedly and thus became immersed in the data at the point of transcription. This meant that, whilst transcribing the large amounts of interview data presented a significant challenge in terms of time consumption, I was able to start taking notes for initial coding. This phase provided the bedrock for the rest of the analysis.

Phase 2: Initial coding

Generating initial codes began when I had listened and read the transcribed extracts and become familiar with the data, and generated an initial list of ideas of what is in the data and what is interesting about them (Braun & Clarke, 2006). This involved a systematic coding of interesting features of the data. Here I constantly moved back and forward between the entire data set, and began to notice, and look for, patterns of meaning and issues of potential interest in the data (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Figure 5 illustrates an example of how I organised the data extracts into meaningful codes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data extract</th>
<th>Initial Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Peter: *I spend more time on the ‘finding friends’ aspect than my schooling. That is how you get derailed with your academics. I didn’t do too well in year nine and year ten because I guess I was too busy finding friends. All you worry about is finding friends and fitting in. That was the whole point of school.* | 1. Friendships and fitting in as important aspects of schooling  
2. Poor academic performance as a consequence of focussing on finding friends |

*Table 5: Data extract with initial coding*  
(From Braun & Clarke, 2006)
Phase 3: Searching for themes

Phase 3 refocussed the analysis at the broader level of themes and began when I completed the initial coding and collating of all the data. This left me with a long list of codes that I have identified across the entire data set. Initially, I started to analyse the codes, and considered how different codes may combine to form an overarching theme. I used different coloured’ highlighters to generate a visual representation for help sorting the different coloured codes into themes and theme-piles. At this point I created a thematic map (see figure 3) when I started to think about the relationship between codes, between themes, and between different levels of themes (main themes and sub-themes). Although, I combined, refined and separated codes to form themes, I found a number of codes that did not fit into any main theme. However, I did not discard these, but rather created ‘miscellaneous’ themes (Braun & Clarke, 2006) that housed these codes.

Figure 3. Initial thematic map, showing the key themes
**Phase 4: Reviewing the themes**

This phase involved two levels of reviewing and refining the themes. Level 1 involved reviewing at the level of the coded data extracts. This meant that I read all the collated extracts for each theme, and considered whether or not they appear to form a coherent pattern that not just describe, but captured something important in relation to the overall research questions (Braun & Clarke, 2006). I also looked at whether there is enough meaningful data within the themes to: (1) tie the themes together coherently, and (2) offer clear and identifiable distinctions between them.

Reviewing the themes at level two involved a similar process, but in relation to the entire data set. During this phase, I focussed on the validity of individual themes in relation to the data set, but also examining whether the thematic map ‘accurately’ reflects the meanings evident in the data set as a whole (Braun & Clarke, 2006). After thoughtful and thorough re-reading of the entire data set to ascertain if the themes ‘work’ in relation to the data set, I further reviewed and refined the coding until I devised a thematic map that I was satisfied with. Figure 3 provides an illustration of the final thematic map.

*Figure 4. Developed thematic map, showing reviewed key themes*
Phase 5: Defining and naming the themes

Phase 5 began after I constructed a satisfactory thematic map of the interview data. Defining and naming the themes involved identifying the ‘essence’ of what each theme is about, and determining what aspect of the data each theme captured (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Importantly, I have considered the ‘story’ that each theme was telling, and how it fitted into the broader overall ‘story’ that I was going to tell about the data. The aim was not just to paraphrase the content of the data extracts presented, but identify what was interesting about them and why (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

Figure 5. Final thematic map, showing the key themes

Phase 6: Producing a report

Chapter seven is dedicated to the write-up of a scholarly report of the analysis. In this chapter, I will present a selection of vivid, compelling extracts, and relate the
analysis back to the research questions and the literature (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The extracts underpinning the themes are embedded within an analytical narrative that goes beyond a mere description of the data. The final chapter discusses the report.

**Discourse analysis**

Discourse analysis focussed on a closer examination of some of the interpretive repertoires (discourses) that were evident in the text. Here I took a small sample of extracts and ‘pulled them apart’ to see what it said about adolescent boys that were special and new. As with thematic analysis, coding was the first step and followed a similar process. The aim was not only to identify themes that derived from the theoretical frame but also to be open to new themes that may be captured during the (re)reading and analysis of the interview data.

Step two of analysis employed an analytical technique where I looked for *crisis points* in the production of discourse (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). These crisis points are signs indicating a possible conflict between different discourses. The aim was to look for *speech disfluency* or lexical choices that convey conflicting statements within the production of different discourses with the intention of doing work. Disfluency can be defined as interruptions in the speech flow such as repeating a statement, fillers or prolongations. Although speech disfluencies are common in oral language, nonetheless they should not be seen as defects, errors, deficiencies, or inadequacies but rather as part of language production where they have a distinct role to perform. For example, the speakers may use fillers or prolongations associated with speech disfluencies to perhaps signal the relationship between their utterances and the social, cultural and historical context in which the discourse were produced. Essentially, this analytical step included an examination of speech disfluencies as indications of discourse production as influenced by the interweaving of the respondent’s social context and their phenotypical variations.
A further technique I used for discourse analysis was to look at speech disfluency as a *shift in pronouns* (Jørgensen & Phillips (2002). The focus was to look for a shift in noun substitution (for example, from ‘I’ to ‘we’) that indicate a shift from a subject position within one discourse to a subject position within another. This involved a process of studying the act the utterance or discourse was trying to accomplish. The interesting thing here is how discourse can be understood as having a function, taking on characteristics of its argumentative position (Edwards, 1997). The notion of interpretive repertoires (discourse) as performative (it does things), as used in a constructionist frame, was central for this study in analysing the work the discourse was intended to do (Nayak & Kehily, 2013).

A key guideline for my study was to take care and guard against the risk of adopting a view of ‘reality’ which the participants themselves conveyed as objective and real or even as true expressions of the discursive world of ‘the immigrant boy.’ I remained fully aware that discourse(s) must not be seen as simply a neutral device for imparting meaning (Bryman, 2012; Potter, 2012), but rather as “a set of meanings, metaphors, representations, images, stories, statements and so on that in some way together produce a particular version of events” (Burr, 2003, p. 64).

The following example illustrates how I carried out discourse analysis.

**‘Ethnic identity’ as a discursive construction**

Bob:  

*Yes, the diversity of my secondary school became quite challenging being a South African. South Africans are all diverse. You get the White South African, African South African; Indians like me, and you get the mix, ‘Coloured’. Uhhm, what I found was that to fit in with the South African group was the biggest thing for me in secondary school. I couldn’t fit in with any South Africans and I had to stop*
being South African. Acting cool and speaking with their thick accents, being all masculine and all this thing about having to have girls. That wasn’t really me. Uhhm ... long pause ...

(Prolongation), so, through my whole secondary school life, my identity, my cultural, and my racial identity I just threw it away. I threw it away because I found that it had no value because what people saw as South African wasn’t as I was as a South African. Uhhm, so, I just sort of adopted a sort of Asian culture and left my South African heritage behind.

As pointed out in the literature review, the achievement of a positive, coherent identity is a fundamental goal of adolescence (Erikson, 1968). The extract from the interview I conducted with Bob shows that a critical task of adolescence for him was to select and integrate personal inclinations and opportunities afforded by society, in order to construct a sense of who he was and what he wants to become.

Here it is important to point out that the function of the discourse requires some understanding and appreciation of the psychological, social, and cultural web in which the individual grows and changes (Phinney & Rosenthal, 1992). For Bob, his comments refers to his opinion about belonging to a specific ethnic minority group, who are seen as different from the host culture, which makes the discourse do the work of describing the process of identity formation and has the added dimension of illustrating his exposure to alternative sources of identification. Lexical pauses such as prolongation may be particularly pertinent here to show that growing up in a society where the mainstream culture differs significantly in values and beliefs from his heritage culture (culture of origin). Bob spoke of his negative attitude towards the group and uses discourse or interpretive repertoire in which he cognitively constructs an ethnic identity ‘crisis’ that emphasises a choice for a stronger, more positive, and more stable self-identity than his South African and Indian identity.
Bob followed up the above-mentioned statements by concluding that in spite of having had a large number of Asian friends, he never actually fitted in with them either, and always felt like an outsider - like the ‘token Black guy.’

Bob: *I sort of just pretended to myself that they were my friends just to belong somewhere.* Pauses and then laughs out loud. *“Deep down I knew that I’ll never be one of them”.*

Discourse analysis captured a *crisis points* in the two competing discourses. First, he speaks of his rejection of his nationality or ethnic identity because of a self-awareness of its liabilities through cultural conflict. However, the first statement seems to act as an introduction to another more important topic. His subsequent utterances in a sense introduces or are intended to an interesting point by suggesting that his ‘melting’ into their host societies is easier by producing either a new ethnic fusion with ‘Asians’ where ethnic differences may become socially inconsequential. Speech disfluencies are thus preparatory acts for a statement which makes a striking admission that the new identity construction was only a symbolic one at best.

Thus, discourse analysis involved an examination of the process of identity formation for South African boys from a variety of ethnic and cultural backgrounds as mediated through developing masculinities within a high school context. From the initial analysis of Bob’s utterances, I tentatively conclude that identity formation for immigrant boys is a fluid, malleable, relational and highly discursive process. The analysis seems to indicate that identity formation is decidedly reliant on various social processes, such as discrimination, subordination, stigmatisation, and resulting classifications and socially constructed labels. For that reason it can be assumed that self-identification strategy may be mediated by locations of the self and constructed within a particular understanding of a particular cultural framework. That is, some individual may self-identify with a certain ethnic group but may fail to feel a strong commitment towards that actual group.
Ethical Considerations

Throughout this project, I was mindful of my chief supervisor Monica Payne’s pertinent statement to me right at the very beginning when I first commenced this project. She told me not to be a careless researcher, suggesting that when researchers work with people, respect must always have the upper hand. Respect, she reminded me, should not be limited to the individual and their time they sacrifice to participate, but must extend to what they bring to the study. Thus, the significance of their individuality was never underplayed. In this way, the study depicted the relationship between the utterance (text) and context in a highly informative way.

Some of the topics being talked about during the interviews were highly sensitive in nature, requiring me to remain thoughtful of trustworthiness and the importance of confidentiality. Moreover, my view of working with people, in a sense, demanded that I took into account the significance of being self-conscious and reflexive with regards to my own set of beliefs and worldviews that I was bringing to the study (Thrupp, 2010). Being reflexive opened up opportunities for critiquing my own ‘gaze’ and the origins of my understanding and positionality (Mac an Ghaill, 1991).

Trustworthiness

In qualitative research, trustworthiness is understood as any effort by the researcher to address the more traditional quantitative issues of validity (the degree to which something measures what it purports to measure) and reliability (the consistency with which it measures it over time). Lincoln and Guba (1985) used the terms credibility, dependability, confirmability, and transferability to establish a set of criteria for addressing the trustworthiness of qualitative inquiry. They argue that these criteria should be combined and address the trustworthiness of qualitative research. Lincoln and Guba (1985) emphasised in their writings on ethics in research that qualitative inquiry should also be judged on authenticity.
Trustworthiness for study was achieved by: (1) asking the research participants for their verification and/or amendment of the transcribed excerpts used in the thesis; (2) by reflexive consciousness about my own philosophical perspective; and (3) by following a systematic research process (Patton, 2002).

Confidentiality

The need to preserve confidentiality and anonymity was a central concern for this study. Every measure was taken to ensure the confidentiality and anonymity of the research participants and anybody else who might have been compromised in this project. In the first instance, all participants were asked to choose a pseudonym right from the onset of the research so that their names and other details could not be identified. I was mindful that there was considerably more to preserving the confidentiality and anonymity of the participants and others than just simply conferring pseudonyms to participants. Therefore, any reporting or discussion was done in a way that did not compromise the identity of the sources of the information. Excerpts from the data shared remained confidential as it was reported in the research project. However, the publication of such data did not disclose the names or the identities of any participant. Strategies for protecting the privacy and identity of people the participants mentioned were employed in two ways. Participants were encouraged not to mention any names or divulge the identity of other persons. I also removed people’s identity so that they become unidentifiable at the level of dealing with the excerpts of the individual interviews.

Conclusion

Research that involved working with people requires an awareness that the worldviews, political and cultural consciousness and perspectives of the researcher and the respondents might influence the design, analysis, findings and conclusions of the study (Patton, 2002). The suggestion to be self-conscious and to be aware of the self, has gained considerable ascendancy in qualitative research
in recent times. For instance, in arguing for reflexivity in educational research, Morwenna Griffiths (1998) pointed out that:

“Educational research is always on/for/with other people – and getting knowledge on/for/with other people is a complex matter. It is complex for three main reasons: human agency; social relations, especially the effects of power; and ethics. The terms ‘agency’, ‘power’ and ‘ethics’ indicate that these questions are particularly significant for educational research for social justice, which... is directly concerned with power, empowerment and the good of communities and individuals” (Griffiths, 1998, p. 37).

As a consequence, being reflexive, then, meant that I had to be constantly involved in self-questioning and self-understanding (Patton, 2002). To put it simply, I adopted a reflexivity approach as a way of reminding me to be attentive and conscious of my cultural, political, social and ideological origins and influences and those of the young men who volunteered their participation in this study. More importantly, being reflexive, in a sense, meant that I had to ensure that I remained aware of the overall aim of this study and that ‘giving voice’ actually meant using the participants’ own words to speak and to hopefully to be heard. I remained mindful of the multiple voices and perspectives embedded in the respondent’s reflective self-stories and accounts of adapting to New Zealand social life was like for them.

Given that the focus for this study was on analyzing texts (transcribed interview data) rather than examining text production or reception, I drew heavily on Social Constructionists’ underpinnings and the constructed nature of knowledge creation within social relations to explore the contradictory positions from which the participants spoke. By and large, the approach of discourse analysis I used emphasized subjectivities as created within discourse as resources with which they are able to navigate and negotiate the social world.
Introducing the Research Participants

“What we see is governed by how we see it, and how we see has already been determined by where we see from”

(Holquist, 1990, p. 163)

Introduction

In terms of representativeness, this study falls somewhere between individual in-depth case study and equal representation in terms of the ethnic (‘race’) make-up of South Africans in New Zealand. The total number of interviewees goes far beyond the number of cases normally treated in qualitative studies. As I have emphasised previously, central to my study is the idea that the experiences of South African boys will not only be affected by the personal and cultural histories they bring with them, but how these have a particular interface with New Zealand’s dominant and subordinate cultures. Some literature points out that neither identities nor masculinities are constructed, performed nor regulated in a manner that is uniform or universally generalizable to all boys and men in society (Cornwall & Lindisfarne, 1994). These studies show that gender is always a ‘doing’, but not a ‘doing’ by a subject who might be said to pre-exist the deed, but gender is continually ‘performed’ through sustained social interaction (Butler, 1990), and from a “view from somewhere” (Haraway, 1991, p. 195).

Specifically, my study focuses on exploring how the complicated intersections of identity construction and ‘doing boy’ were mediated through the values, attitudes, and cultural practices that individual boys from a variety of South African ethnic and cultural backgrounds brought with them to the interface with both the dominant and subordinate New Zealand cultures. In addition to providing an overview of the research context, I consider it both important and relevant to make the participant’s personal features explicit, largely because it will assist in
analyzing the data, not in isolation, but within the complexity of the intertwining of social context and individual biography (Wetherell & Potter, 1992), and the ‘view from somewhere’ (Haraway, 1991) shaped the immigrant experiences “in the course of adjustment to their new society and their encounters with its members” (Trlin, 2010, p. 160).

South African boys vary considerably, and broad, taken-for-granted categories such as nationality, ethnicity, or religion often mask the diversity within what is an extremely heterogeneous population. In this case, then, this chapter includes some demographic information about each participant and let it sit side-by-side with contextual information that I provided in Chapter 4. I will also include four very different stories from four very different participants to show how the interplay between historical and present-day social contexts and biography. Much of the analysis will include an examination of how factors informed the participant’s meaning-making (how and what he knows; then and now), and how they reconstructed adolescence from a position of young adulthood. Despite these advantages, the analysis cannot be considered representative in a statistical sense because it is not based on a strictly random sampling. This is mainly due to the aim of the study to work with a demographically diverse group of young men. What follows next is a summary of each participant’s demographic information.

**Participant demographic information**

Young men aged 18-23 from all four politically labelled racial and ethnic groups (Black, ‘Coloured’, White and Indian) responded to an invitation to be interviewed. The young men were asked to talk about their lived experiences in New Zealand in order to take current understandings of immigrant youth adaptation forward by exploring the complexities of the individual experience.
While the majority of the participants immigrated with their parents during their adolescent years, eight of them can be referred to as ‘1.5-generation’ (see Figure 3). The 1.5-generation is a concept that describes immigrants as neither first nor second generation. Sociologist Ruben Rumbaut (2004) was among the first to use the term to examine outcomes among those people arriving in the United States before adolescence.

Demographically, of course, the notion of a 1.5-generation is impossible; someone born in South Africa is technically considered first generation, and anyone born in New Zealand is considered second generation. The term 1.5-generation, however, is significant when it used in reference to sociocultural adaptation experiences of pre-adult immigrants. Splitting the respondents into two clear and distinct generational cohorts of 1.5 and first generations, defined by age at immigration, and not ‘lumping’ them together is important for understanding the ‘coming of age’ of children of immigrants and their modes of acculturation, ethnic identity, ethnic group formation educational, occupational, civic trajectories into adulthood (Rumbaut, 2004).
New Zealand has developed a high quality education system, yet one that does not serve all students equally (Ministry of Social Development, 2008a). Inequities within New Zealand’s education system are of particular concern for ethnic and socioeconomically disadvantaged students. The Ministry of Education (2008a) acknowledges socioeconomically disadvantaged students as one of its two ‘at risk’ groups, along with Māori and Pasifika students. The review of education specifically recognizes the education system’s failure to meet the needs of socioeconomically disadvantaged students. School qualification data suggest developing, yet still insufficient, improvement in reducing educational disparities for students from socioeconomically disadvantaged backgrounds (Ministry of Education, 2008b).

The Ministry of Education allocates funding to schools. A decile is a 10% grouping, there are ten deciles and around 10% of schools are in each decile. A school’s decile rating indicates the extent to which it draws its students from low socio-economic communities. Decile 1 schools are the 10% of schools with the highest proportion of students from low socio-economic communities, whereas decile 10 schools are the 10% of schools with the lowest proportion of these students. The increased funding given to lower decile schools is to provide additional resources to support their students’ learning needs. A decile does not indicate the overall socio-economic mix of the students attending a school or

Figure 7. Age at immigration.
measure the standard of education delivered at a school (Ministry of Education, 2013). There is a common belief that school decile ratings is a way in which parents are able to measure the quality of the teaching despite it only being used as a funding model. The lower a school’s decile rating, the more funding it gets because it is assumed that there will be a shortfall in voluntary donations from poorer parents.

Figure 8. Bar graph showing secondary school decile ratings that ‘Coloured’, White, Black, and Indian study participants attended.

The Research Participants

AB

AB was twenty-three at the time of the interview. He described himself an English-speaking Indian. Together with his parents and two younger brothers their family arrived New Zealand in 2002 when he was eight years old. AB’s father works as a Call Centre Operator for an international airline company and his mother is employed as a Pharmaceutical Sales Person. He started his high school
career in South Africa but spent most of his secondary schooling in New Zealand. AB attended a decile 8, co-educational secondary school in East Auckland where he completed NCEA level 3 and at the time of the interview he was studying towards a Bachelor of Optometry (Honours) at a local University.

**Aromat**

Aromat was twenty when I conducted the interview with him. He described himself as an English speaking White South African. Aromat is the oldest of three children and arrived in New Zealand with his family in 2007 when he was fourteen years old. He wrote in his proforma that his father is a Business Analyst and his mother works as a Project Manager for a multinational Construction Company. Aromat attended a decile 10, co-educational secondary school situated in an affluent suburb on Auckland’s North Shore. He left school in 2011 after completing NCEA level 2 and was working as a technician for the Royal New Zealand Navy at the time of the interview.

**Bob**

Bob was twenty-one at the time of the interview. He described himself an English-speaking Indian and was ten years old when he arrived in New Zealand. Bob studied at a decile 8, co-educational secondary school in Auckland where he completed NCEA level 3. After finishing school, he enrolled in a Bachelor of Psychology degree at Auckland University but dropped out after the first year of study and started his car valet business. He then sold the company a year later to complete his tertiary studies. Bob was in his final year of the degree programme at a local University when I interviewed him.

**Colin**

Colin was nineteen at the time when the interview took place. He described himself as an Afrikaans-speaking ‘Cape ‘Coloured’. Colin, together with his
parents and younger sister, arrived in New Zealand in 2006 when he was fourteen years old. His father works as a Correctional Officer and his mother is a Hairdresser. Colin attended a decile 6, co-educational school in South-East Auckland. He claimed that he got stood down from school many times for ‘misdemeanours’ and as a consequence left school in 2011 without any formal secondary education qualifications. At the time of the interview, he was studying towards level 2 certificates in Building and Carpentry at a local Polytechnic.

**Dean**

Dean was twenty-two at the time of the interview. He described himself as an English-speaking ‘Coloured’. They arrived in New Zealand in 1997 when he was seven years old. Dean’s father works as Motor Mechanic and his mother is a Primary School Teacher. Dean attended a decile 8, co-educational secondary school in central Auckland where he completed NCEA level 3. At the time of the interview, he told me that he recently completed a Bachelor of Science (Psychology) degree at a local University.

**François**

François was twenty when I conducted the interview with him. He described himself as a proud White South African. François claimed that his choice of pseudonym depicted his patriotic devotion to his country of birth. François Pienaar was the South African rugby captain who defeated the All Blacks in the 1995 rugby world cup. François is an only child and together with his parents arrived in New Zealand in 2002 when he was ten years old. Both his parents are Secondary School Teachers. François attended a decile 10, co-educational secondary school in East Auckland. He left school at the end of 2010 after finishing NCEA level 2. François was an apprentice truck mechanic at the time of the interview.
**Garry**

Garry was nineteen at the time of the interview. He described himself as an English-speaking White South African. Garry and his family arrived in New Zealand in 2004 when he was eleven years old. He has two older sisters. His father works as an Electrician and his mother is an Early-childhood Teacher. Garry studied at a decile 7, co-educational secondary school in rural Northland and left school after completing NCEA level 2. He was an apprentice electronics technician when I interviewed him.

**George**

George was twenty-one at the time of the interview. He described himself as a ‘Coloured’. George is an only child and together with his mother arrived in New Zealand in 2004 when he was thirteen years old. His mother is unmarried and works as a Teacher Aid / Caregiver at a local primary school in Auckland. George attended one of Auckland’s most prestigious co-educational secondary schools, situated in a leafy East Auckland suburb and described himself as a homosexual. He graduated from school with NCEA level 3 and at the time of the interview he was studying towards a Bachelor of Performing Screen Arts at a Polytechnic.

**J.C.**

J.C. was twenty-one when I interviewed him. He was quite humorous as he described the choosing of a pseudonym that represents sought-after French Champagne only consumed by affluent South Africans. J.C. announced that he is a proud Afrikaans-speaking ‘Cape Townian’ (a stereotypical ‘Coloured’ person living in Cape Town). He has three younger siblings and together with their parents arrived in New Zealand in 2000 when he was twelve years old. J.C.’s father works as a Boat Builder and his mother was unemployed at the time of the interview. He attended a decile 6, co-educational secondary school in South-East Auckland and left school after completing NCEA level 2. At the time of the
Interview, J.C. wrote in his proforma that he was studying at a local polytechnic towards qualifying as a Fitness Instructor.

**Jimmy**

Jimmy was nineteen when I conducted the interview with him. He described himself as an English-speaking White South African. Jimmy has a younger male sibling as well as a brother and sister that are older than him. They arrived in New Zealand in 2009 when he was sixteen years old. Jimmy’s father is an Insurance Salesman and his mother is an Early-childhood Teacher. He attended a decile 7, co-educational secondary school in the big North Island town of Tauranga and left school after completing NCEA level 2. At the time of the interview, he was an apprentice welder/metal fabricator.

**John**

John was twenty-one at the time of the interview. He described himself as an English-speaking ‘Coloured’. John has a younger brother and together with his parents, they arrived New Zealand in 2008 when he turned seventeen. His father is working as a Plumber and his mother is a Nursing Student. John studied at a decile 8, boy’s school in Central Auckland. He was expelled in 2012 for ‘constantly breaking school rules. John was unemployed at the time of the interview.

**Little Man**

Little Man was seventeen at the time the interview took place. He described himself as an Afrikaans-speaking ‘Coloured’. Little Man is an only child and arrived in New Zealand in 2009 when he was fourteen years old. His father is a Mechanic and his mother works as a Caregiver. Little Man got expelled from his decile 8, co-educational secondary school in Auckland in 2012 because of ‘ongoing abusive and combative behaviour towards staff and students.’ This was
his description of the reasons for his expulsion. The entry on his proforma suggests that Little Man was unemployed when I interviewed him.

**Mark**

It was shortly after his 20th birthday when I interviewed Mark. He described himself as an English-speaking White South African. Mark has one older brother who lives in England. Together with their parents they arrived in 2007 when he was fifteen years old. His father is a Mechanical Engineer and his mother works as a Civil Engineer for a prominent New Zealand construction company. Mark studied at an Independent (Private) School for Boys in Hamilton and graduated with NCEA level 3 at the end of 2010. He was studying towards a Bachelor of Engineering at the time of the interview. Mark claimed to be the youngest part-time tutor in the Faculty of Engineering at a local University.

**Matt**

Matt was twenty-two when I interviewed him. He is English-speaking and described himself as part Indian and part ‘Coloured’. Matt did claim that for the purposes of ethnic classification, he always ‘just go with Indian because it eliminates the hassle of having to explain to others what he is.’ Matt and his family arrived in New Zealand in 2003 when he was thirteen years old. His father works as a Diesel Mechanic and his mother is a Receptionist. Matt studied at a decile 8, co-educational secondary school in Central Auckland and was part of the first group of New Zealand students to study towards the NCEA. At the time of the interview, he was studying towards a Bachelor of Electrical Engineering at a local Polytechnic.

**Musa**

Musa was twenty-one at the time of the interview. Although Xhosa (Indigenous Southern African Language) is his mother tongue, he is fluent in both Afrikaans and English. He described himself as Black. Musa told me that his parents are
divorced and that his two older brothers who were still living with their father in South Africa. He and his mother arrived in New Zealand in 2008 when he was fifteen years old. Musa’s mother works as a Midwife. He got expelled from his decile 8, co-educational secondary school in 2010. I conducted the interview with him while he was studying automotive mechanics and allowed to leave his home for the purposes of study. Musa was arrested with a group of friends in 2011 for stealing a motor vehicle. I interviewed him during one of his ‘monitored’ trips to a local Polytechnic while being under electronic surveillance.

**Nicholas**

Nicholas was nineteen at the time when the interview took place. He described himself as a person of mixed race: African and ‘Coloured’. Nicholas is fluent in Afrikaans, English and Xhosa. He grew up in a ‘Coloured’ suburb in Port Elizabeth, South Africa, and together with his parents, and three other siblings, arrived in New Zealand in 2003 when he was nine years old. His father is a Diesel Mechanic and his mother works as a Caregiver / Nursing Home Assistant. Nicholas attended a decile 8, single-sex secondary school and at the time of the interview he was working as an Apprentice Mechanic.

**Paul**

Paul was nineteen when this interview took place. He described himself as an English-speaking White male. Paul was born in Cape Town and arrived in New Zealand in 2004 when he was eleven years old. He described his upbringing as typically South African - authoritarian and highly conservative. Paul, together with his two younger brothers, attended a decile 10, co-educational secondary school in East Auckland. His father works as an Accountant and his mother is a Librarian. Paul left school in 2010 after completing NCEA level 3, and at the time of the interview he was studying towards a first degree in Computer Science.
Peter

Peter was twenty-two when I interviewed him. He described himself as an English-speaking Indian male. His family arrived in New Zealand in 2001 when he was eleven years old. Peter has three older brothers who attended different secondary schools. His father works as an Automotive Parts Manager and his mother teaches at a local Secondary School in East Auckland. Peter attended a decile 10, co-educational secondary school in East Auckland and graduated after successfully completing NCEA level 3. His proforma indicates that he completed a Bachelor of Psychology in 2011 and at the time of the interview was studying towards a Master of Health Psychology Degree in Health Psychology.

Piet

Piet was twenty-three at the time when the interview took place. He described himself as an Afrikaans-speaking Afrikaner. Piet grew up in a rural town in South Africa that continues to be infamously known as the ‘last bastion of Apartheid’ because of its enduring racist and discriminatory social practices. He did, however, made a point of stating that he sees himself as a proud Afrikaner and that ‘he is not racist.’ Piet’s parents are divorced and he is an only child. Piet came to New Zealand in 2006 at the age of seventeen when he came to live with his father who works as a long distance Truck Driver. He studied at a decile 7, co-education secondary school in a rural town in the lower North Island. Piet left school in 2008 after completing NCEA level 2, and shortly afterwards he joined the New Zealand Army.

Steve

Steve was twenty-three when I interviewed him. He described himself as a ‘Coloured’ and arrived in New Zealand when he was only five months old. Steve is one of the participants that are referred to as 1.5 generation because he arrived here before the age of twelve. His father is an Electrician and owns a small business and his mother works as an Accountant. Steve grew up in a middle-class suburb and studied at a decile 8, co-educational school in West Auckland. He told
me that he dropped out of school during his final year of secondary school because ‘he could not see the point of continuing.’ Steve was working as an Accounts Clerk at the time when the interview took place.

**Willem**

Willem was twenty at the time of the interview. He described himself as a ‘Boer’ (White Afrikaner) and claimed to have only White South Africans as friends. Willem has a younger sister and together with his parents arrived in New Zealand in 2007 when he was fifteen years old. His father works as a Sales Manager and his mother is a Student Teacher (Early childhood Education). Willem attended a decile 10, co-educational secondary school on Auckland’s North Shore. This school has a large South African student and teacher population. Willem was studying towards a Bachelor of Applied Technology (Automotive) at the time when the interview took place.
Table 6. Summary of participant demographic information at the time of the interviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age when arrived in New Zealand</th>
<th>Number of years living in New Zealand</th>
<th>Father’s occupation</th>
<th>Mother’s occupation</th>
<th>Decile rating of secondary school</th>
<th>Highest level of school leaving qualification (NCEA level)</th>
<th>Current occupation / Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Musa</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Midwife</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Trade Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Black/ ‘Coloured’</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Diesel Mechanic</td>
<td>Caregiver/ Nursing Assistant</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Apprentice Mechanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>‘Coloured’</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Correctional Officer</td>
<td>Hairdresser</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Carpentry Apprentice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>‘Coloured’</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Teacher Aid/ Caregiver</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Student - BPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>‘Coloured’</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Motor Mechanic</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Student - BSc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.C.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>‘Coloured’</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Boat Builder</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fitness Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>‘Coloured’</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Plumber</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Man</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>‘Coloured’</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mechanic</td>
<td>Caregiver</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>‘Coloured’</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Business Owner</td>
<td>Accountant</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Accounts Clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Call centre Operator</td>
<td>Sales Assistant</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Student - BOptom (Hons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Years Exp</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Education/Training</td>
<td>Year(s) of Experience</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Call-centre Operator</td>
<td>Sales Assistant</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student - BSc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Diesel Mechanic</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student – BE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Automotive Parts Manager</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student - MSc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aromat</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Business Analyst</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trainee Motor Mechanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>François</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marine Technician</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garry</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Electrician</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Electronics Technician</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Insurance Salesman</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Welder Metal fabricator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineer</td>
<td>Civil Engineer</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University Tutor/Student - BE (Hons)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Accountant</td>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student - BSc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piet</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Truck Driver</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Soldier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willem</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sales Manager</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B.Applied.Tech.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interviewing can be seen as a way of developing a comprehension of a culture and for providing an arena for reflexively considering the interpretive repertoires (discourses) that the participants draw on (Wetherell and Potter, 1992). This is not something straightforwardly captured by questionnaires. The following narratives will demonstrate that storytelling can develop a more conscious and theorised understanding of how South African boys described their cultural membership and how individual personal and cultural histories help determine a “view from somewhere” (Haraway, 1991, p. 195).

The individual narratives presented are varied and reveal the complexity of relationships developing within situatedness and “what we see is governed by how we see it, and how we see has already been determined by where we see from,” (Holquist, 1990, p. 163). The stories that emerged from the interviews show widely contrasting private and public stances of their take on their lived reality. The intention of including these extracts is to show how each story is unique and indicates a complex construction in relation to context, as multiple ways of seeing and interpreting their own experiences of adapting to life in New Zealand during adolescence. I take the position that the young people’s self-stories became more powerful and meaningful because sufficient space was given for heightened ethnographic and personal insights.

George

[Coming to New Zealand]

My mum made the move, she first came for a tournament and she liked the place and said you’ll have a better future on that side and I was like: “Yes okay, I’m all for that”. It was challenging because you know we never rented a house in South Africa, We were financially stable so both of us were presented with challenges. It
took a while to get us on our feet I guess. That kind of affected me in a way you
know, as a kid it kind of distorted my image of what life was all about. It became
not a hassle or bad thing but it was negative to a certain extent. It was negative
but I was enjoying myself at the same time. My mother found it difficult finding a
job and all that type of thing and a guess I had to grow up fast in a short amount
of time. All these things that accumulated over time and you get all the pressures
all the time to commit to a bad place that I don't think I would have been back
home because you have your family there to support you. I think the culture back
home is completely different.

[Talking about bullying in Intermediate school]
Oh yea, it was just, I guess from primary that they have formed groups and I was
new to the school and I guess that I was just in the position to be the one to be
bullied. I didn’t know much about the New Zealand culture and how they were
brought up. I was trying to find a place and that particular day, I like to dance,
and I was dancing with a group of students in my class. I don’t know where it
came from but he just pushed me and I took that and left it at that. Then it
happened again and I decided to stand up for myself because there was no one to
back me up. (Laughing) I took a beating (laughing) and we went to the principal
and we got stuck in detention, both of us. I complained to my mother that I wasn't
comfortable with that idea. I didn't think that I deserve that and I took it
personally. Was it just because of my nationality that he took the right to
approach me that way? The damage that did! So, I withdraw from that particular
school and I did home schooling for a year with my mother

[Talking about high school]
So, it took time and when it came to high school I felt uncomfortable because I
was kind of placed in the same situation where the people from Intermediate
would have formed their own groups. I felt kind of abnormal because I kind of did
silly things to kind of fit in initially. Such as, I asked a girl out in the first week
and everybody thought that was funny. I became known as the funny guy and that
kind of highlight how I found my place. But I don’t think I really expressed who I
was or who I am really at high school. It was more of an image thing. I mean
being from another country is a challenge and if you are going to be yourself, like being gay, you are going to end up being lonely. That is something I didn't want to be. .... I guess it was like a protection mechanism that I used or mentality to stop myself from going down that road to feeling not accepted. I kind of put on this image and I was not an academic student at school. I didn't feel that anybody could connect with me and my issue. Back home you felt a part of everything that was going on. I never felt what it was like to experience that and I guess that affected my learning because I was more focused on fitting in that I was on my schoolwork.

[Friends]
It was a good experience for me. I found that it was easier to fit in with other foreigner students. So, my friendship circle, which I managed to develop within the first weeks, was mostly from Iraq and France because I felt that we had something in common. When I first arrived here in New Zealand, I initially found it difficult to communicate with New Zealanders as such. First of all the language barrier, particularly I felt disadvantaged at one stage because I got bullied within the first term of Intermediate .... Their attitude towards their work affected my attitude towards my work. It wasn't all that bad like it sounds. It wasn't bad because I found a place where a group supported me. I guess I was lacking the self-confidence at that point. Hey I'm going to be myself and people just have to accept that or not and I'm going to be focussing on doing things for me. Results came up and it was like what is going on. Because everything seems okay on the surface but I had issues that had to be dealt with.

[Fitting in]
I guess we look for acceptance in a way if people do not respond to you, you feel like an outcast. You always look for the consent of your peers. So, I guess I charmed my way or my unusual personality at the time...I guess I was respected in a way. I caught on and people started noticing me. My family is very religious and I use to take a bible to school and I used to read because that was how I was brought up. People started noticing and started asking questions: “Why do you do that; why do you talk in a particular way; why do you call the teacher Miss?” They made the effort to ask me and then I took the opportunity to find out about
them. Like I said it was mostly foreigners. So, yea, it was all about finding myself and finding where I belonged. That is quite a big focus. I used to attend the Youth as well and there were some other South Africans who were in the same struggle but they conformed to this idea of to be with the cool people. You have to do this, so I am just going to pursue this. That was going to be my long-term goal. You either got mocked or you got excluded. That is not a nice feeling. You see, words do hurt and as much as you try to...a comment of someone do hurt you. You cannot control that. It was best to avoid it. Just do the wrong thing and try your best to avoid it. I guess that got me out of my shell.

[Talking about schooling]
Yes, there were expectations from the school and from your parents. Obviously, those were the main ones but there were expectations from your friends. I guess there were pressures coming from all ways. The school was so focussed on academic achievement. Every day there was this message that had to be heard. There was no way to outrun that. They always reflected on previous years and how well they did. You had to do the same. They indirectly hinted on the consequences of not studying. It was just focussed on making the school look good. Well, that is what I am thinking. It was constantly in your face. Every assembly they pointed out the successes of the school. I don’t think you should ignore that but it makes you feel out of place because you didn’t achieve that. I guess they had our best interest at heart, in a way. (Laughs) I mean they provided all the tools you needed to achieve. It was an unnecessary pressure I think. I got to achieve an A because anything else is not good enough. I became careless and I guess that is where the cool kids came into play. They didn’t care and we were really just a bunch of losers but that was cool (laugh). That was all right because we had each other. I guess that is a messed-up view because these guys are just in a place ...they don’t know where they are, they don’t know who they are. They are the ones who really need the help. When you on your own you don’t see things for what they really are.

[Things that helped or hindered his learning]
The teachers always made themselves available. The tests that we did, gave you a fair idea of where you’re at and then you could communicate it with your
teachers. They made sure that you got all the help you needed. What hindered my learning? The idea of being cool. People that didn’t work were a distraction and unnecessary pressure. The focus wasn’t on the students; it was more on the outside. It was never just learn and do the work. I guess my social life outside school hindered my learning in order to get into the cool group. People in general hindered my learning. I guess I allowed them to do that because I was focussed on them so much. That was my mind-set. I gave them the right to do that.

[Speaking about a caring teacher]
The teacher that ran the production of the schools, she called me up and said she liked to have a chat. She sat me down. She cared about me. I knew that because she knew my circumstances and that I could be open with her. She was quite open with us and kind of laid down that foundation of trust. So she sat me down and said: “Hey George what is going on, what’s going on?” I said I’m dealing with issues and she said I can see that and it is affecting your marks. I was waiting for someone to say but I didn’t want to enforce the message to someone. I want to make them say that and so when that happened it was like a revelation that the people not just cared about you but the issues that you have within your family.

[Speaking about family support and cultural differences]
My mom and grandmother were very supportive. They told me to pick the subjects that I wanted to do and not to let anybody tell me otherwise. Do what you love. They were always interested and tracked my progress. Whether something went well or it didn’t they cared about that. There were nights when I sat up doing projects and my grandmother would be consistent in bringing those cups of coffees. Just being there for you. I think back home is the same. Everything is taken seriously but you don’t interfere with someone’s learning. I think everyone has that same respect. I saw with my cousins, they would be so focussed and self-motivated in their work and they were happy in their work. They took pride in their learning. I think that is something that is lacking here in New Zealand high schools. I still see it now when I travel to Uni. how New Zealand high school students interact with one another. They don’t even stand up when an old lady get on the train. They won’t even offer their seat. I don’t know…it nags at me. It’s
something that frustrates me because that is not the way I was brought up. You need to respect you elders.

[Reflecting on his experiences]
I guess after all that negativity and the struggles I went through, it was good because I came out knowing what I wanted to do, knowing who I was and who I didn’t want to be. I managed so secure a good group of friend who I still keep in contact with. The overall experience was great. For South African boys being in a new country it is useful. I don’t think some of the qualities that I learnt, I would have learnt back home. I wouldn’t have had those issues because I would have grown up with all that history and there wouldn’t have been that need to fit in. Yea, I appreciate that it built me up into the person that I am today. I’ve come out doing something that I love at Uni. I met people with the qualities that I would want to possess. So, it gave me a clear view of the route that I want to take in life. The content within the subjects didn’t really matter. I know where I am going and I gained that through my school years. I embrace all the challenges, the good and the bad experiences that I faced at high school. I am completely happy and I know who I am. Sometimes it takes people many years to know who they are and discover passions. High school is a place where I matured a lot and I learnt a lot.

Nicholas

[Moving abroad]
We moved out of my house and lived with my grandmother because we sold our house to move over here. We only stayed with my grandmother for a week before we came here. My aunty and two of my cousins were living over here already. We came here and lived with them for a little while before moving down to what...what you call it? Whakatane. Ja (Yes), we moved down there and I went to primary school there. I felt excited about moving here. I was excited when my family told me we were going to move to New Zealand. It took about a year before we actually moved. Yeah, it was pretty exciting for me.
[Arriving in New Zealand]

Err, it was like clean and very modern. The houses and stuff. Where I stayed with my aunty the houses were very modern compared with where we lived in South Africa. Hmmm, the people were friendly most of the time. We moved to Whakatane from Manukau I think, around Manukau, Botany area. Yeah, my dad found a cheap place which we rented in Whakatane. I started school when I was eight. It was a very small school with only about two hundred students. When I first got there they made me introduce myself in front of the whole school. You had to stand up in the middle of the assembly and say your name and stuff. Not just your class, the whole school (laugh). It felt weird ’cause they don’t do that in South Africa. They were friendly people. Weird Māori names which were completely different to what I knew.

[High school experience in Auckland]

Like when I didn’t go to school, they never noticed. They didn’t mind me being away. They didn’t ask me anything about where I was. Hmmm, it was like I wasn’t even in the class. Hmmm, I felt bad. Like the teachers don’t notice me because they don’t know everyone in the class. I don’t know … they just focus on a group of people and teach them. That is what a few of my teachers did. They focus on just the people who want to learn and ignore the other people. I wanted to learn but I used to sit with my friends at the back of the class and the people at the front of the class … I don’t know... they just…I don’t know how to explain it. It was like they didn’t notice us, me mainly. It felt weird. It felt like they didn’t want us there. I don’t know. I just felt left out. Like I don’t belong there. Some of the students didn’t even want to learn and they got all the attention. My teachers spend all the time just teaching them. [Pause] I hated that class. It was mostly immigrants like me in the class. I know the teachers didn’t like us. We did nothing to them. I still don’t understand why they acted that way towards us.

[Talking about friends]

Err, yep. I had like a multicultural group. Like an Indonesian, like my friend, he was from Ethiopia, White people, South Africans. I had like a weird mixture of friends. I don’t know. They were all sporty. Yeah, they were good friends and we had fun together. We played rugby and hanged out after school as well. We had
the same interests. Easy going people that don’t judge people by their culture or whatever. They were good friends that always helped me to get my mind off my girlfriend and stuff. I liked playing rugby and most of my friend played for the same school team. I had mostly African friends because I was from South Africa. I got to know some South Africans and I spoke some Afrikaans with them. You know, making jokes with them because they just like had the same kind of personality than me. It made like sense to me.

[Teachers]

No, no, they didn’t treat me like a South African. I was seen as African. My rugby coach put me on the wing because I was African and supposed to be fast (laugh) Stupid people. Like my personality was different from them. I didn’t like follow them and they didn’t understand what I was about. Err, it hard to explain it. It’s like, err... I was always like a loner at school in year 9. Sometimes I use to hang out with myself. Not having any friends. I couldn’t do my work because I was scared to talk to teachers. I was very shy. The teachers were treating me weird and that made me like not free to talk to them. I never asked any questions....

Teachers were treating me like I wasn’t even there. Forgetting to hand me things, specifically not handing me stuff. Like not even noticing that I am wagging school and stuff. Like if you not there for a whole week they don’t even care. They just left me alone [pause] I don’t know actually. I always wanted to listen and do my work and stuff like that. I had one good teacher. I mostly had male teachers that did that. Female teachers I seem to get along with better. Like when I first started high school there was a teacher called, err ... I can’t remember her name, but she helped me a lot. She always told me that if I need help she would help me. She made me answer questions in class. She was the only teacher who asked me for an answer in all my time at school. She helped me with learning and homework and stuff like that and encouraged me to stay back after school and do some extra work.

Some of the teachers they couldn’t understand my language, my accent. They come to me and say: “What are you saying”. Like they want to embarrass me in front of the whole class. That made me shy a lot of the time. That’s when I started my shyness. I used to get very shy. Teachers used to...we use to do studies about
Nelson Mandela and stuff like that and they expect me to know it as if I was there. Teachers are supposed to do something when other students mock you but they encouraged it. They use to make fun of the South African rugby team saying that they’re losers. Because New Zealand and South Africa are big rugby rivals they take it out on me because I am South African. I don’t think that was right. It made me very shy. It made me feel angry. Sometimes I felt very angry. Sometimes I felt like hitting the teacher. Nah, I never actually did that.... For some reason African and South African are always put down with some racial stuff. When we watched some racial movies the students and the teachers always make fun of us.

[Things that helped with fitting in]
Things that helped. Hmmm, there was one for African students so I went to that one. There was an African teacher there and he helped me with my homework and stuff. That helped a lot. I tried playing rugby and that made me enjoy school. I started playing rugby for one of the teams, under fifteen I think. Playing rugby helped me enjoy school. Just like looking forward to the breaks and stuff, looking forward to hanging out with my friends. I actually wanted to go to school when I started playing rugby. It took away all the learning stress for me. It was just like fun for me. I enjoyed playing rugby for the school. Err ... some teachers were helpful. One of the teachers encouraged me to stay at school. She helped me a lot. School was an up-and-down time for me. I was all over the place. [Pause] I felt down most of the time.

[Difficulties at school]
When I was down I used to wag school or go home straight away. Nah, Hmmm, I just couldn’t be bothered with school. Teachers annoyed me so much. Hmmm... [Pause] err... Like you don’t understand the work because they couldn’t explain it to you and they are having a bad day as well. Sometimes teachers wouldn’t even come to our class. We just went home. I don’t know why they did that. We used to complain to the headmaster but nothing happened. We were a pretty naughty class though. The teachers got annoyed with us a lot. Well, students would interrupt the teachers deliberately. Not me, other students would do it just to piss off the teachers so that we could get some free time or whatever. That always happen to us. I always wanted to learn and study Science because I liked
experiments and stuff. They stopped us from doing experiments because the students would catch on junk. Burning holes in the benches with soldering irons.

Uhhm, my girlfriend, we were always fighting and having problems with her. She always asked me questions like... stupid questions like do you stare at other girls at school. We were always arguing about stupid things that didn’t even mean anything. After school we forgot about everything and get along, but every time at school we used to argue. That led to big distractions like I had to text in class, phone calls out of class and the teachers used to get angry with me. I used to tell her to stop calling and stuff like that. Then we broke up and everything was like easier. Two years (laugh) I was in year eleven and year twelve. It was a big distraction for me. Thinking about lunchtime was a big distraction for me as well.

[Final thoughts]
Hmmm, Yeah, high school should be fun for students, but it was a very miserable experience for me. It kind of felt like too much stress... too much problems. I felt sick of it a lot. I felt that I didn’t want to go to school anymore but I still went. Nah, it was just like... some teachers need to take more notice of the students, not just let them sit at the back and let them wonder off. Yeah, it wasn’t the best experience. High school wasn’t the best part of my life.

Piet

[High school in South Africa]
I was done with South Africa; I couldn’t wait to leave the place. The crime and stuff was just getting out of control. But I was even happier to leave my old school. I went to five different school in South Africa. We kept moving around. Uhhm, back home I was the one who stood out. [Laughs] At my last school. I was the only White person in the F-class at my previous school. All the other boys were either Black or ‘Coloured’. I still don’t understand it but my White friends all left me because I hanged out with the other kids. They told me that I shouldn’t
be friends with them. But I was the only one in the class, and besides those guys were not bad. Once you get to know them. I got along better with them than with the other guys.

[Coming to New Zealand]

So my parents are divorce and mum got his new boyfriend. I knew that I was in the way because since he came, my mum just changed. She became angry with me. Hmmm, I remember how she made me sit in my room all night to study so that I could get out of the F-class. She was definitely ashamed of me. We argued a lot. (Sigh) It was mainly the new guy who made him up against me. He called the Blacks a bunch of monkeys. I hated him. So when I got bullied at school, I couldn’t speak to my mother because when it happened the first time, she said that I should stand up and fight back. I got into more fights and stuff. (Long pause) So, my mum came to me one day and she was crying and stuff and said that she can’t handle me anymore and that I should go to New Zealand to live with my dad. Within a couple of weeks I arrived at the airport. That dickhead, my mum’s boyfriend didn’t even come to say goodbye.

[Settling into his new school]

When I got here, I decided from the start to act tough. Like back in South Africa, I just wanted to fit in. You learn how to change your first appearance. Like the first school I went to I was like really shy and stuff and I got like pushed around a lot. I got bullied quite badly. So, later on I started being a bit more like, uh like talk back to them. Like if the bullies gave me shit, then I gave them shit back. They then sort of think that you would do something really bad, even though I wouldn’t really have done anything. I just acted confidently and pretended to be like a violent person. Just a bit of confidence was needed, although you felt scared, they just backed off. That is what got me through secondary school. You sort of pretend that you’re violent and they think that you’re from South African and that you’re used to acting violently. That is what I sort of did over here. I didn’t feel right about having to pretend to be someone else. But that is what saved me from being bullied again. It was mainly the Māori guys that tried it on. I remember
how one guy smacked me and tried to choke. I just pushed him away real hard and he fell and he backed off. In South Africa he would have been hit with a rock or even stabbed. After that they just left me alone.

Ja, (yes) it was really good coming to New Zealand. I fitted in really nice, really quickly. I had mates at my house the second day of school. Everything just happened real quickly. So, nah I didn’t have any problems fitting in. Everybody just accepted me from the beginning. Overall, secondary school was a good experience.... So, ja I think because I made friends so quickly, made the move to New Zealand that much easier.

[Making new friends]
I made friend very quickly. Like I said, within like a couple of days I had friends over from school. My dada was very supportive and let us work on a car he was rebuilding. They guys I hanged out with were all into cars and motorbikes. I made friends with another South African and he really helped me with understanding the school work. Hmmm, like we decided not to speak Afrikaans. I think he was here since very long and couldn’t really speak much Afrikaans. That is what helped me. Not to speak Afrikaans and get stuck into being South African. We went to Auckland a couple of times and I met guys over there and all they do is pretend to be back home. It’s like they have South African still in their head. They just do exactly what people in South Africa are doing. Why don’t you try something new? Hmmm, it was my dad. My dad thought that I was lonely and that if I met up with other Afrikaners (gesturing quotation marks) then I’ll be a bit less home sick. (Laughs) I hated South Africa. I couldn’t wait to leave. Besides, I had heaps of new friends. Mostly Kiwis but a couple of Asians, like Indians and Māori boys. We just hanged out every day after school and every weekend. Oh yes, I also got into a bit of trouble with my dad. Obviously there’s a lot more weed (marijuana) and stuff over here and when I first got here I tried that stuff and my schoolwork went down. My dad got angry and threatened to send me back. I then decided to get friends who were not bad with that stuff. So, I got friends that wouldn’t like forcing you to get into that stuff. Like my friends now, they’re really good. Hmmm, like we still friends today.
[Teachers]
All my teachers were very helpful. I suppose because I went to a small little school and everybody knew that I was struggling with the language. They all helped me a lot. It was great to be able to go up to them and just ask for help and stay after school or whenever to get help and support. I am glad I didn’t go to Auckland. Here it is much better than like those big schools back home… I remember how teacher wouldn’t ask me a question because they didn’t want to embarrass me because they knew that I was working out the question by translating it in my head. My friend would help me with this as well. Like in the beginning, they would ask me how I was settling in and stuff. Nah, look all my teachers were great. I really like it here. My dad likes it here as well. He was talking about checking out Perth or Brisbane. (Sigh) I don’t know, I just settled in here nicely. For the first time I am really happy in a place.

Willem

[Coming to New Zealand]
At first they didn’t really discuss it with us. A few years before we were going to move to Canada, or we wanted to. Hmmm…I don’t know what it is. It just faded and it never happened and then they brought in New Zealand. I thought maybe we could do this even though I didn’t know where New Zealand was on the map. Yeah, when they discussed this with us I was ok with it. My parents asked what we think about it and all of us just said we want to get out of here. Well, at the time…it was a lot of years of my parents planning to come to New Zealand. Finally when my parents decided it was time to get out of South Africa, my dad moved over to New Zealand for six months to find a job. You know, to get everything sorted before we came over here. I was excited because I didn’t really care about moving out of my country. I can still say it’s my country, but to say that we all stand arrogantly together, like South Africans do, and that everything will become better is just stupid. For me that is just stupid. Why should I live in a country where I can come to a place that shows me how people should live in it
and not how they...how we lived in South Africa. So, I was excited. I was happy to come to New Zealand. Me and my brothers and my family, we were all excited to move over here. My dad wasn’t particularly happy about it. He was very attached to South Africa and err ... the rest of us we were excited and couldn’t wait. At one stage my dad couldn’t get a job here. He kept getting interviews but then won’t get the job or something. At that stage he was just about to come back to South Africa and we were going to stay there. Friends of ours who lives here in New Zealand heard about it and as he was on his way to the airport they called him and told him: “Listen here; what is your problem, if you can stay here and make a better life for your family, don’t be an idiot. Stay here a bit longer and you will find something and everything will work out” He was just like: “Ok fine” and he stayed. So, I and my mother and my two brothers were excited that he decided to stay on. Yeah, that was good that he stayed on.

[Arriving]
Well, when I first arrived it was the best time of the year. Mid-summer and the weather were good. The sun stayed out till 9 o’clock. So, I was happy with the place. Living the dream. It felt like I was on vacation most of the time because New Zealand looks like a holiday resort compared with South Africa. We had nice weather before winter hit obviously. I was happy; I was excited to come to this new place. Dad told us what we could and couldn’t do. The basic laws of New Zealand. He explained it because he knew that we would explore and start finding our own way around the place. Ja, (yes) I was excited.

[Comparing schools]
There was a big difference between the two schools. My new school was a lot different than my old school in South Africa. There is a big difference in the education system from South Africa and New Zealand. I would say that was the biggest change for me when I came to New Zealand. I found the school pretty easy when I came into my class. The maths and work that I was doing in year 10, I was already doing in primary school back in South Africa because my high school was a top academic school with very high expectations. You had to work your arse off just to pass. So, when I came here, it was very, very easy. I just sat in the class and was bored out of my mind most of the time. Hmmm, Yeah, especially
science was boring, except for physics. I was never good at science but ended up top of the class in year 10 and year 11. It felt like a breeze. It probably depends on the school you came from in South Africa. Err... Probably the expectations of the different schools. Yeah... I think I was lucky to go to very good school.

Oh Yeah, the culture. I would say the spirit...I don’t know ... probably the school spirit here is crap. From primary school we sang the National Anthem every morning. Obviously with Christianity big in South Africa, we also did prayers and stuff like that. We were strong on being South African. We were proud to be South African. Basically, everyone was Afrikaans befok (Mad about the Afrikaans language). We didn’t care about any other language. It was just Afrikaans. When we sang the National Anthem in the mornings, everybody would be quiet during the other parts of the anthem but when it came to the Afrikaans bit everybody would just sing loud and proud. We raised the roof. (Laugh) Everybody was just proud being Afrikaans. When we came here it was different. They would have assemblies once a week and just ramble on about shit that is happening in school and that is it. The sports here are a joke. You get reserves and just a few parents on the side during sports for example.... Well, we were mostly Whites at my old school in Pretoria. It was a White Afrikaans school. We were proud of our language and that’s what we did. We hated the other languages. We didn’t even understand all that crap. We weren’t proud of the way the country was going. Not a lot of people in my school were proud of the government. Things are bad and it’s getting worse.

[Making new friends]

Hmmm ... It was great. I had heaps of friends already. I met these two South African girls of Facebook. They invited me to the beach and we hit it off straight away. It was really cool. I met their friends and before long I had more friends here than I had back home. All of them only spoke Afrikaans as well. It was like being back home except without the crime. So, when I went to school, I had plenty of friends already. All South Africans and we went to the same Afrikaans church as well. It was like being back in South Africa? You know what a sokkie jol (South African dance) is right? We have one every fourth night. It’s great fun and not just Boere musiek (traditional Afrikaans music) all the time. We play anything
that’s cool. I don’t know, we have so much in common being South African and all. Friends were important because they made me forget about South Africa but not all together. Do you know what I am trying to say? [Pause] Err... let me think...I don’t know how to explain it to someone. Yeah, I think that having friends around helped me to forget about South Africa. I didn’t have time to miss the place. Hmmm ... I do miss my cousins and stuff, but I don’t miss the country anymore. It is still my country and we’ll always support the ‘Bokke’ (Springboks – South African rugby team), but I have sort of moved on. Do you what I mean? Err... my friends helped me move on because it is like being in South Africa over here. We basically do the same stuff as back in South Africa. Yeah, friends are important and those two girls I met on Facebook helped me a lot to settle in.

[Talking about his new school]
Most of the students at my school were South African. They all live in Bruins Baai. (Browns Bay) (Laugh) Mostly on ‘the shore’ (Auckland’s North Shore). Err... I have other friends as well. I made friends with some Islanders and Kiwis when I played rugby for the school. They’re ok. Rugby is different here. In South Africa you play for your age group. So, I played with big guys. Here you play in weight groups. Hmmm ... it is strange how they think over here. They don’t care much for discipline. You can have your hair as long as you want and the uniform is slobbish. At my old school, they will kick your arse if you’re that slobbish. We wore ties and blazers and your shoes...Oh my God! Your shoes had to shine like mirrors. It was good I guess but I think they went a bit over-board at times. Err... Yeah, it was a really good experience here. The technology is great. Back at my old school we never use the Internet at school. We had single desks and a Black board and maybe an overhead projector. No computers. We copied everything into our books. I guess it was ok for learning and remembering stuff but this is much better. I don’t think you have to remember everything. We had to work really hard at my old school. It was like Uni is here. All you have time for is schoolwork and not much else. I struggled finding time for rugby practice. High school here was easy. I cruised all the way... [Pause]
[Things that helped or hindered learning]

Ok, let me see. I made a few notes ... Teachers helped I think. Most teachers were very friendly and very helpful. Especially if you showed an interest in your learning and you respected them. I was taught by my parents to respect teachers. I think that most Kiwi kids are just plain rude and disrespectful towards their teachers. I think that most of them will struggle with the strict discipline in South Africa. Yeah, I had a few teachers who helped a bit. Well, not all the time. ... I didn’t struggle as much as other students. It was just the English and stuff. Err ... oh yes, teachers were helpful but it was your choice really if you wanted to learn. Well, some students don’t care about much about their education. For them it was all about just having fun ... coming to school to hang out with friends and that sort of thing. It’s stupid I think. Hmmm ... in South Africa, you must know, if you fail one subject then you repeat the whole year. I made sure that I had a good balance between schoolwork and having fun. It easier over here to do that. Shit, I can’t see how anybody can fail school here in this place. They give you heaps of chances and I don’t know... (Pause) Friend also helped me a lot. My close friends helped me settle in when I arrived here. I was lucky to have a great bunch of friends at school and also outside of school. Well, like I said, most of them went to Crystal Bay College. There was always someone to talk to, especially when you need help with something.

[Final reflections]

My high school experience was great. I really enjoyed my time at XXXXX College. Maybe because I went to a top academic school that I found high school here very, very easy. Like I said before, it depends on the school you come from. Some of the schools in South Africa are shit and it’s getting worse and worse. That is why we left the place. We also left because they are all coming into our schools now. You know...the Blacks mostly. They are taking over the place. People say that our schools will end up like theirs. Shit holes with no discipline. Gosh, I am glad we left the time we did. We’re not racist or anything and it’s not our fault that the government is so flippin’ useless. Do you know that my dad still loves South Africa, but I think he is slowly getting over it now. Err ... let me think quickly. Err ... I was always going to go to University but I don’t think that high
school has not prepared me well for University. I have to work extra hard just to keep up with my assignments and stuff. I might have to give up my part-time job when I go back to Uni. It’s not difficult work… it’s just that I never manage to have much free time anymore. I think we were spoilt with getting so many opportunities to resit an assignment or exams. Hmmm… giving students too many chances to pass is stupid. It’s like dumb. That is definitely not in line with what is expected of you at Uni. Uhhm, also, we spend too much time on having to present work neatly, especially for NCEA. That is why girls get better marks than boys. They spend most of their time drawing borders and stuff when it’s a portfolio. I think that teachers like that sort of thing. They say that it shows effort. What a joke. Here at Uni you just get a cover sheet. You don’t get marks for pretty pictures. (Laugh) It’s just dumb. Think about it.
South African boys in New Zealand: Exploring the concept of identity for immigrant boys

"Increasingly we emerge as the possessors of many voices. Each self contains a multiplicity of others, singing different melodies, different verses, and with different rhythms. Nor do these many voices necessarily harmonize. At times they join together, at times they fail to listen one to another, and at times they creates a jarring discord”

(Gergen, 1991, p. 83)

Introduction

The previous chapter served as an introduction to the research participants and illustrated that the sociocultural locations that frame their talk are incredibly varied. With this contextual picture as the backdrop, I am going to examine the concept of identity for immigrant boys. The aim is to listen to what South African young men have to say about why some of them made adapting to life in New Zealand with relative ease while other immigrant boys seem to struggle to adjust to their new location. More specifically, in this chapter I wish to explore the extent to which identity construction is mediated through the values, attitudes, and cultural practices that South African boys bring with them to the interface with the dominant New Zealand culture. Of particular importance here is to examine in what ways the particularities (e.g. distinct values, attitudes, and cultural practices) that individual boys from a variety of ethnic and cultural backgrounds brought with them to the interface with New Zealand cultures mediated the construction of different masculine identities.
Thematic analysis of the one-to-one interviews tends to suggest two overarching sets of themes. It needs to be stated that these themes were not imposed, but rather captured through what the participants themselves said about their lived experiences of coming of age in New Zealand. The first set of themes, *identity uncertainty and confusion* is about the contradictions and tensions around identity formation and connectedness that bring the issues of how different boys adapt to life in a new country to light. The themes appear to show how different South Africa boys employed a number of interesting discursive moves as they explored their own cultural and ethnic identity in an effort to expand the range of identity-related goals beyond those sanctioned by the particular context in which they operated and lived. While battling with identity is not new to adolescence, the analysis seems to indicate that cultural and ethnic identity shifts were fluid and in constant flux for some boys while others experienced little or no fuss with coping with what is generally understood as a period of identity uncertainty and confusion.

The second set of themes, *boy’s friendships groups as sites for identity exploration* highlight the relationship between friendship groups and identity formation. These themes were prominent in many of the interviews and show that identity formation among teenage boys is not wholly an individual process. Rather, the close social and intimate relations with others require knowing and sharing the self. Included in this set of themes is the impression that close relationships with others are important social sites for setting and policing the boundaries for constructing ‘acceptable’ and ‘unacceptable’ forms of identities. The hallmarks of these socially constructed identities are their capacity to be fluid and that they are not always compatible with societal norms. Furthermore, the interviews tend to suggest that when adolescent boys forge close relationships with other boys, the aim is ultimately for the service of identity exploration.
Identity uncertainty and confusion

The following themes were captured by initially coding the data, analysing the codes, and then considering how different codes may combine to form an overarching theme. Collectively, they seem to show a complex picture of identity uncertainty and confusion and how powerful workings of bifurcation and dominant discourses may exclude, marginalise or demand assimilation. In particular, the themes exemplify some of the implications and costs of such exclusions, isolation, conformity and marginalisation.

When in Rome...

The following extracts appear to show how some South African boy’s rejection of their own cultural and ethnic identities, was a strategy they used to create a passage towards social inclusion. These boys viewed the adoption of their host’s cultural practices as the most adaptive mode of functioning under the current conditions of wanting to fit into their new learning and social contexts (Marcia, 1966, 1980). It appears that they negotiated a possible uneasiness with their own cultural differences by deserting their heritage cultural and behavioural practices in favour of new ones in order to smooth out the adaptation path. An example of this reasoning is evident in Peter’s account. He explained:

Everybody wants to be accepted. You have to do those things in order to be accepted. I mean, you can go home and be by yourself and with your family as much as you want. I didn’t do it in year 9 and year 10. I was always home playing video games. I wasn’t really thinking outside the box. Yeah, first party came along and I started to drink and that didn’t turn out too well for me. My parents came along and caught me in the whole act. It kind of made me think I guess. In saying how bad it was it was also good because when you go back to school you know you had a good time. I mean everyone was just more accepting of you. Yeah, people accepted you and understood you and they saw that you were part of it. You meant something to them and that was kind of good I guess.
To be accepted, I am not going to lie, I do have some Kiwi ways. Even though I knew deep down that I was doing the wrong thing. The whole time in secondary school was just to be accepted.

(Peter, Indian, arrived at age 11)

I definitely thought that the Kiwi way was the right way. We just had to go along with them. I mean, that peer pressure is everywhere. The pressure to conform is huge. You see, when I went to school it was all about friends and having a good time. I thought that if I hang out with Kiwis then everybody would accept me. So, then I just went with what they are into. [Laughs] Like they say: ‘When in Rome…’

(Dean, ‘Coloured’, arrived at age 7)

Yeah, the whole party aspect of secondary school came into play. I started getting an interest in girls. You know, the usual puberty stages, whatever. I would go to a couple of parties and drink. Binge drinking is like the norm here in New Zealand. I was turning sixteen and all my friends were partying. That kind of is the culture here. You don’t want to be like an outcast coming into a new country, so you try to fit in. I know people say that you shouldn’t give into peer pressure but you kind of have to. You try to limit yourself but you do get caught up in those kinds of situations.

(AB, Indian, arrived at age 8)

Here we see that boys as social beings, are both shaped and are shaped by their social context, with power as the centrifugal force in this process (Graff, 2010). The power of social structures involved in ideological constructions of people through discourses of race, class and gender should not be underestimated because they shape individuals’ perceptions and create knowledge regimes (Foucault, 1978, 1980), whereby particular knowledge, especially knowledge about cultural difference and hierarchy are understood and enacted. One example is an extract from Matt’s account:
It was all about an image thing and you afraid of being seen as a loner. It always matters about people’s opinions. I guess we looked to them for acceptance in a way. You don’t want to feel like an outcast. You always look for the approval of others. The opinions of Kiwis mattered because you always thought that they grew up here and they knew what was good. I trusted them quite a lot and we were kind of looking to their culture for how to behave ... I was too afraid to say how I was brought up because it wasn’t my place. So, I kind of just went along. I compromised my morals and values in a way.

(Matt, Indian, arrived at age 13)

The extracts above look as if to portray a status of Identity Diffusion among these particular boys. Their accounts give the impression that committing to an internally consistent set of values and goals was absent and that identity exploration was either missing or shallow. The boys in identity diffusion tended to follow a path of least resistance, or may have been dissatisfied with the value of what their own cultural and ethnic identity offers in a New Zealand context. In addition, the extracts show some of the accompanying complexities associated with immigration and the notion of heritage cultural and ethnic identity rejection as a legitimate strategy employed by some boys in order to gain social acceptance, particularly in school. Such instances of feeling social excluded amplify the voices of those often marginalised and questions dominant discourse of “metaphors and meanings of differences” (Enciso, 1997, p. 13) and portrays how ‘fitting in’ can be a dominant mode of experiencing the world for some immigrant boys.

‘Skinning of the self’

From an assimilationist’s perspective, blending in with the dominant culture by relinquishing one’s cultural and behavioural patterns, or participating in ‘ethnic flight’, seems like a ‘magic potion’ for marginalised immigrants. The following extract shows that what successful assimilation looks like is often defined and controlled by the
dominant group (spectator) and not by the object in gaze (immigrant) and is frequently centred around cultural terms which are highly dynamic and contextual (Graff, 2010). The notion of ‘skinning the self’ for current purposes refers to ‘minimising the differences’ both in terms of observable physical and cultural and behavioural features. For example, J.C. explained how his observable physical characteristics, in particular his skin colour, was a major barrier for ‘minimising the differences’ and becoming more like his home-grown peers:

T.W.: You mentioned earlier about your need to comply with - what you call - normal boy’s behaviour. What do you mean by that and why was it important for you to comply?

J.C.: Uhhm, I think to fit in was of the utmost importance for us immigrant boys ... I think we kinda had to adapt to what other boys prescribed. So yea if you can’t beat them you might as well join them in other words.

T.W.: Do you mind elaborating?

J.C.: I mean as a ‘Coloured’ you tend to be the focus. Everybody is watching you. People see you as different and to fit in you must minimise those differences. So, what we did was go with the flow. All the stuff Kiwis did, we did as well. Funny, but we never really hung out with them. All my friends were ‘Coloureds. So, for example, we couldn’t say that we went to church or that we’re not allowed to drink or smoke. We just did it. Obviously my parents were not happy at all. They threaten to send me back home.

[laughs] Parents don’t get it. I bet it’s tough being an immigrant for them as well. We all have to in a way become Kiwis in order to be accepted. We come here and we’re basically have no say. You have to be like a Kiwi when you with others at school and outside and then when you go home or when you go to church, then you have to be South African [big sigh] it was like I had two identities to live out.
I seems that passing the ‘litmus test’ needed for social inclusion for J.C. required a process of ‘skinning of the self’ which involved the temporary setting aside of his cultural identity when he is hanging around his peers and then picking it up again when at home or at church. His desire to fit in with his peers and his receptiveness of a cultural clash was curtailed by his physical observable characteristics and he realised that social negotiations of merely adopting the ‘Kiwi way’ and being like them is an unrealistic and problematic enactment of a new identity. The decision-making process for him was not as straightforward as simply deciding on and enacting an identity.

It clear from his account that certain identities for immigrants are habitually constructed for them by the dominant culture and that perceptions of being different is often based on large-scale discourses of ethnicity/’race’, social class, gender and country of origin. The following commentary by Musa mirrors a similar process of psychological ‘skinning’ of his cultural identities which affected almost all aspects of his social life as well:

*Being different is a challenge and if you are going to be yourself, you are going to end up being lonely. So, I started to do things that was wrong... [Pause] Not serious stuff just stuff you won’t normally do. Just petty crime stuff... you know...as well as drinking and going around with girls. I am not even supposed to drink... You know I am a Muslim and we don’t drink or use drugs and shit like that. It was odd in a way but I also had good times. I kind of lived a lie in a way. I did things that didn’t sit well with me and my religion. But you do what you have to do. Fitting it is difficult and when you stand out it can be a real challenge. You can do one of two things: Like I said earlier, you either adapt or you die. [Laughs out loud]. Seriously, it’s that simple. You either go with the flow, which I did, or you get excluded. I went the opposite way.*

(Musa, Black, arrived at age 16)
Returning to the idea of skinning the self, a number of extracts show that when immigrant boys felt socially excluded, their attempts at ‘minimising the differences’ were hindered by their inability to ‘peel off’ their skin and fit into their new environment. Some respondents mentioned that adopting a more privileged cultural identity was easier for White boys since they ‘just change their accent and become invisible’, while dark skinned nonWhite boys were unable to completely ‘skin the self’ (Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001). Minimising the differences were restricted to cultural and behavioural practices only for non-White boys. Colin’s quote personifies his struggles with identity confusion and about feeling like an outsider for looking different:

*I never felt a home here. I always felt like an outsider because of my skin colour and my curly hair. Of course I look different. I am a ‘Coloured’. I shouldn’t use that word. My mother freaks out when we say we’re ‘Coloured’s. Like my dad, she grew up during Apartheid and still hates us being referred to as ‘Coloured’s. [Pause] Tell me, what the hell are we? I am not White, I am not Black, and so what am I?*

(Colin, ‘Coloured’, arrived at age 14)

Stories of involving identity exploration with the idea of skinning the self were at times interconnected with notions of duality or dancing to two different tunes were prominent during the interviews.

*Duality and the dancing to two different tunes*

Many of the participant’s stories gave an impression that identity construction for them involved the construction of two confliction identities as they negotiated the expectations and consequences of who gets social included and who gets overlooked. A number of them were somewhat focal about having one persona when they hanged around with their friends and a vastly different identity when they were at home with their family or at involved in church activities. Both AB and John attributed part of their duality as being influenced by what they perceived it meant to be a teenage boy at the time when they attended high school:
All boys are same. South Africans are no different. You have a life at home and a life outside. All boys do that. They have different personalities at home and at school. I remember, when I was with my friends I acted differently. Thankfully I reached a time quickly when I realised that I had to take action on the needs of others. That is what my parents taught us. That is why they immigrated. My parents were always there for us. Especially my mum. We were poor and she worked hard to give us a better life here. So, I didn’t want to disappoint my mum so I never let her see the other me. The one that likes to party. So, the biggest challenge for me was to cover up my other personalities. I also want to be the man that my father gave up to give us the opportunities he never had. It’s not only an immigrant thing. It affects everybody.

(AB, Indian, arrived at age 8)

I fell into that trap myself. I acted like a typical boy when I was with my friends and then when I was with family and church people, I acted like differently. I used to attend the youth at church as well and there were some other South Africans who were in the same struggle but they conformed to this idea of being with the cool people. You just had to do it, be one of the boys and then when you with the youth – the church group, you act with respect. You act differently. Yeah, that was the plan I followed. It was difficult and confusing to be two different people. Why I did it? [Laughs] Friend mainly. Yeah, I suppose I did it to fit within my friends.

(John, ‘Coloured’, arrived at age 17)

The identities produced and performed were a continuous contestation of the meanings and boundaries of significant identities regardless of age of arrival or ethnicity. It appears that a powerful cultural identity tug-of-war took place between the selves and social expectations within the different social and public spheres which frames the daily interactions with various actors within these spheres. From the respondent’s individual accounts, it seems that the peer group especially were responsible for dominating the production of different (dualistic) identities (Minganti, 2014). James Marcia (1980) refers to this stage of identity exploration as a moratorium status and points to a process of forging dual identities from the myriad of possibilities available to the acculturating individual.
However, this preoccupation with exploring identity options and working towards commitment were not universal for all the participants. Although a large number of them reported that they felt some form of pressure to conform to the dominant cultural norms during adolescence, the majority of the White respondents pointed out that they elected to hang onto their heritage identity.

*No need to become a ‘Kiwi’*

In the literature on immigrant adaptation, the assimilation perspective continues to dominate much of sociological thinking on the subject. Central to this perspective are the assumptions that assimilation is a natural process consisting of gradually deserting old cultural and behavioural patterns in favour of new ones; and that, once set in motion, this process moves inevitably and irreversibly towards assimilation (Rong & Preissle, 2009). However, the interview data suggest that cultural flight were an option that few White boys took. For example, François spoke about how he felt somewhat pressurised to conform to cultural norms, he ‘tried out’ the host culture but decided to stick with his own cultural identity:

*I definitely felt like a South African! The kids at my school always picked on us. It was always the same stuff: your accent, the Springboks losing, apartheid. Just annoying stuff like that. But it was constant. That is why I only had South African friends. I tried the Kiwi way but it didn’t suit me at all. I refused to be sucked in by peer pressure and having to do what everybody else was doing.*

(François, White, arrived at age 10)

Both Jimmy and Willem (earlier in text) pointed out a sense of ‘racial’ pride and of being an Afrikaner. Taken together, their narratives show that the decision to distance themselves from the host and to preserve their heritage cultural identity was entirely their own doing:

*What stood out for me was the massive difference in culture. The way New Zealanders act was totally opposite to how we were brought up. The way they*
speak to teachers and their parents was wrong. But I didn’t say anything. I didn’t want to question them. I was just happy in the shadows. I just minded my own business and didn’t want to stand out. In my opinion, it wasn’t necessary to become like that. Our cultures are so different. I was happy with my own culture.

(Jimmy, White, arrived at age 16)

The collections of themes above, captured from the interviews, clearly indicate the enormous value the vast majority of South African boys placed on their ability to connect with New Zealand’s host society. Connectedness appeared to be considered by them as central to the service of their identity production and performance. The stories seems to indicate that some adolescent boys may try out a variety of possible identities for the purpose of fitting in while others are quite firmly tied to their heritage identity. It is important to note that from an adaptation point of view, the boys who followed the foreclosure pattern, adopted a single set of values and goals, usually those of their ancestral heritage. This is an important point because it contradicts the assimilationist perspective of cultural flight. Negotiating the discourses of assimilation and cultural difference meant that immigrant boys either isolate themselves from the host community or they exhibit congruent behavioural patterns that reflect the host society’s dominant norms and expectations. The strategy of ‘cultural buy-in’ was widely used by some of the boys as a means of coping with feelings of cultural and ethnic identity ‘inadequacy’ or when they felt marginalised in contentions environments where their culture were undermined (Berry, 2001; Berry, Trimble & Olmedo, 1986). Acculturation strategies were varied and often determined by how well the boys adapted psychologically and socio-culturally to their new environment. The data show that White South Africans may have chosen the separation strategy and that the largest number of boys who used integration, and to some extent marginalization, seems to be nonWhites irrespective of when they arrived in New Zealand. Despite the data failing to provide any clear evidence between age of arrival and identity work, understanding some of the issues associated with migrating identities may nonetheless be useful for teachers working with new arrivals.
Boy’s friendship groups as sites for identity exploration

Friendships are defined as interactions that endure over time and that transform the basis of reciprocal interpersonal expectations (Hinde, 1997). My interest in this topic stems from my observation of immigrant friendship groups in schools and my fuzzy understanding of how they evolve and influence identity formation and behaviour during adolescence. The young men’s stories revealed the importance of intimate male friendships. They also point to the significant role that friends played in their lives and what friendship group membership meant for them during adolescence.

Friendship group membership: ‘It’s the most important thing’

When asked about friends and friendship groups, all the participants unanimously agree on the importance of having close and intimate friends. Bob, who was one of the most vocal and forthcoming interviewees, proclaimed that ‘it’s the most important thing’, by making explicit reference to the social pressures of not having friends. All the other interviewees share his conviction.

Definitely! Friends were important because you need time out from your studies. They help get your mind off schoolwork and to settle in. But they can also be bad if you have friends that influence you. I know of a lot of students – boys and girls– who just got in with the wrong crowd and then into drugs and shit like that. I have seen good students at my old school who were highly smart and then turned out to be druggies. That is why I only had a small group of South African friends. We were mostly into cricket and video games. Yep, really friends influenced me easily but the good thing is that I never felt lonely at all. My friends kept me out of trouble because we were into sports. We were the sporty guys. You get the geeky kids and the macho, wannabees, the gangster types. But we were the guys who were into sports. The saying is true: ‘into sport – out of court. That was our motto.

(François, White, arrived at age 10)
Were friends important? I think so ... just being there I guess. Being able to fit into a group. I think we were all in the same boat. We could speak to each about our experiences. My teachers knew that I was deliberately failing to please my friends. Some of them spoke with me and told me be my best. I could tell that they knew that I could do better. But friends was important... Otherwise you’ll get excluded.

(John, ‘Coloured’, arrived at age 17)

Of course, even though I didn’t have a lot of friends when I went to school. But yes, like I said, friends were important because you need them. Especially when you’re new to a school. I felt lonely at times and my friends helped me settle in.

(Little Man, ‘Coloured’, arrived at age 14)

The aforementioned narratives are only some taken from a large numbers of commentaries which emphasise the importance of friendship group membership for South African boys regardless of ethnic or racial background. It seems that friends were important both in terms of social inclusion into the cultural mainstream as well as for creating a sense of belonging. There does appear, however, an ambivalence about what exactly intimate friendships were able to achieve with regards to adapting to life in a new country for South African boys. For instance, a number of participants repeatedly and powerfully expressed the need for group membership and for wanting intimate male friendships (Way, 2011) yet it appears that belonging to the ‘right group’ was seen as more important than just belonging to a group. Group membership seems to be more about social inclusion than friendships per se:

I spent more time on the ‘finding friends’ aspect than my schooling. That is how you get derailed with your academics. I didn’t do too well in year 9 and year 10 because I guess I was too busy finding friends. All you worry about is finding friends and fitting in. That was the whole point of school. It was just that yearning for that extra group of people. I guess I just needed a whole bunch of people...like a family unit. How do I say this? ...You know how boys join gangs...it kind of like that. That kind of mentality. I just wanted to find more
friends. You know, the more friends you have, the more you feel like you belong...or the illusion of whatever it’s called.

(Peter, Indian, arrived at age 11)

It’s the most important thing. There’s always that social pressure of not having friends. You didn’t want to be seen a loner. That wasn’t cool. Everybody wanted to feel important, and everyone feel that they want to belong. So, if you don’t have friends, it becomes difficult. Not just your social life but also your academic life, your family, everything gets affected. So, it was really important to have friends.

(Bob, Indian, arrived at age 10)

Peter’s reflection about ‘right group’ membership offers some useful insights into the implications of non-membership. Specifically, his account seems to imply that in-group membership was an important element for invoking a sense of belonging, whether or not this feeling of belonging were real or simply imagined (Kehler & Atkinson, 2010). What is also interesting about his statement is the notion of ‘the more friends you have, the more you feel like you belong...or the illusion of belonging.’ This is an important statement because it shed some light on how friendship group membership (whether real or imaginary) may provide adolescent boys with a springboard for establishing an ‘appropriate’ identity that affords them the necessary qualities and characteristics needed for social inclusion and may smooth the path for successful adaptation. Thus, identity exploration for South African boys was dominated by identity work, which involved the construction of social identities based on forming close alliances with similar others (feathering and flocking).

‘Feathering and flocking’

Ronald Akers and Gang Lee (1996) argued that boys formed close alliances with other ‘similar’ boys. Featuring and flocking generally assumes that delinquent young people simply ‘hang out’ and socialize with other young people with similar mindsets and behavioural tendencies (Akers & Lee, 1996; Hamm, 2000)
in an effort to gain cultural support for their masculine representations. Importantly, the extracts show that boys quickly learnt the ‘cultural moves’ associated with their group through a series of manoeuvres they imitate from other members of the group (Akers, 1996; Hamm, 2000; Way, 2011).

In response to the question whether or not friends were important in their lives during their time at secondary school, some of interviewees voice not only the significance of having friends for providing a sense of belonging and for reasons of inclusion, but also for reminding them of their morals. Bob’s statement is an extremely provocative one as it goes pretty much against how adults think adolescents behave. Adults are almost entirely overlooking what young people learn from them. Bob’s statement is a powerful voice on two levels. It constructs a novel-seaming version of friends as the providers of a moral consensus for behaviour rather than parents or others adults and, at the same time, it challenges essentialist thinking around teenage boys as ‘rule-breakers’ where it is the parents who set the rules and friends are the ones who influence others to go up against this regulation.

There is a lot I could say but I’ll talk more about being South African because that’s important for your study. Being a South African is difficult in New Zealand because we come from a difficult past with racism, segregation and inequality and you come to New Zealand and it is here. Apartheid, even though I haven’t experienced it myself, I did learn about it from my parents who lived through it. It makes it difficult to get along with other South Africans of different colours because of that. But for me personally, I still find it hard to get along with White South Africans. I always just feel that they’re... looking at me. Like they’re judging me. These White South Africans just blended in with other White pupils at school and became invisible. So, I think in that in a sense it was difficult for me to get along with others South Africans and that is why you’ll also find that South Africans in New Zealand is either going to hang out with the same kind of South Africans with the same colour or they going to hang out with people with totally different colour.

(Bob, Indian, arrived at age 10)
I know that we are different but we all South Africans right? I don’t know, it’s just that the whities (White New Zealanders) were always sort of reminding us that we’re not one of them; that we are different. Especially when they kinda exclude you. They always remark about your looks. Like always saying something about my hair. This one guy always says you should open a dairy or drive a taxi and then the others would laugh. That’s what White people do. So, I never socialised with White South Africans. As a matter of fact, we just stuck together. You know, I just hanged out with other South Africans. At least we had something in common.

(Matt, Indian, arrived at age 13)

The above-mentioned extracts support previous studies that noted the extent to which close friendships are seen as important in the lives of adolescent boys for intimacy and creating a sense of belonging. Both William Pollack (1999) and Niobe Way (2011) drew attention to friendship groups as opening up safe spaces of belonging, shared community for much talk and self-disclosure that could not occur elsewhere.

The stories that the respondents shared with me were intellectually and emotionally charged and echoed over and over again some of the psychosocial difficulties associated with coming of age in a new country:

So as an immigrant, I reckon it was worse for us. You do what you needed to in order to fit in. Also, it can be hard if you not used to that sort of thing. Then, unfortunately you had to learn it quickly. It not that you condone the violence, it’s just that you do what your mates do. It wasn’t all that bad because I found a place where… a group where they supported me. I guess I was lacked the self-confidence at that point. Here was a group of friends that I could relate with. They were the naughty guys who were always in trouble. There were the real bad guys like the Māori and Islanders and then there were us. We were naughty but not like those guys. They were real gangsters at school, like cribs and bloods and killer bees. They were all immigrants. I just latched on to them and became part of the group. In
a way it was good to feel finally that you belong somewhere. I became very attached to some of the guys in the group. It was cool.

(Dean, ‘Coloured’, arrived at age 7)

... That is why I only had South African friends. They were very important to me because they help you settle in. Of course, they also influenced me in a bad way. But it was good in a way otherwise I would have cracked. Friends got me through tough times at school when I felt lonely and teachers pick on you.

(François, White, arrived at age 10)

I’ve seen it at school. You can’t really blame the ‘Coloured’s for wanting to be on their own. I didn’t think that they were gangsters or anything like that. Although most people thought that they were out of control. I think that they were just a group of brown boys who were from the same place in South Africa I think, who always just hanged out together. [Pause] I didn’t mind them but I didn’t want to hang out with them. I am not racist or anything, but I just didn’t gel with them. Besides I had my own friends and the teachers hated those guys...

[Long pause] they tried too hard to fit in.

(Paul, White, arrived at age 11)

The social experience for most adolescents includes banding together in collectives with two or more other persons. Because friendships and other dyadic relationships are sometimes embedded in groups that have unique characteristics, some young men I interviewed told me how they felt that they were compelled to ‘put on a façade.’ This was done in an effort to resemble more closely the characteristics of the group they have chosen to belong to. In the interview with Steve, he described clearly how the putting on of a façade for him was ‘like playing a game”: 
Yes, we all put on a façade and learn to Uhhm... to act a certain way. I guess I didn’t really learn this. I was dealing with this all my life. You act the way you’re expected to be at home or wherever you are. Uhhm. You act the way you’re expected to be at school.

(Pause)

Let me elaborate on that. At home you’re expected to be the son – you’re expected to be, if you have younger siblings, you’re expected to be the role model. [Laugh]. Then your friends expect you to be tough and they expected me to be a certain person where as my girlfriend expected of me to be a certain person. At church, I was expected to be this holy guy. You do get good at it eventually. I feel sorry for the ones who just arrived now. I can see how they struggle with making friends. What they did sat well with the school, but not with their mates.

TW: Do you mind explaining a bit more?

Sure, I mean you turn up to class, you do your work and stuff and when your friends go to ...let’s say Mc Donald’s, you go back to class. Now teachers like you but your friends... it doesn’t gel with them. You then become isolated. You lose friends and you end up alone. That is why you must play the game. Put up a façade if needed.

(Steve, ‘Coloured’, arrived at age five months)

Where putting on a façade was seen as playing a game, it also emerged that fitting in became the primary focus of their pretence. Bob, Piet and J.C. all mentioned this notion of feathering and flocking but not being governed or framed by ethnic or racial boundaries:

It’s the cool group that everyone wants to get in with. I guess that is what I tried initially by attending the parties and doing stupid things that Kiwis do like arguing with teachers. The thing that bothered me as well, the thing that I can’t really explain...there was that pressure, even innocent people that stuck to their beliefs felt the need to be part of that group. I guess that is what it comes down to is that as an immigrant you did the things you did in order to fit in. You had to do those things to be accepted. For everybody it was about being in, being part of the moment.
But, at the time I went to school we couldn’t really fit in. We stood out because we looked different. People treated us differently. Teachers as well. That’s when I started to live in the image of someone else. All my ‘Coloured’ friends, we kinda lost our own identity and took on what was sort of a gangster rapper personality. That was our way of expressing ourselves. I acted like I was a Black rapper. So, I kinda lost my own identity and kinda like lived in the shadow of someone else.

TW: Why was that?

I don’t know, maybe I just wanted to be someone else. I was sick of being a failure. [Laughs] My parents hated it when my friends came around. My mum said that we looked like skollies (gangsters). So, we just altered our behaviour when we were around our parent but when we were outside, we were like cool again. It was living a double life. We were not even Black. We pretended to be Niggers. [Laughs] I guess it was our way of showing everybody that we deserve respect. Like showing them that we are somebody.

(J.C., ‘Coloured’, arrived at age 12)

Piet was another participant who mentioned how he put on a façade and pretended to be violent but felt uncomfortable about having to pretend to someone he is not. The aforementioned accounts tend to illustrate that by projecting identities, South African boys put on a facade not only for reasons of social expectations (Steve), public acknowledgement (J.C.), social resources (Bob), but as Piet explained, challenging existing power relations. Overall, it appears that the key task of pretence and the diverse construction of masculinity demonstrate the complex nature of hegemonizing practices (Arnot, 2002). It seems that central to these constructions were the exploration of different options to see which ‘identity match’ will offer them a better chance at fitting into their new environment.
‘That’s just what everybody did’

The centrality of identity construction through the need to ‘fit in at all cost’ or ‘do whatever it takes’ is further illustrated in the following extracts. As the different participants explained, friends often established the boundaries within which a range of social identities were negotiated and ritualistically lived out by South African boys. Paul described group norms and the impact of peer influences:

*I would do anything just to fit in. Yeah, I kinda knew that if I wanted to fit in, I had to become more like my Kiwi mates. I knew that what we were doing was wrong and that I was disappointing my parents, but ...it was hard in the beginning changing your ways just to please your friends. (Pause) I did a lot of bad stuff and things I am not proud of. [Sigh] I honestly thought that what we did was just what boys do. We were into skateboarding and tagging and drinking and stuff.*

*[Pause – sigh]*

*Now that I think about it, those guys were just dickheads. They used me in a way to do stupid things. I fell out with my dad over what I did. That was hard for me. Yeah, of course, I didn’t really think that they cared about me but still. Then, when I told them that I wanted out, they just left me. They just ignored me completely. Luckily I made some other friends at school. I moved from the skateboarding loser group and joined a group who really tried to do well at school. My new group had heaps of girls as well. That was when I started to enjoy going to school again. I am glad my eyes opened in time. I tell you that it not easy being new to a school. Too much pressure to comply.*

T.W.: *Do you mind tell me what you mean by that?*

*Uhhm, sure, it just this massive pressure to have friends and to fit in. You can speak to any teenager. Even girls. I’ve spoken to some of them and they all say the same thing. It massive, the peer pressure and to do what other kids do. You do anything to fit in. That’s not making excuses. It just what is expected of you. To behave like a big shot, to be cool and stuff. That is huge at school. Hmmm, all*
this macho, hey look at me I am cool kinda stuff is pretty normal. I went through it myself.

(Paul, White, arrived at age 11)

Peer influences are contextualised to a greater extent than his account indicates. Obviously, the extent to which conversations and modelling affect an adolescent depends on the social setting in which it occurs (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). A number of participants pointed to a possible link between the contextual characteristics of friendship groups and how these moderated the conditions under which they constructed their identities.

I did a lot of stupid things like swearing at teachers. My friends expected me to act in that way. Back chatting teachers and beating up kids were our way of showing how cool we were. It was like a game we were played among ourselves to show who was the coolest. I would never have done those things on my own. It’s all about being accepted and making sure that you continue to have friends. They can really influence you. Making you change your personality. Going from good to bad really quick. [Snapping his fingers] Quickly and you’re one of them.

I suppose that I could have done better if I worked harder instead of trying to please my friends all the time. School was a lot about friends. Thinking back, friends can hold you back; especially the ones who are lazy.

(Aromat, White, arrived at age14)

Thinking back, secondary school was tough for me because it was just about an image thing and how you try to be like everybody else. Immigration was tough for us because we didn’t know anybody here and my mum was the only one working. So if you are going to be yourself like being gay, then you are going to end up being lonely. That is something I didn't want to be. It was odd in a way but I managed to adjust ... I kind of put on this image of who I wasn’t. An image of whom other wanted me to be. This I did mostly out of fear for being excluded and bullied.

(George, ‘Coloured’, arrived at age 13)
Most relevant for this study, the above extracts support and are consistent with Erikson’s contextually focussed (i.e., psychosocial), relationally based theory of identity formation. Identity exploration for these boys can be seen as forms of social action established and actively constructed in discourse as part of navigating, negotiating, debating and engaging in an argumentative struggle around the choices of friends, beliefs, personal meanings of gender, sexuality, ethnicity, culture, nationality, and their relationships with significant others. This notion of identity struggle coincides with prior literature with similar assertions (e.g., Berry, 1998; Phinney, 2004) but the data further shows that adolescent boys are well capable of complex moral reasoning and that they do engage in critical reflection both during their time at school and when given the opportunity to recall their lived experiences. This stands in stark contrast to what was previously suggested by Kehler and Martino (2007) that adolescent boys may not be capable of interrogating their own masculine identities:

We all have to in a way become Kiwis in order to be accepted. We come here and were basically have no say. I do feel bad for the way we acted, especially towards teachers. [Big sigh] Ok, we did some bad stuff, but we come to our senses and took school more seriously. I didn’t want to be that person again. I didn’t worry what my friends thought about me. I was done trying to be someone else.

(J.C., ‘Coloured’, arrived at age 12)

Later on, I realised that all this macho stuff was just holding me back. Yeah, I just got real tired of it and eventually decided to focus on my learning. I was sick of all the back chatting and the way we treated teachers. I thought of how my parents sacrificed to bring us here and I really wanted to change. I guess everyone gets to a point where you just grow up and get serious. [Pause]...

[Smiles] It’s funny that when I tried to change some teachers still blamed me for things that I haven’t done ... I was desperate to make amends and make my parents proud. I was so stupid. I was a lot like your average teenage boy who just mucked around and stuff. Looking back now, I didn’t really think ahead then.

(Aromat, White, arrived at age 14)
Although boys ‘mucked around’ and ‘caught on crap’ because ‘that’s just what everybody did’, some adolescent boys know the boundaries of what they can and cannot do and what they should and should not be doing because of what their parents would allow. The statement made by François about this parents ‘killing’ him if he got into drugs can be interpreted as an individual who may be at identity moratorium (state or trait) on the way to foreclosure. This issue is especially important in considering moratorium for immigrant boys, which Marcia (1980) claims is for most people a transitional state, because when it comes to identity statuses, the duration of their classification determines the rate of chance. In response to critical life events (such as immigration), it seems that a normative psychological task is likely associated with an identity formulation period in which friends play a significant role:

Yes, definitely, definitely. You need friends to hang out with. You don’t want to be seen as a loner. Friends keep you in line when you want to catch on crap. So, what I did was get friendly with the popular boys and then you’re accepted. You may not always agree with their ways but at least you learn the ropes of how to act right.

(Peter, Indian, arrived at age 11)

It’s the most important thing. You need friends to help you cope with the pressures of being a teenager. There is no prescribed way of how to act as a teenage boy. Nobody tells you how to behave and what to do. I think that is one of the things that could help a lot of people. Knowing how to be a proper boy. I’m not talking about all this macho stuff. Nobody seems to teach youngsters just how to be a decent young person. That is why friends are important. They remind you of your morals.

(Bob, Indian, arrived at age 10)

Despite individual variations in the extracts, both are quite thought-provoking by indicating that their friends provided them with a moral consensus in which the members of their particular group collectively ‘drew the line’ between acceptable and unacceptable behaviours. It looks as if teenage boys analyse existing actions
and effects within the social sphere of their friendship group rather than relying on adults to provide them for guidance. Of course this is not to say that all boys live and die by peer-regulated rules. What is obvious from the respondent’s stories is that aside from the ‘handiness’ of friendship group membership in terms of smoothing the adaptation path, the social encounters of these boys occurred within organised frameworks of intimate friendships that comprise interlocking
relationships framed by specific rules around what is deemed suitable and improper behaviours.

**Conclusion**

By putting identity exploration at the centre of attention for understanding adaptation issues better, the interview extracts demonstrate some of the complexities of (dis)belonging for immigrant boys a bit more accurately (Anthias, 2012). The foregoing interview extracts offers a rare glimpse into the often hidden lives of South African boys by mapping identity construction as telling a powerful story of how the “**who I am is constantly defined by where I am, who I am with and how I am defined by whom is different (or similar) to me**” (Fay, 2004, p. 173). Through the notion of identity as a social construct, the stories that emerged from these interviews point to several layers of meanings of (dis)belonging and identity and how being a South African adolescent boy were constructed and experienced.

The analysed data suggests that youth adaptations for South African boys was a complex and heterogeneous process and that the identities they constructed were not fixed but re-negotiated and recreated discursively within the context of acculturation. The data also demonstrates that identity formations are inherently relational. It shows that cultural and ethnic identities for South African boys were defined through ‘social mirroring’ and in the possibilities offered to them in their social relations with significant others, and that the identities they formed corresponded directly with their particular South Africanness. It does seem, however, that as
these boys progressed through secondary school, social exclusion did not seem to be too overwhelming for them and were outweighed by the gains of social inclusion within their own friendship group. Moreover, there are some evidence to suggest that by employing a number of different strategies for handling the complexities of identity formation and for developing a sense of self-worth in their changing world brought about a greater ease in adaptation and paved the way for ‘getting through.’
South African boys in New Zealand: Exploring the interplay of immigration, masculinity and schooling during adolescence

“The main demand on boys from within their peer culture (but also, sometimes from teachers) ... is to appear to do little or no work, to be heavily competitive (but at sports and heterosex, not at school work), to be rough, tough and dangerous to know”

(Epstein, 1998, p. 106)

Introduction

The previous chapter has shown that South African boy’s diverse cultural and ethnic identities can provide supportive roots but also limiting stereotypes as they made their way in New Zealand society. In this chapter, I will explore the issues relating to immigration, masculinity and sexuality during adolescence for these boys. One of the main recent theoretical areas of concern within gender studies has been the essentialist – constructionist debate. In short, essentialists assume that gender and masculinity (and femininity) have an essence and can be found across societies and histories as a universal form (Plummer, 1999, 2005). By contrast, this study takes a social constructionist approach and assumes that there is no universal essence of gender but rather discursively constructed. Thus, the aim of my study is to examine more closely the ways in which South African boys negotiated, navigated, resisted, contested and challenged the powerful discourses about them that operated in their environment, and how the ‘boys will be boys’ discourses in particular manufactured their masculine identities.
Alongside exploring the formation of masculinities in general, I will be focussing specifically on the ways the dynamics of school life mediated the conditions under which South African boys acquired their identities, and what are some of the tensions and contradictions within these migrating masculine identity formations. One of the crucial inquiries for researching masculinity and sexuality has been the necessity of examining how gender regimes in schools are implicated by societal expectations. As both Connell (1992) and Mac an Ghaill (1994) pointed out, secondary school enters the picture at this very critical life stage and its impact on the construction of gendered identities has to be understood in this context. It follows then that I will be examining the relationship between schools as institutional sites of gender identity contestation and the setting of boundary demarcations for the formation and control of certain forms of migrating masculinities (Connell, 1989).

‘Boys will be boys’

A prominent set of themes, normalizing and regulating masculinity(ies), resurfaced repeatedly during the (re) reading of the interviews and tend to suggest that cultural messages around what it means to be a ‘normal’ and a ‘real’ boy are central features of the processes of normalisation and regulation involved in prioritising certain ‘privileged’ masculinities as the norm for adolescent boys. The personal stories embedded within the following sub-themes illustrate how large-scale discourses of ‘boys will be boys’ support and promote the presence of ‘truth’ in ideal masculine stereotypes and practices of masculinity among immigrant boys.

‘It’s just what teenage boys do’

Taken together, what the interviewees’ stories seem to have done was to map how dominant discourses of gender are put to work and how effectively these discourses shape young masculinities as both natural and learned. The young men who participated in this study spoke of how, at their every-day level, a masculinist
ethos, that privileges natural male traits, is exemplified in ‘common-sense’ masculine ideals as natural and irrefutable (Whitehead, 2006). The most telling examples of this ideal male representation were captured in the following extracts:

*It’s just what teenage boys do. You know what I mean … just normal boy’s stuff. It wasn’t all bad stuff… mostly verbal stuff, like mocking and making fun of others. [Pause] Yeah, there were fights as well. At times, it got serious and people got hurt … Being staunch was a big part of growing up as a boy. You definitely didn’t want to be seen as sissy. Hell man that was a one of the biggest no-no. There was also drugs and drinking. Drinking was massive at school. Everybody got stoned at the weekend.*

(Dean, ‘Coloured’. arrived at age 7)

*… It’s what was expected of you. There was an expectation to behave like a big shot, to be cool and stuff. That was huge at school. Hmmm, I remember all the focus being placed on being macho, like: ‘hey look at me I am cool.’ That sort of stuff was pretty normal at school. I went through it myself.*

(Paul, White. arrived at age 11)

Although South African and ‘Kiwi’ (New Zealand) masculinities have been represented and performed in various ways, historically both ‘Southern masculinities’ are characterised by complementary masculine martial ideal of being aggressive, fierce and staunch, especially during military and sporting encounters. Both South African and New Zealand masculine ideals embody honour and dedication to mateship, except the South African male appears to be more rooted in religious and family ties. It seems that the performance of acting macho is probably one of the most popular contemporary representations of Kiwi masculinity in New Zealand. The perpetuation of staunchness and sporting prowess by the mass media preserves boys becoming manly men as a cultural institution by putting up the Jocks as the masculine ideal to strive for:
The Jocks (macho boys) were the popular guys and everybody respected them. Hmmm, we were expected to behave like them. It’s not like you’re told or anything. It just that you’re made to believe that they are really the cool guys. Most of them were just dumb guys, who were good at a sport that’s all. But so many boys wanted to be like them. Hmmm, Yeah, you had to act like a man all the time. Like being tough and not like sissies.

(Jimmy, White. arrived at age 16)

Acting macho was quite a big focus for boys. That’s how you got told to behave. It was everywhere in my school. Every boy acted in a macho way. Like you don’t want to be seen like acting like girlish. That wasn’t cool ... So, many of the boys went to a gym to bulk up so that they could fit in with the rest. That was the culture of the school. Everybody wanted to appear to be staunch and tough.

(John, ‘Coloured’. arrived at age 17)

Among the respondents, several used the phrase: “you know what I mean” in the same way as an important statement which they seem to imply a shared understanding of what boys are like. For instance, Dean’s use of the phrase “It just what teenage boys do. You know what I mean ... just normal boy’s stuff” indicated both his very own conviction of how he understood ‘boys will be boys’ and his desire for my ‘approval.’ However, his present awareness that violence and staunchness are not quite ‘natural’ boy’s behaviour, became obvious as he concluded that: “It not that you condone the violence, it’s just that you do what your mates do”.

‘Doing what your mates do’, is an important statement because it emphasises the essentialisation of masculinities (or femininities) by ‘reproducing’ gender stereotypes as irrefutably natural and normal. It seem, then, that when an immigrant boy makes a statement such as ‘it’s just normal stuff boys do’ it may well depict the ideological positionings of masculinities as both social and contextual practices learned through rites of initiation and passage. For instance, and judging from the sheer number of responses concerned with the ideal
masculine mode and what it means to be a ‘real boy’, there would appear to be no significant difference between the meanings of ‘expected’ masculine behaviours for boys who arrived here at an earlier age compared with those who arrived here at a later stage during the onset of adolescence.

With the juxtaposition of age of arrival, it does appear to some degree that most of the late-arrivals may have committed to certain migrating masculine identities without having gone through a process of exploration. Limited exploration may have been exacerbated by constructing forms of migrating identity other than those prescribed by social pressures or pressures to conform, and can potentially be seen as contradicting the ideal masculine mode as demonstrated by their peers for example. However, conforming to notions of peer-mediated masculinities were frequently articulated during the interviews as those that must be lived and displayed to one’s peers in order to gain acceptance. The following extracts from Garry and John illustrate how immigrant boys felt obligated to attract the right sort of peer attention by constructing and performing ‘appropriate’ masculinities:

Sure we got into trouble for mucking around, but that was just what everybody did. You don’t really care about what happens; all you care about is what your friends think of you.

(Garry, White. arrived at age 11)

Everybody acted manly when they with their friends; they didn’t think ahead of the consequences that would come. I believe that it was all about finding yourself and finding where you belong.

(John, ‘Coloured’. arrived at age 17)

Strikingly the extracts highlight how the notion of ‘what boys are like’ takes on a familiarity that seems to deny other versions and alternative representations of what a teenage boy could be like. The real question is how a statement such as: ‘mucking around was just what everybody did’ is able to construct such a powerful and real-seeming version of what boys (including immigrants) are
supposed to be like, and more importantly, copying how they see other boys behave (Wetherell & Potter, 1992). In fact, this statement illustrates clearly how the speaker’s linguistic choice reflects much of the complexity of power relations and how understanding of what it meant for him to be a ‘real’ boy privileges certain groups to help sustain the function that dominant discourses of ‘boys will be boys’ provide adolescent with the reification for how to behave ‘appropriately.’ These selective behaviours may well be in line with or against the expectations of parents, teachers and society as a whole.

Rough, tough and dangerous to know

Earlier chapters confirm that migrating identities are highly plural and reveal the multiple intersections of self, place and time through the continual navigation and negotiation of dominant discourses of assimilation. Migration literature, however, seldom give an explanation of what makes immigrant boys take up certain identity choices that they pick from. Where do these migrating identity choices come from? Like Sinclair-Webb (2000) argued, “refusing to engage with essentialist notions of gender among others is akin to ignoring or underplaying the power of dominant cultural values which in all societies generally prove harder to resist than to incorporate” (p. 13). The interviews tend to suggest that trying to escape the essentialisation of ‘rough, tough and dangerous to know’ may be incredibly difficult for some immigrant adolescent males because large-scale discourses have a way of creating and reflecting societal norms as legitimate or truthful (Inglis, 1982). The following extracts show how immigrant boys get caught up as well in the whole reproduction of adolescent male stereotypes as ‘dangerous to know’:

We had guys who just pick fights with anybody for no reason. They just go around and pick fights to show off their ‘manliness.’ It was disgusting behaviour... I never got into any fights myself and I tried to avoid that sort of thing. Being good at fighting, they thought that they were cool. Well, you look what’s on telly and in the movies. Violence! I don’t think that it is good to have those expectations of how to be tough and macho. What annoys me is that they
think that they can get into a fight and look tough, but they don’t think of the consequences.

(Mark, White. arrived at age 14)

The construction of boys as inherently violent and connecting male aggressiveness with innate behavioural patterns rather than a discursive construction is an example of common-sense claims that violence and challenges for dominance are natural and, therefore, unavoidable. Certainly, this perspective fails to question the legitimacy of understandings that boy’s violent, dysfunctional and oppressive behaviours as ‘natural.’ What the respondents recalled and how they positioned them in these recollections draw attention to thinking around biological explanation for some of the male characteristics such as aggression and violence as normal and natural in many ways legitimise violence in schools and other social contexts (Whitehead, 2002):

Hmmm... Yeah, I never used to bother anybody, but later on I started to get into fights. This happened all the time, especially when I was stoned. I guess that was my way of adapting. Showing how manly I was. It was just a way of showing that you’re not scared of other boys. If you show that you’re scared, you are going to get picked on and bullied. The way I saw it was to show them that I was willing to get hurt and that you’re willing to get into trouble. Once you do that then they kind of accept you in a way. Not totally but at least you’re seen as a real man. Hmmm, back home it’s the same. It’s probably worse as well. There you have to prove you’re a man by living in the bush and you learn to survive by learning from the older people. [Pause] You learn to stick fight and how to really hurt someone with a kierie (baton). [Laughs] Yeah, I still struggle with fitting in ...

Being different is a challenge.

(Musa, Black. arrived at age 16)

Violence is always there and it has always been there. I don’t know where it came from. Most South Africans at my old school were fighting because they thought that they’re cool and strong. They don’t understand violence. If you live in South Africa, you can understand violence. What annoys me is that they think that they can get into a fight and look tough, but they don’t understand violence. [Pause]
Another expectation was that boys don’t cry. Just harden up and don’t show your emotions. I think that is both a South African and New Zealand expectation. I have noticed over the last few years that here in New Zealand it is easing away or the acceptance of it. Everyone has hard days and emotional issues and men...boys should be taught that it is ok to cry. I still do it. You don’t have to be staunch.

(Bob, Indian. arrived at age 10)

These discourses embedded in the young men’s stories reflect ongoing processes of individualisation taking place in globalised societies, the ‘local me’ and the ‘global me’ do not co-exist independently but rather interconnectedly (Abbott-Chapman & Robertson, 2009). It shows that ‘tribal’ viewpoints and identities are sometimes hard to shift. Recognising masculinity as highly complex, one should not turn a blind eye to boy’s agency and the historical and global influences that help shape masculinity. A number of extracts show that, irrespective of the location (whether in South Africa or New Zealand), societal expectations of ‘rough and tumble’ remains a real challenge for adolescent boys. The struggles of coping with the demands of immigration and adolescence when there are so many other factors that impact the construction of masculine identities at the same time.

Making a case for both the complexity of masculine formation for young migrants and how issues of immigration and adolescent development intersects are demonstrated in the psychological impact that bullying and discrimination had on some boys. Piet’s account provides personal insights into how he adopted a staunch and violent facade to help him cope with settling into his new school because he did not wanted to appear weak and an easy target for bullies. Somewhat remarkably, it appears that migration literature continues to pays scant attention to the interplay between immigration and sexuality, particularly looking at the experiences of those immigrant youths who might be perceived as ‘sexually deviant’.

‘It is cruel how they get treated’

Homophobia was a powerful theme that was captured during analysis work. As others have shown, engaging in face-to-face discussions with young people may
well offer a medium through and with which one is able to map the complex ways in which they shape, contest and resist different sexual identities. For instance, my discussion with Colin seems to underpin an argument that self-stories are able to explore the specific gender regimes in operation in schools, and the gendered subject positions that are made available to boys. The following extract highlights how talk became the medium through which boys were able to demonstrate their understandings of gender and sexuality. It also shows how discourses of heteronormativity construct hegemonic and prejudicial knowledge which young people may draw on to inform their understandings of what being gay or straight means for them.

... I remember those Roman sandals they made us wear. I hated those so much and just refused to wear them. Some boys in my class wore them; they looked really gay. Especially the senior boys looked stupid. If you wear that crap stuff in Cape Town, they will moer (assault) you.


You know the people in SA (South Africa). The kids in school; they will think that you’re a fokken moffie (fucking homosexual) wearing those sandals.

T.W.: Why is that?

It just was. Nobody respects moffies. People look down at you. It’s like you useless, not a real person. I mean being gay is stupid. I don’t think it’s normal.

T.W.: What in your opinion is normal?

I don’t know, I suppose being the way God made us. You know – man and women. I don’t think it is normal to have sex with another man. Shit, how can that be normal? Here in New Zealand they tolerate it but that doesn’t make it normal. I had a friend in S.A. who was a moffie. He was gay since he was young. His family tried to hide it from others but he kept wearing high-heel shoes and lipstick and talked like a girl.

T.W.: Why did his family try to hide his sexuality?
Shit, they were embarrassed. Nobody wants a moffie in his or her family. His brothers even tried to moer (physical beating or hiding) it out of him. He was fine for a while until he went to secondary school and started hanging out with moffies again. Moering him didn’t help; I think that his family sort of accepting him now. I hope that my kids won’t turn out like that.

T.W.: Why is that?

It is cruel how they get treated. Not just at home but also in school; everywhere. Besides, I don’t know if I can live with that. Ja (yes), I realise that times have changed and that we are expected to treat everybody the same, but I don’t know. I just hope ... [pause] ... I don’t think it’s right. I kinda hate moffies. [Pause] I am sorry. I remember how they just had to keep to themselves all the time otherwise they get beaten up. [Sigh] Hmmm, I don’t know what to say anymore.

(My interview with Colin shows discourses of normalization at work and how hegemonic processes of normalization are able to support and maintain gender hierarchies. Although, he was talking about South Africa, it nonetheless, illustrates how regimes of normalization suggest that homosexuality is ‘unnatural’ and offers young people a certain version of gender identity and gender reality appear solid, factual, stable and above all, normal (McCormack, 2012; Wetherell & Potter, 1992). The following extracts from George, Paul and Jimmy tell a similar story about homophobia in New Zealand secondary schools. Their accounts exemplify how adolescent boys are engaged in ongoing processes of reflection and show how some South African boys reflected upon their own sexuality and other familiar types of sense making devices that form a taken-for-granted basis for policing of sexual boundaries at school. The key issue of sexual discrimination, that were captured in the (re)reading of the interview transcripts, establishes that gay students were often constructed and (re)presented as ‘abnormal’ in comparison with straight students, particularly at high school:
Fighting and bullying was quite normal at my school and I suppose at other schools as well. We targeted the faggots especially. But not just in school. Violence against gays and faggots was also common outside of school. It’s just what some boys did. I think that everybody kind of socially accepted violence towards faggots. It’s not just the bullying, but the name-calling and how they got excluded. They never got invited to any of our gigs. They just kind of hung out by themselves. Being gay was by far the worst thing in school. Everybody picked on you constantly, even more than the dumb guys.

(Paul, White, arrived at age 11)

It seems that violence towards gays by the Jocks is a two-fold responds to masculinity at school. It sanctions feminine behaviours as ‘unnatural’ but at the same time bore similarities to the masculine martial ideal of warrior-like and heroic by exaggerating hyper-masculine characteristics in their public personae, in order to prove themselves and be respected by their peers (Morrell, 1998). Some narratives suggest that the Jocks’ policing of appropriate masculine ideals is a legitimate cultural institution in schools that aims to preserve masculine values and passes them on to younger boys and newcomers:

I do remember how some of the Jocks would pick on you constantly if you behaved like a girl in any way. They would say stuff like: ‘Man up bitch’ and this was the same inside and outside of school. [Pause] I just stayed at home weekends because it didn’t suit me. I didn’t like all this macho stuff. The jocks also picked on the guy boys. The fafas (Polynesian term for homosexual boys) just to give them a hard time. Oh my God, it was like those guys were like dictating the rules. I have nothing against fajas or whatever you call them. Whatever makes people happy ... [laughs] it’s funny how they didn’t care about girls hooking up. The lesbians just walked hand-in-hand and kissed in front of everyone. Nobody gave a shit. But the gays got a lot of stick. [Sigh] I don’t know what the hell is going on with people.

(Jimmy, White. arrived at age 16)

A lot of time was spent on getting up to speed to play for the school team. If you didn’t measure up, the Jocks (macho boys) would sort you out. They were big
boys and we were little compared to them. So, we worked hard to be like them. I was fast and that helped earn their respect. Hmmm, we were expected to behave like men all the time. Being tough and not like sissies… If you didn’t live up to expectations, the Jocks would call you names and worse… They would beat you up and make you feel excluded. They can make anyone feel like an outcast. The Jocks ruled the school and most of them were perfects as well. They all came through the system themselves.

(Willem, White. arrived at age 15)

Even more disconcerting was my discussion with George. His story show that secondary schools continue to be frightening and dangerous places for some boys, especially gays and seem to perpetuate socially-accepted sanctioning for those boys who are perceived as ‘sexually deviant.’ George’s firsthand account illustrates how he felt compelled to hide his sexuality at school out of fear and made adaptation for him even more complicated and stressful when compared with other immigrant boys:

I felt totally disconnected with school and stuff. I mean I didn’t feel that anybody could connect with my issues and me. Back home you felt a part of everything that was going on. I never felt what it was like to experience that, and I guess that affected my learning. Because I was more focus on fitting in than what I was on schoolwork. Yep, I felt kind of lost and stuff…

T.W.: Why was that?

(Laughing out loud) I am gay. You can probably tell. So, I like to dress up. Dressing up was probably the way … dressing up with other stuff and the school uniform. I particularly broke the school rules in order to connect with people and wanting to attend parties and things. I must have been around 15 when I started to drink and you just did it because everybody did it and it was the cool thing to do and if you were in with a group nothing else mattered. I guess as I went through year eleven, twelve and thirteen, I managed to become a bit more bold and I thought I connected with the other kids in the same way… but I didn’t … I was always wary of what they were going to think of me when they found out that
I was gay. [Pause] Worse, what they would do to me. I’ve seen how they treat gays. It’s really mean the way they treated them. In a way, I turned my back on everything my mother taught me. She always told me to be whatever I wanted to be, and not to let people tell me otherwise. (Long pause) .... You either got mocked or you got excluded. That is not a nice feeling. You see, words do hurt and as much as you try to...a comment of someone do hurt you. You cannot control that. It was best to avoid it. Just do the wrong thing and try your best to avoid it. I guess that got me out of my shell. Well in year thirteen I stop pretending anymore. I just came out and I now I am happy with who I am. I couldn’t care less. I knew that it was ok to come out as I was going to leave school anyhow.

(George, ‘Coloured’, arrived at age 13)

George’s account points to an internalised tension around his own subjectification as ‘gay as straight’ within a sexist school marked by either pervasive cultural expectations or sexual prejudices against deviancy. Specifically, this becomes clear if one is to interpret what George said: “I was always wary of what they were going to think of me when they found out that I was gay. Worse, what they would do to me. I’ve seen how they treat gays. It’s really mean the way they treated them. ... In a way I compromised my values and my morals.” His narrative shows that social expectations around expected sexual behaviours often place gay students in vulnerable positions, socially and culturally (Farahani, 2012). The compromising of his values and morals can be seen as a form of consenting or submitting to dominant forms of sexuality. Being gay meant he had to occupy a subject position that would attract social isolation at best and physical violence at worse. It appears that within the constructs of oppression, domination and power relations, George’s negotiation of different social identities were created through tensions evoked through an uneasiness with proclaiming that his sexual orientation.
Schools and the making of manly men

Learning to become a ‘manly’ man at school

The respondents’ stories reflect and support the notion that schools are important sites for contestation and collective assertiveness concerning demeaning stereotypes and stigma and central to formation of school masculinities are the elements of power, perspective and positioning which shape these constructions (Giroux, 2003). In what follows, part of Peter’s story show that central to masculine identity construction among adolescent boys is a tension between how certain forms of masculinity are defined and valorised:

Looking at that from the perspective of ... you’re not the Jock but you want to be like that because they were respected by the teachers and the principal. That is why I wanted to be like them. You might not be academically inclined but you want to be like them, so you strive to be like a Jock. You try to be like them because you know you get respected in school. You get the friends...you get the good package deal, where if you’re the intellectual sitting in the corner with books... at my old school, the smart kids really didn’t get a second look ... honestly, you don’t take a second look...that was bad. I mean, those people who were doing well academically and who were just sitting in the corner, didn’t get a second look. Also, if you’re not much into co-curricular activities, you didn’t get a second look by teachers. But they are the ones going home and studying. They weren’t causing any problems outside of the school. They do everything right, where those guys, the tough top sports guys, most of the time they were the ones laying on the side of the road drunk. I’ve seen it so many times. I’ve been to the parties and I’ve seen them. I’ve witnessed them drunk. If the teachers could have seen them in this kind of aspect of life, their natural form, their natural way of behaviour. How did they show you that much respect at school? It doesn’t make sense if they had to see you like that. So, they were putting on a show. That is all they had to do, that is all you had to do. You are practically learning this. You see this and if you want to be in, then you have to learn this. Obviously, you can’t be in the top rugby team but you can still mess around after school to be accepted by them. If you hang around with them after school and the teacher comes along and talk to the Jocks and you’re there, the teacher would like: ‘Oh,
who are you?’ and you get recognized. That is how you get known. Inside school, that is one way of getting known. Then outside you can be a rebel without a cause wanting to fit in.

(Peter, Indian. arrived at age 11)

During the interview, Peter described in detail how he tried to form a sense of self through a tumultuous period of cultural change and how he struggled with the decision to ‘branch out’ and embrace the normative identity performances as a form of empowerment (Cheng & Berman, 2012). For example, he stresses hanging out with the Jocks at school was one way of getting recognized, getting known. Peter partially resist the Jocks way of life but still wants to use the privileges of being associated with them to allow the path to adaptation and fitting in to be smoothed out significantly. It seems that fitting into their new school environment for immigrant boys was mostly about living up to social expectations of ‘doing boy’ in appropriate and acceptable ways:

It’s only in secondary school that you are meant to be tough all year round, 365 days a year, 24/7 you have to be tough. If it happened at high school I would have been called a ‘pussy’ or something like that. We just had to live up to the expectations of society.

TW: What happens if you can’t live up to societal expectations?
I think it was very difficult for some boys to live up to the masculine expectations and for them to be strong all the time. I think of it as one of two ways. One, they can embrace it and accept it and focus on your other strengths. That’s why in secondary school I went the other way. I could have easily gone the violent way.

(Bob, Indian. arrived at age 10)

Navigated the ‘boys will be boys’ discourses at school appears to be rather fluid in nature and in their perceptions around what is deemed acceptable boys’ behaviours were in constant flux. Weighing up the benefits of certain masculine identities and then deciding which construction suited their adaptation needs best was a common thread running through the extracts. What is particularly interesting is the way
in which a number of young men described how they devised cognitive strategies that provided them with feeling in control of their social identities during their time at school. Discussions further reveal that South African boys deliberately constructed divergent forms of masculine identities that stood in stark contrast from the expectations of social norms:

_Hmmm ... masculinity was big. Acting like a man was big...especially when it came to rugby. One of the big things that affect boys and how they behave is how schools allow them to get away with. At my school, they didn’t worry too much about what is happening outside the classroom. They just turn a blind eye to what was really going on school. I am talking drugs and stuff and what was happening on the weekends. It didn’t stop there. Some boys were out of control and they got away with it. That was another big factor that influenced how boys behave. Stupid. .... Like I said before. I wasn’t very popular at school and just flew under the radar. I hanged out with a group of friends that also did not apply themselves either. I just tried to fit in. I tried the drinking scene but my parents were strict and I could see the point of going against them. I knew that I was going to be singled out if I acted differently. _Hmmm, I just took a wait and see approach. Acting manly all the time was big and everybody was doing it. There was nothing else to do. Of course, drinking. Drinking was big as well. If you don’t drink and act macho, then you stand out. _Hmmm, it didn’t bother me. I didn’t care. I just stick to the background. It wasn’t the stuff I was into. _Hmmm, I had a couple of friends who felt the same and we stuck together._

(Jimmy, White. arrived at age 16)

Yes, there were expectations from the school and from your parents. Obviously, those were the main ones but there were expectations from your friends. I guess there were pressures coming from all ways. The school was so focussed on academic achievement. Every day there was this message that had to be heard. There was no way to outrun that. I became careless and I guess that is where the
cool kids came into play. They didn’t care and we were really just a bunch of losers but that was cool (laugh). That was all right because we had each other.

(George, ‘Coloured’. arrived at age 13)

Examining the power struggles connected with constructions of masculinity through the lenses of and intersections of immigration, masculinity and schooling, the aforementioned extracts seems to illustrate that schools can be sites where boys learn to be manly men. The extracts also show that school are institutional sites that operate for the selection and de-selection of masculinities, and for the allocating of boys to different levels in status hierarchies of subjectivities. The analysis seems to indicate that, regardless of race and ethnicity, masculine manifestations of migrating masculinities are often a reflection of the relationship between thought and action as indicators of masculinity constructions for the purposes of fitting in. The respondents’ stories show that secondary schools continue to be frightening and dangerous places for some students and what is perceived as ‘normative’ boy’s behaviours may well make the lives of immigrant males even more complicated as they adapt to their new country.

‘A lot of time went into sports’

The majority of those I interviewed mentioned how their school focussed heavily on sport as a visible measure of ‘manliness.’ They readily spoke about how the social category of being a real man was epitomised by being good at playing sports by both staff and students. Interestingly, the extracts show this to be the case irrespective of whether or not the school was co-educational or single sex, high or low decile and inner city or rural:

It was different for me at my previous school. It was a private school in Hamilton. I didn’t like it there because it was just about rugby and that sorts of stuff. I got bullied for being too smart and so my parents took me out. Also, I think that it’s not so much about looking different than it was about acting differently. You can maybe get away with looking different but not if you sort of
refuse to go along with what the school wants, then you in trouble. Like if you’re not into sport then it’s difficult to fit in. Thank goodness that crap is behind me now.

(Mark, White. arrived at age 14)

A lot of time went into sports. I don’t want to judge my old school but all they interested in is sports and getting their name in the newspaper. If you’re not good at sports or if you’re not smart, then you’re basically a ‘nobody’. And of course, the focus was on having to be the best at everything, like sports and all this competitive stuff. Its kids who didn’t do well at sports that simply got lost in the system. Your average kid, who could not live up to the sporty expectation, just got ignored. It was that stupid.

(Jimmy, White. arrived at age 16)

That is why you must do something that will help get you in. Like playing a sport. I just gave anything a go if I needed to. I did what I thought was going to get me in, and what was going to get me noticed. I played rugby for the school. First fifteen. [Laughs] You really get noticed if you’re in the top team. Even though nobody wants to stand out, everybody wants to fit in and belong. [Laughs] I liked the attention. Hmmm, you didn’t want to stand out for the wrong reasons either. That was a line you didn’t wanted to cross. You didn’t want to stand out for being a dumb-ass or for being stupid. It was a real challenge for those guys who were not into sports and stuff, or even just not into doing stuff that other guys did.

(Steve, ‘Coloured’. arrived at age five months old)

Given the particular contextual fluidity in the construction of school masculinities, it appears that nonWhite boys, who felt that they were failed to fit in by being implicated in discourses of ‘difference’ turned to sports for redemption. One of the participants, J.C., who identified himself as ‘Coloured’, talked about how he and his ‘Coloured’ friends turned to football as an ‘escape hatch’ for when they felt like academic ‘failures’ in class. Similarly, George’s utterances were imbued with intentionality of ‘othering’ and how he turned his attention to rugby when school became ‘unbearable’ for him:
We looked at most of the Asian students in my class and they were all smart, and that kinda made us feel inferior to them. We were never going to be as smart as them. So, when they put us in the same groups with the Asian students, it sort of said that they are the smart ones and we are the dumb ones. Looking stupid kinda disrupted my learning as well. Putting us all in one class... so by doing that everyone just became absent-minded. We were all kinda like just there for the sake of being there. Because we were seen as the dumb group, we didn’t really go to class to learn. In that sense, we turned to football. ‘Coloured’s might not be good at learning and stuff but we are good at football. [Laugh]That was our way of proving that we’re just as good as them. That was what got me through school in the first place. Football and friends. [Laughs]

(J.C., ‘Coloured’. arrived at age 12)

So when teachers treated me bad and school became unbearable, I just focussed on rugby. That was all I thought about. Like I would I sit in class and couldn’t wait for lunchtime so that we could play a game of rugby. That was my way of coping with secondary school.

(George, ‘Coloured’. arrived at age 13)

Although, other social processes and practices may also account for policing masculine boundaries, the discourses embedded in the respondents’ speeches suggest that schools are placing such heavy demand on boys to be competitive in all facets of school life including enthusiasm for sports. The stories seem to suggest that schools may be implicated in the ‘boys will be boys’ discourses, and as a consequence, are acting as major masculinity-making devices in the lives of adolescent boys as they go about negotiating and navigating the cultural messages around how gender identities should be envisioned and lived out. Like Mac an Ghaill’s ‘Macho Lads,’ it appears that some South African boys have also rejected the official three R’s (reading, writing and arithmetic), and instead opted for playing sports as an ‘escape hatch’ from issues of classroom exclusion. Although, they did not go for the 3 Fs (fighting, fucking and football), they did construct social identities that they thought would equip them with values better suited for
social inclusion. Being talented at sports seemed to serve the purpose of being seen as ‘anti-school’, tough, and having a good time (Mac an Ghaill, 1994).

Pedagogically-mediated masculinities

A recurring theme, *pedagogically-mediated masculinities*, was captured during the (re)readings and analysis of the interview transcripts. This theme seems to suggest that identity formation develops through complex intersections of student and teacher beliefs, attitudes, behaviours and social interactions, which in turn, appears to produce the boundaries for masculine identity demarcations (Mac an Ghaill & Haywood (2011). Regardless of whether or not immigrant boys’ stories of prejudice are inaccurate or imaginary, their recollections solidifies a need to take a more concerted look at student-teacher professional relationships and issues of adaptation:

> There were times when I wouldn’t complete my homework, and my teachers would just regard it as laziness. There was this one teacher, in particular, she was totally racist and wouldn’t actually ask: ‘do you need help with this.’ We just got mucked around in class. There was no point in doing any work because the teachers didn’t really care about us. [Pause] Most teachers were like that. You would think that they will know better. Most of them didn’t like immigrants. You could tell. Not all of them, but definitely most of them.

(Matt, Indian. arrived at age 13)

I don’t know how to explain it. It was like they didn’t notice us, me mainly. It felt weird. Teachers were treating me like I wasn’t even there. [Pause] I hope it never happens to anybody else. It really hurt my feelings. [Pause] Forgetting to hand me things, specifically not handing me stuff. Like not even noticing that I am wagging school and stuff. Like if you not there for a whole week they don’t even care. They never ask me: ‘where have you been. Were you sick or something.’ They just left me alone. [Pause] It made me really angry, and I wanted to show them that I wasn’t this person that they thought I was. But I just stayed quiet and didn’t speak to them. I couldn’t wait to leave school. [Pause] It made me very shy. It made me feel angry. Sometimes I felt very angry. Sometimes
I felt like hitting the teacher. Nah, I never actually did that. [Long pause]... I felt down most of the time.

(Nicholas, ‘Coloured’. arrived age 10)

Perhaps a couple of subjective accounts do not prove that structural and institutionalised forms of discrimination against various groups is present in New Zealand schools. However, the respondents’ utterances during the interviews do convey the importance of anti-racist programmes in schools, especially for dealing with a newer form of racism that seems to be orientated around imagined cultural differences. Although none of other participants shared similar stories of perceived racism, a number of stories have indicated teacher action of being unkind and uncaring:

I never really felt connected with the teachers. Where my brother again, he goes to another school. He started there in year ten. He went to the same school in year nine and hated it. The teachers at my school weren’t caring, and they weren’t as accepting as what you would imagine. They were just cold I guess.

(John, ‘Coloured’. arrived age 17)

Some teachers gave me a hard time. They didn’t understand my Tourette. It was like they wanted to get me into trouble. I’ve heard them mock my Tourette. Mocking me and pretending to be me. I told my mother, and she went to the Deputy Principal, but he just made excuses. He took the teacher’s side. It was one of the male teachers who forced me to leave school. They just made things up about me. I can’t remember one single teacher who cared about me. I don’t think that was right. The way they treated me. It made me angry.

(Little Man, ‘Coloured’. arrived age 14)

It remains unclear whether any connection between unkind acts and racial prejudice existed within the context of South African boys in New Zealand. Nonetheless, sentiments expressed during a number of interviews captured the essence of ‘othering’ and of feeling socially excluded. During his interview, Colin’s construction of himself delineated his relationship with one of his
teachers. His recollections of the ‘discriminated other’ in some way position himself and, by default, other immigrant boys not only as ‘objects of gaze’ but show how past experiences of perceptions of prejudices informed conceptions of the self (Darder, 2012; Mac an Ghaill & Haywood, 2011):

Yeah, teachers can make school fun, or they can make it crap; some just choose to be grumpy all day. Once I went my Dean to ask to change a subject, right. Without giving me a chance to explain; she just blew my off. The bitch! Sorry! I hated that bitch. Sorry! [Laughing] I get angry when I think about her. Nobody at my school liked her. That teacher never bothered to listen to me. She was like: “You guys should feel lucky to be here.” I knew what she implied. I knew that was because we are immigrants, and we just had to do as we’re told. You could see that she wanted to let you know that I didn’t belong there. It wasn’t so much that she refused to help me. Like it wasn’t what she said, but the tone of her voice. How can I describe it? I don’t know, it felt like…like I was a little boy being told off. I don’t know, I just felt empty inside. I think that was the turning point for me. That was it for me.

(Colin, ‘Coloured’. arrived at age 14)

We looked different. Teachers treated us differently because we looked different, and we were not as smart like most of the Asian students. That kind of made us feel inferior to them. … The teachers just picked on us. Making us feel stupid and stuff.

(J.C., ‘Coloured’. arrived age 12)

J.C.’s utterance does not provide any clarity for why he believed that the teachers picked on him and his friends. Further probing may have been useful at this point during the interview. However, despite the vagueness within the data about being picked for reasons of ‘mucking around’ in class or simply being an immigrant, the analysis does show that teacher-student relationships are critical contributing factors for explaining why some adolescent boys are driven to behave in socially irresponsible ways (Darder, 2012). The unique contribution of taking a narrative approach is its focus on the individual differences that result from social
interactions between unique individuals (diversity) and their social environments. Although exploratory in nature, the aforementioned interviews do offer some examples of how ethnicity intersects pedagogical relationships between teachers and immigrant boys.

Whilst the vast majority of the non-White interviewees were very critical of their teachers, Steve’s retelling of one incident where he was able to ‘connect’ with a teacher indicate the way in which recalling past experiences open up ways of making meaning and how social identities are constructed through dialogue:

Err... teachers - let’s go back to when I was in year 10 because that was when I realised that teachers are human beings after all. I wanted to drop out of school. Uhhm... One of my teachers spoke to me and told me to stay on. We connected when he was just like: ‘Yeah, you’re a smart kid, whatever decisions you gonna make, is gonna affect you for the rest of your life.’ I thought that he gave everyone the same talk. But at the time it meant a hell of a lot. ‘Now you can just throw it all away for yourself’. It was great how he got real with me really quickly. Hmmm... I think one of the things that really impressed me was that he swore in front of me. He was like: ‘You don’t fuck it up Steve’ and I was like: ‘Yeah.’ He levelled with me so quickly and that’s when I started to see that teachers were human. So hmmm... that is why I listened to him and I went back to finish school. Talking to people that can speak your language was important. Teachers that you could really relate to were really important. Yeah, they’re almost like a reflection of you. That was the first time I actually saw a teacher have emotions. Someone who cared about students. Even immigrants or refugees. Anybody. You don’t see that a lot. So, Yeah, it meant a hell of a lot at the time. This was just a one-on-one moment with my teacher that changed my life.

(Steve, ‘Coloured’. arrived at age five months old)

The interview above clearly shows that through conversation with the self and others, knowledge is constructed through discourse. This is, in part, one of the tenets of Social Constructionism. We see that within the theme of the ‘cool teacher’, the respondents crafted identities about themselves and others through
discourse embedded within dialogical conversation. Based on Steve’s recollections, he constructed a social identity of the caring teacher in response to his personal perceptions and positioning within the conversation they had when he was on school camp. While other respondents were of the same mind with regards to caring teachers, I recalled a tonal quality in Steve’s voice that indicated the value he placed on the experience.

Most of the White participants spoke at length about: “Teachers who were very friendly and very helpful, willing to help you if you want to turn your life around, teachers who went out of their way to help you get back on the road, so to say, and being a good student again (Garry); “Teachers who were good and extremely helpful and generous with their time” (Paul); “Caring teachers at my school” (Willem); “Awesome teachers, they were great and knew their stuff, teachers were really good to us” (Jimmy). François was the exception and the most vocal critic of his teachers:

Some teachers shouldn’t be teaching. They are a disgrace to the profession. I had a teacher who always picked on me for no reason. When I challenged her about a mark I got for an English essay, she gave me a ‘not-achieved’. I put in so much work but she still failed me. She did not even explain the mark. The next time I let my brother write my essay. He is at Uni and very good at English. Still, this bitch gave me just an achieved. It was then I realised that she was deliberate. She didn’t like me. Other students are druggies but she’s friendly with them. I could never understand why some people are doing this important job. Maybe they are just in it for the money. We had a few teachers like her.

The aforementioned sets of extracts illustrate that schools are not necessarily unwelcoming and threatening places for all immigrant boys. However, the retelling of some of the lived experiences of adaptation equally emphasise the role of student-teacher relationships as fundamental to the formation of a range of migrating masculinities at school and does indeed show how nonWhite boys especially continue to be challenged by assumptions about them based less on biological categories, but rather on imagined cultural differences. From an
immigrant youth perspective, a number of stories show that whether or not the constructed rationality behind the forms of teacher-instigated actions is racially charged, teacher’s actions often serve to legitimate frames of understanding that governs adolescent boys’ thinking and behaviour, which in turn, plays a significant role in identity formation. Some teachers may consider such interpretations as hypercritical; however, the interviews call for proper scrutiny of discriminatory actions, and their consequences and relevance for those involved in educating immigrant boys. The retrospective accounts, at the very least, testify for the need for ongoing dialogical activities needed for transformative pedagogies.

Conclusion

Chapter eight demonstrates that migratory masculine subjectivity for South African boys are not only shifting but pluralistic in nature (Farahani, 2012) and like other migrating identities, often seems to contain contradictions and dualities. By mapping the themes and sites that these boys engaged with on a daily basis, it suggests that some immigrant teenagers experience more adaptation difficulties compared with other young migrant because of how they navigate and negotiate powerful dominant discourses of ‘boys will be boys’ that operated in their environment. The interviews show the importance of social relationships in both the shaping of young masculinities and in regulating the different ways of ‘doing boy’. It appears that South African adolescent boys operated with crude conceptions of normative boys’ behaviours as both natural and learned.

Examining the power struggles connected with constructions of masculinity through the lenses of and intersections of immigration, masculinity and schooling, data analysis seems to show that schools can be sites where boys learn to be manly men. Secondary schools are institutional sites that often operate for the selection and de-selection of masculinities, and for the allocating of immigrant boys (and boys in general) to different levels in status hierarchies of subjectivities. Regardless of race and ethnicity, masculine manifestations of migrating masculinities are often a reflection of the relationship between thought and action as indicators of
masculinity constructions for the purposes of fitting in. Ultimately, the power of perception and position can be responsible for schools to be frightening and dangerous places for some students and what is perceived as ‘normative’ boy’s behaviours may well make the lives of immigrant males even more complicated as they navigated across the discourses about them.

The stories that emerged from the interviews provide the reader with some clarity around the constitution of desirable, heterosexual masculine subjectivities in a secondary school context, by offering a rare glimpse into how individual South African boys challenged, confirmed and dealt with these expectations. Compared with previous studies, I argue that a major upshot of interviewing is that talk may allow, often unreported issues of gender and sexuality, to be placed at the centre of attention when focusing on the wider issues of immigration, masculinity and schooling. For instance, when Bob claims that “It’s only in secondary school that you are meant to be tough all year round … If it (crying) happened at secondary school I would have been called a ‘pussy’ or something like that”, it raises the important question of whether or not high schools have now become the primary influence on masculinity formation and whether what should be happening rather than what is currently happening in some schools can bring about social change. Within the context of South African boys in New Zealand, hegemonic depictions of ‘boys will be boys’ are often interwoven with complexities of gender, socio-political agendas of migration and globalisation.
Conclusions

“There is a sense that no one theory can give the whole picture of an ever-increasingly complex global arena in which shifting gender meanings are experienced and negotiated in complex ways. Hence rather than try to tie up the understandings and definitions of masculinity, we suggest that masculinity needs to remain conceptually open and disputed. It should not preclude differences but should actively acknowledge incongruity as an important process of developing the field of inquiry”

(Haywood & Mac an Ghaill, 2003, p. 146)

When I initially introduced myself and my research proposal to the University of Waikato and my supervisors, I summarized the aims of my research as being about concerns for the school-resistant (sub) culture of immigrant boys and how processes of acculturation may impact this. Subsequently, the stories that emerged from the interviews have shifted the focus of the study to address the more interesting exploration of the complexities of identity after immigration at a time when immigrants into New Zealand are coming from an increasingly diverse range of nations. It proved rather useful to take this path as interview data allowed for an in-depth comparative analysis between ethnicity and masculine identity (re)construction.

The study reflects contemporary concerns about the impact of mass migration and youth adaptation into the interwoven spheres of school and social life, especially given the compounding multi-ethnic, multicultural demographic of twenty-first century New Zealand. In the context of mass migration, the aim of this study is to bring into focus the realities of the lived experiences of a group of South African males at time when immigrants into New Zealand are coming from an increasingly diverse range of nations. Specifically, the thesis explore the power of
institutional and interactional social relations and the intersections of ethnicity and masculinity in the formation of identities. It is hoped that this text may offer teachers, who work with adolescent boys in culturally and ethnically diverse contexts, insights into how the interconnections between personal, social and cultural factors might combine to shape masculinity and behaviour.

The narratives, while attesting to immigrant boy’s understanding about their adaptation experiences, significantly maps and reveals the complex ways in which the young men recalled how they negotiated, navigated, contested and resisted their engagements with the different discourses and stories about them that operate in their lives. Much of the analysis of the data includes an investigation of the dynamics of school life and the conditions under which the boys acquired their identities. The findings discussed below are less about presenting a logical set of generalized statements about youth adaptation and more about offering a glimpse into the complexities of how individuals make meaning of their lived experiences of adapting to life in a new country during adolescence.

As previously stated, the study’s intent was to explore the complexities of how the history and culture that the respondents brought with them from South Africa intersected with cultures of masculinity and national and ethnic identity within New Zealand schools. The data suggest that the process of struggle against ‘Othering’ were central to the ways South African boys constructed and lived out masculinities and that these constructions were not fixed and unproblematic but in constant flux and did pose real challenges for adaptation. The stories show that schooling played a central role in the social relations of masculinity, and that individual boys were able to draw on personal, group or globalised resources in the forging of new and potentially ‘enterprising’ school masculinities. The main thesis developed in this text proposes that migration identities are constructed discursively and socially and that these identities are reflections of and attempts by immigrant boys to grapple with identity constructions as dynamic and related to broader societal influences.
Reconsidering the key themes

Identity (un)certainty and confusion

The crux of this study’s argument is that cultural and ethnic identities for South African boys were constructed discursively given the prominence of dominant discourses in their lives. To put it simply, the identities that these boys constructed and lived out were defined by the possibilities offered to them within their social relations with others, apace with the stories and discourses about them and their particular South Africanness that operated in their environment. For instance, the powerful narratives that emerged from my discussions with the respondents show that White South African boys remained unwilling to let go of their heritage identity because they perceived it as being on equal footing with the dominant New Zealand culture. Their depiction of their culture and ethnicity as ‘superior’ to other cultures, including the dominant one, constructed them as proud Afrikaners living in New Zealand. White South Africans have for generations projected a picture of white cultural superiority that they and other South Africans have internalised as higher and grander and one that demands replication by others gazing from outside. Within this perspective, the analysis suggests that the majority of White boys felt no pressure to conform to New Zealand’s dominant cultural norms. By following the foreclosure pattern of identity (Marcia, 1966) they maintained a single set of values and goals, usually those of their ancestral heritage advocated by their historical past.

The analysis holds that what appears as identity foreclosure for a number of White boys may well be a form of self-categorization or identifying oneself as a member of a particular social grouping as a basic but vital element of group identity (Ashmore, et al., 2004; Phinney & Ong, 2007). Having undertaken seemingly no exploration or very limited exploration (“tried the Kiwi way”), it seems that White South African boys’ decision not to adopt the cultural norms of the dominant group may well have been informed by identity directions established in childhood (Marcia, 1966). The statement, “No need to become a Kiwi” is in sharp contradiction to classic assimilation theories where the elimination of newcomer’s cultural and ethnic identity and the reconstruction of a ‘host only and English
only’ identity are viewed as necessary for successful integration (Liebkind, Mähönen, Solares, Solheim, & Jasinskaja-Lahti, 2014; Rong & Preissle, 2008). This is hardly surprising because the old assimilation model is no longer expected or desired by all newcomers because ‘The way I think is the way my parents taught me to think.’

Separation, or the maintenance of home culture and isolating themselves from the dominant culture (Berry, 2007), was possible for the White boys because they looked like White New Zealanders and were able to become ‘invisible’ within their new settings but still maintained their old cultural and behavioural patterns. It looks as if these boys were able to assess the two different cultures and then chose to separate themselves from the host. Interesting, but hardly surprising, little attitudinal and behavioural preferences and characteristics changes were required from them and this may have been a central influence in their decision for separation (Organista et al., 2010; Berry, 2006a).

This acculturation strategy of separation is in sharp contradiction to what was previously suggested by assimilationists:

“The children of immigrants have always gravitated to characteristics of the new culture...They desperately want to wear clothes that will let them be “cool” or, at the very least, do not draw attention to themselves as ‘different’. Children of immigrants become acutely aware of nuances of behaviours that although ‘normal’ at home, will set them apart as “strange” and ‘foreign’ in public...[they] desperately want to be accepted, as most people do, and what is new for them is often what is most desirable” (Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001, p. 91).

By contrast, the majority of the nonWhite boys I interviewed reported high levels of acculturation stress due to their desire to assimilate. Most of them voiced their awareness of the power of whiteness and how white privilege that positioned Whites back in South African as superior was once again reflected in New
Zealand society. Their stories suggest that they soon recognized how their cultural and ethnic identities positioned them well outside the social and cultural norms and precluded them from the benefits of resembling their host and allowing a smoother adaptation path. The data illustrates the tensions and contradictions for these boys insomuch as acculturation stress occurred when they perceived that the ‘skinning of the self’ required more than simply adopting the prescribed cultural norms of the dominant group.

It is unclear from the data whether being clumped together with other minority boys of colour such as African or Pacific Islanders may have contributed to heighten levels of acculturating stress. Some participants did point out that although they were happy to hang about with or immigrants and ‘Islanders’, they did not share similar values. Although is unclear whether or not any adaptation discomfort nonWhite South African boys may have experienced were caused solely by them being clumped together with other minority groups, the interview do illustrate that the ‘who am I, how do I fit in’ (Erikson, 1959), were more exaggerated for them as opposed to White South Africans. A small number of interviews indicated that some nonWhite boys did not want to be mistaken for Pacific Islanders or Maori boys because of their perceptions of the stigmatization might have of these groups of young people. A follow-up study could prove both useful and interesting by examining the extent to which such factors as social, political and economic clout were considered when South African boys reformulated their initial identity (Marcia, 2006) by aiming to adopt the characteristics and traits of the dominant group (Wetherell & Potter, 1992).

Although rejecting one’s heritage culture and adopting the cultural traits of the host is a predictable strategy employed by minority youth in other contexts, as a viable way for integration (Suárez-Orozco, et. al., 2010), what this study suggest is that some nonWhite boys will do ‘whatever it takes’ to acquire the necessary characteristics for social inclusion. Fear of social exclusion may have been imagined but for these boys it was real nonetheless. According to their accounts, it can be inferred that the act of mimicry, as an exploration of identity, is both fluid
and unstable but took into consideration the particularities of the individual boys as social actors (Papastergiadis, 2012).

The prominent theme of mimicry that emerged during the interviews underlines immigrant boy’s strategic use of downplaying their own ethic and cultural identities in order to negotiate the desired goals of acquiring a real sense of belonging within their new settings. The interviews tend to suggest that fear of being regarded as a loner or being labelled by peers as a loner/loser may have been central to the need for ‘us wanting to be like them’. Although mimicry does not only relate to cultural manifestations, in this particular context it does appear to be used by those boys who perceived their ethnic and cultural identities as devalued and underrated by their host. As a result, some South African boys quickly learnt to play within the rules of integration and replaced their minority identity with that of the dominant host. However, the interview data points out that some of these identity constructions failed to make the recognizable ‘Other’ (Said, 1979) a subject of sameness. In other words, as Bennett and Collits (1995) wrote, “almost the same, but not quite the same” (p. 57) meant that while some nonWhite boys may have adopted similar practices congruent with the dominant New Zealand culture, their observable physical characteristics such as having a different skin made them detectable and rendered them ‘Other’.

The notion of duality or double consciousness (Phinney & Rosenthal, 1992; DuBois, 1963) was apparent in some of the accounts. However, unlike description of African Americans in the 1960s as having “two warring idols in one dark body” and having to choose between two conflicting or competing identities (DuBois, 1965, p. 17), a number of participants frequently mentioned that adaptation for them did not necessarily demand having to choose between two competing identities, but rather, as J.C. pointed out that he had two identities that he had to live out simultaneously: “I guess what it comes down to is that as an immigrant you did the things you did in order to fit in.” A key argument here is that when nonWhite boys like J.C. construct a second identity or persona that stands in conflict with his ‘home identity’, it appears to be in response to how he understands reality.
So, when J.C. points out that he and his friends constructed what he refers to as a ‘Tupac identity’ it was not done as a betrayal of their particular ‘South Africanness’ but rather as an act to seek power and social recognition in an alternative identity that held more promise of acceptance from their peers compared with other identity possibilities. A significant factor why J.C. and his ‘Coloured’ friends enter into an idealized portrayal of a ‘real man’ gangster identity such as a ‘Tupac identity’ appears to be in essentially in response to disenfranchised boys of colour realising that the ideal white Kiwi identity is unachievable (Minh-ha, 2011). Adolescent boys like J.C. frequently enter into hyper-masculine behaviours to combat the degrading effects of perceptions of racism and victimization on their self-esteem (Iwamoto, 2003). Moreover, the characteristics of a ‘Tupac identity’ is often associated with hyper-masculinity behaviours that reflect an emphasis on sexual prowess, sexual conquest, and sexual aggression (Lindsey, 2015).

The late African American hip-hop artist, Tupac Shakur (1971-1996), who is considered to be ‘one of the most dynamic, influential and self-destructive pop stars of the Nineties’ (Rolling Stones, 1996). Tupac, whose songs often detailed the misery, deprivation and violence of ghetto life, grew up a troubled and sensitive child, living with his family in one inner-city community after another. He has been arrested eight times and served eight months in prison for a sexual-abuse conviction. Even today Tupac is considered as a legend in the hip-hop world, and has sold over 22 million records, posthumously. By adopting the ‘cool pose’ of the gangster culture or ‘thug life’ significantly illustrates the ways in which some non-White immigrant boys are “creatively tapping into and appropriating the new resources” (Manase, 2016, p. 185) of identity. However, Like Tupac, it seems that the construction of the hyper-masculine identity was much more a matter of style than of substance. Importantly, J.C.’s interview shows that displaying toughness, aggression and sexual prowess was not so much about being involved in gangsterism, but rather sanctioning him and his friends to exaggerate these hyper-masculine characteristics in their public personae, in order to prove themselves and be respected by their peers (Morrell, 1998).
The above findings clearly show that the identities South African boys constructed during adolescence were defined through the prospects offered to them by the context they were located in, the discourses about them and their particular South Africanness. This construction of multiple identities are consistent with Erikson’s contextually focussed (i.e., psychosocial), relationally based theory. The findings shed some light on how contextual factors influence identity exploration for immigrant boys during adolescence. They show that identity construction can be seen as forms of social action that are actively constructed in discourse as part of navigating, negotiating, debating and engaging in an argumentative struggle around beliefs, personal meanings of the world and relationships with others. These findings coincide with prior literature with similar assertions (e.g., Berry, 1997, 2007; Phinney, 2004) and show that adolescent boys are well capable of complex moral reasoning and that a number of them resisted group demands for conformity or group manipulation while others saw no option but to adopt the characteristics of the host culture (Marcia, 2006).

**Surveillance and policing of school masculinities**

The findings of this study suggest that the masculine identities that South African boys constructed and live out were not fixed and unproblematic but rather fluid and in constant flux. This meant that boys were watching other boys to see what was expected of them. They findings show how school’s cultural practices were actively influencing the learning to be manly. A recurring theme in the young men’s stories suggests that as teenagers they took up and/or resisted diverse and changing versions of masculinity as they responded to different discursive possibilities offered within their new school environment. I was struck by the frequency and ease with which the majority of the interviewees spoke about how cultural practices at school had on their lives. Individual accounts seems to suggest that school routines often embodied clear messages about ‘gender difference’ and appropriate social behaviours for boys (Mac an Ghaill, 1994; McCormack, 2012).
The construction of school masculinities were often done in response to tensions between the demands of proving themselves to be ‘manly enough’ on the one hand, and the possibility of being demonised for their apparent interest in their studies on the other hand. This often resulted in tensions inside and outside the classroom where differentiated and fluid male subjectivities were constructed and stood up against one another in relations of power. This concept of subjectivities negotiated within particular relationships of power and subordination was used widely during the interviews but not explicitly referred to in such terms. The findings are in line with the work of Connell and others (Connell, 2005; Carrigan, et al., 1985) who have led the way in developing the theory of a hierarchy of masculinities. Making use of Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci’s (1971) notion of hegemony, Carrigan et al (1985) describe the hegemony of masculinity as the domination of one form of masculinity over another. By describing their own masculine presentations in this way, some of the young men imply that masculinities are fluid configurations of social practice generated in particular situations in changing structures of their relationships with others.

Amid the most striking features of the analysed data is the apparent unanimity among the young men of the importance of a sense of belonging to a social group. A number of narratives show how a dilemma were created around how boys responded to ‘doing boy’. Their stories demonstrate that some boys took a ‘wait and see’ approach to their own performance of masculinity. This ‘wait and see’ approach afforded adolescent boys an opportunity to first see how their peers are ‘doing boys’ and then making sure that they comply with these prescriptions. Further examples of this strategy was demonstrated in the interviews when boys were unsure whether or not to trust their own behaviours out of fear that their representation of masculinity might betray a cultural difference that they wish to conceal (Seidler, 2006; Pascoe, 2011). Notably, a number of individual accounts seem to suggest that some boys reluctantly constructed, or at least seem so in detectable ways, forms of migrating masculinities which corresponded with the dominant definitions heteronormativity by way of adopting a ‘wait, see and comply’ strategy. By passing the litmus test of what it means to be a ‘real man’,
these individuals were often rewarded with social inclusion within their social spheres (Connell, 1987).

The constant need to prove that you are a real man came at a social and educational cost to a number of newcomers. The data show that when boys felt marginalised and socially excluded for not ‘measuring up’ to what it means to be a real man, they would do whatever it takes to fit in rather than be seen by the observer (host) as an outsider. This is an important reminder that as boys grow up they often become conscious of themselves by comparing themselves with other boys and by being concerned with what other think about them (Seidler, 1994). As Seidler (1994) pointed out, adolescent boys tend to sustain a sense of masculine identity through comparing themselves with other boys and then thinking that they are doing well because they see themselves are doing better than other boys in certain things other than schoolwork. These boys then become trapped in an endless cycle of comparing and competing with their peers. In the case of some South African boys in New Zealand, the interviewees told me that they learnt to draw attention to their sporting prowess in an effort to both conceal their perceived academic ‘shortcomings’ but equally to show their peers that they are better than them at certain things such as sports.

Taking into account that most boys look away from themselves and towards other boys for lessons on how to behave properly, ‘appropriate’ boy’s behaviours were often closely linked with violence and combativeness directed at subordinate males and at times aimed at their teachers. Although the extent of violence in schools is unclear, the main thesis developed here is that despite their varied ethnic backgrounds, most South African boys conceptualised and articulated violence and staunchness as a normal part of school life in New Zealand. It seems from the respondents’ accounts that, within their high school context, the workings of the ‘boys will be boys’ discourses are notably visible in framing a clear distinction between the environmental demands on heteronormativity as opposed to demands on normative boys’ behaviour as violent and staunch. Stereotypes of ‘manliness’ continued to be reinforced in the ways in which
masculinities were recreated and relational and oppositionally defined in relation to femininity thus reinforcing a binary nature of gender (Davies, 1989; Hatchell, 2003; Whitehead, 2006). “It’s just what teenage boys do. You know what I mean ... just normal boy’s stuff” (Dean).

The comment: “It’s just what teenage boys do. You know what I mean ... just normal boy’s stuff” seems to reflect Haywood and Mac an Ghaill’s (2003, p. 146) observation whereby “the difficulty of discussing gender is that we tend to know in a common-sense way (implicitly), the meanings and significance of masculinity”. Among the participants, several of them used this phrase in the same way as an important statement that they seem to imply a shared understanding of what boys are like. For instance, Dean’s use of the above phrase indicated both his very own conviction of how he understood ‘boys will be boys’ and his desire for my agreement.

It is worth noting that some accounts seems to indicate that acting violent and staunch, created both an sense of inner contradictions (Epstein, 1998) and an uneasiness with ‘toeing the hegemonic masculine line’ but at the same time helped some boys to transcend the boundaries of cultural affiliations (Wetherell, 2009). The idea of performativity emphasise the way discourse shape us rather than our creatively acting out a role (Butler, 1990). This idea of gender as performance is in strong contrast to recent arguments put forward by Sukhu (2012) that men’s violence against women is integral to their masculine gender identity and that they take little or no responsibility for this violence. The respondents’ stories suggest that most of them felt uncomfortable with showing disrespect towards their teachers. Moving into the senior years, they did not remain in the fixed category of violent, combative and school-resistant subjects with most of them ‘growing up and coming to their senses’ and becoming more positive in respect of their education. This process could potentially be an interesting and useful process to trace in a follow-up enquiry, given that, in some settings, many boys are leaving school early and fewer are continuing onto higher levels of education (UNESCO, 2010).
A number of the narratives seem to support past and present arguments in the literature and revealed that the problems some boys experienced in schooling and in life generally were closely linked to how their school’s micro-cultures actively contributed to their varied and changing masculine constructions and how they live out these constructions (Connell, 2005; Mac and Ghaill, 1994; McCormack, 2012). They illustrate how South African boys looked at the options available to them and then decided which subject position they are willing, or in some cases, depending on their particular South Africanness and their upbringing, able to inhabit. These strategies often involved the construction of a range of masculine identities as determined by the workings of the dominant discourses of heteronormativity that operated in their environment. In the case of South African boys, individual accounts seem to show that the school’s cultural practices were powerful in allocating boys to different levels in status hierarchies of subjectivities. The analysis shows that regardless of whether or not adolescent males manifest their masculine construction as violent, combative, dominant, marginalized, or as a disempowered ‘other’ of heterosexual hegemonic masculinity, how they constructed masculinities were in most cases a reflection of the way that they felt, the relationships they developed with others and the climate of the learning context they were embedded in.

Although the extent of homophobia in high school is unclear from the retrospective accounts, some interview extracts show how some South African boys continue to be challenged by gender transformation and how homophobia and gender configurations remain fraught with historically embedded meanings of what it means to be a real man. Despite their varied ethnic and cultural backgrounds, some boys situated themselves within a hegemonic heterosexual masculinist discourse as a way of distancing themselves from homosexuality. Notably, my interview with Colin shows how he thought about sexuality in essentializing ways rather than socially constructed. These discourses of normalization were at work in a number of other interviews and show how hegemonic processes of normalization were able to support and maintain ‘common-sense’ understandings of gender and sexuality. These interviews powerfully illustrate how regimes of normalization offer adolescent boys a certain
version of gender identity and gender reality at school that appears solid, factual
and stable, and above all, normal (McCormack, 2012; Wetherell & Potter, 1992).

The interviews produced a theme that suggests that male adolescent’s
relationships with their teachers are fundamental to how easy or challenging their
integration into the new school might be. The analysed data emphasis that
student-teacher relationships developed through complex intersections of student
and teacher beliefs, attitudes, behaviours and interactions with others that
ultimately affected the quality of the relationship they form. These relationships,
in turn, influenced the value of their experiences of high school. This often meant
that the quality of such relationships went much further than just fitting in.
Student-teacher professional relationships seems to have either enhanced or
constrained the boys’ attitudes towards their schooling and their desire to learn.

Despite its fluid character, however, power relations in the classroom appeared to
have been central to how some boys occupied their masculine stances (Connell &
Messerschmidt, 2005). A number of interviewees pointed out that some of their
teachers asserted positions of superiority over them. Perceptions of unequal power
relations often resulted in contradictions and tensions within the classroom, where
some boys felt that they were not only discriminated against but were rendered
completely powerless within their learning context by uncaring teachers. These
so-called uncaring teachers were referred to as ‘bitches’ during the interviews.
The recurring discourse of the ‘bitch’ is a dominant social discourse in high
schools, and at times are used by students as an internalising frame for evaluating
and labelling female teachers who appear to be heartless and uncaring. A number
of boys said that they disliked or flat out hated these teachers because they felt
that the teachers were treating them unfairly as compared with their peers. By
taking into account perception versus reality, the stories nonetheless captured the
tensions between the relationship of ethnicity and pedagogical processes. As a
result, for some of the non-White boys, for example, the construction of their
masculinities were in the context of either acceptance or rejection from their
teachers and were most obvious in the talk of those interviewees who described their high school experience as “unbearable” (George).

Another key tension illustrates in the data points to the complex relationship between ethnicity, culture and gender and the insecurity of ‘place’. The data argues that schools can be unwelcoming and threatening places for a large number of students. Several accounts show how some boys continue to be challenged by assumptions about them, their culture, ethnicity and sexuality, based less on biological categories but rather on imagined cultural differences. Whatever the constructed rationality behind the forms of culturally-instigated racism and sexism at school, the interviews show that teacher’s actions may well serve to legitimate frames of understanding that govern thinking and behaviour around certain groups of students. In a sense, this study shows that power is, at least in part, a struggle over the way we say (articulate and/or perform) things (Butler, 1990). It calls for a proper scrutiny of deeply entrenched discursive enforcement of norms and the rethinking of how power relations are structured within the classroom.

Potential contribution

Breaking with essentialist models of examining youth adaptation, the study emphasizes how some boys resisted the dominant peer culture at school through the development of distinctly school-resistant sub-cultures. This resistance was not anti-educational, it was anti-institutional. This concept of ‘separation from the norm’ and constructing new and ‘innovative’ identities as sites for developing self-esteem and peer acceptance were key motivations forming resistant masculinities to deal with tensions and contradictions of identity in their lives. Undoubtedly the strategy of ‘wait and see’ is not new to adolescence but in this context it may well be one of ‘symbolic resistance’ which shows the ways in which different subjectivities were constructed, and how the boys defined themselves against other boys by noncompliance. This is significant for understanding how self-identities and ethnic loyalties often influence patterns of
behaviour and how discourses about them compel some immigrant boys and rebel and pull away from a school’s cultural that is vastly different from their own.

The interview data suggest that although hegemonic forms of masculinity were dominant at school, it was by no means the only form of masculinity embodied by boys (Gilbert & Gilbert, 1998). Also, power relations were notably evident in the interviews as the young men emphasised the conceptualisation behind their own sexuality at school. It appears that narrow and patchy understandings of gender and masculinity (and femininity), have serious implications for offering safe spaces for cross-examination and/or resisting hegemonic forms of masculinities in social institutions where already damaged young people should be free from vulnerability to abuse (Pascoe, 2011). It also raises the issue that perhaps the problem with misbehaving and homophobic behaviours among boys may not necessarily lie with so-called problematic boys, but rather the problem could be with how masculinity and how schools and other social settings shape masculinity and how boys live out these constructions (Gilbert & Gilbert, 1998). Importantly, the extracts powerfully advocate that young people must be included in any realistic delinquency reduction and prevention programme and that schools and the discursive practices within them can be altered to counter new forms of discrimination against various groups, allowing meaningful participation by all students.

The stories that emerged from the interviews highlight the complexities of adaptation and demonstrate the potency of such institutional factors as racial/ethnic subsystems, phenotypical variations, institutional cultures (rules, norms, and routines that guide feelings, thoughts and behaviours) in determining cultural assimilation, or acculturation outcomes. Cultural assimilation for nonWhites were especially problematic because readily identifiable characteristics confined them within a painful bipolar process of identity uncertainty and confusion; and did pose real challenges for adaptation. The respondent’s stories also show the interplay of immigration, ethnicity (‘race’) and masculinity in their lives and how individual boys were able to draw on personal, group or globalised
resources in the forging of new and potentially ‘enterprising’ school masculinities (Pincus, 2006). These factors combined with the interfacing of the historical, political and cultural features of both the sending and receiving countries and set in place a contradictory process of adaptation for the various South African racial/ethnic groups.

The findings of this study are less about presenting a logical set of generalized statements about South African boys adapting to New Zealand social life and more about making an important contribution to understanding the complexities of how individuals make meaning of their lived experiences of acculturation and how the ‘new boys on the block are getting through.’ By introducing the intersection of ethnicity and masculinity into the framework of segmented assimilation, the main thesis developed in this text proposes that migration identities are constructed discursively and that these identities are reflections of and attempts by immigrant boys to grapple with identity constructions as dynamic and related to the interaction effects between personal and/or group characteristics and broader societal influences. The study also concludes that, in explaining divergent adaptive patterns, neither generation nor length of New Zealand residence significantly influenced adaptation outcomes. Specifically, the contradictions and tensions within gender relations everyday interactions with teachers and peers were important factors for adaptation, regardless of racial/ethnic backgrounds. It is hoped that this text may offer teachers, who work in culturally and ethnically diverse contexts, insights into why some immigrant boys may rebel and pull away from a culture vastly different from their own and how being hyphenated New Zealanders may influence the ways in which boys construct their masculine identities.

**Limitations of this study**

Although a major strength of this qualitative study and working with a highly diverse and differentiated group of young men, is the rich and detailed data that it
provides (Durkheim, Jacobs & Dixon, 2014), the limitation of this methodology is that it may limit the generalisation of the findings. Analysing the interview data for the twenty-one respondents suggest that the findings cannot be taken as a general representation of all South African boy’s experiences and realities of adapting to life in New Zealand. Moreover, while adolescence is seen as the focal period of migrant identity formation, a life-span developmental perspective is essential, in order to understand the both precursors of adolescent migrant identity and to trace its impact beyond adolescence.

Another limitation of this study is the possible implications of how my own ethnicity could have potentially impacted the data collection and therefore may have had some influence on the interpretation of the interview data. Therefore, I openly acknowledge that the analysis of the data set merely offer one of many possible sets of interpretations. Although, this study provides a series of insightful reflections, there are obvious follow-ups. From a teaching and learning perspective, I propose three possible areas that need closer attention: (a) exploring the effects that large numbers of foreign students have on the schooling of domestic or home-grown students, (b) examining teachers’ responses to mass influx of newcomers into their classrooms, and (c) examine whether the practice of ‘lumping’ immigrants cohorts together or ‘splitting’ them into distinctive units may offer more meaningful analysis of other aspects of acculturation such as educational and occupational attainment.

Final thoughts

As I was finishing this research project, mass migration, Islamophobia and multiculturalism once again gained high levels of political, media and public attention as thousands of Syrian and other displaced families from Afghanistan, Iraq and a number of African states risk their lives seeking refuge in Europe (UNICEF, 2015). In the last five years since I started this project, a lot has changed globally with regards to migration patterns. The most significant is the issue of displaced refugees who, after fleeing the brutality of civil war and finding
refuge in surrounding countries, are now entering Europe in very large numbers. Media reports suggest that there are more children on the move now in 2015 than there have been since the end of World War II. This devastating humanitarian crisis has deep consequences for the resettlement of so many children into countries which have opened up their borders so that these displaced peoples may be given an opportunity to restart their lives again. New Zealand is among several Western industrialised countries to respond to the current emergency refugee crisis identified by the United Nations Refugee Agency (UNHCR) by announcing an emergency package to allow hundreds of Syrian refugees to come to New Zealand. This intake will go ‘over and above’ New Zealand’s annual refugee quota (Trevett, 2015).

A knock-on effect of showing the necessary humanity towards these most vulnerable of people is that more and more displaced students will now enter foreign and often strange education systems. Rather than critising the so-called knee-jerk political response of these countries in the furore over the mass media’s portrayal of events, space for rational discussion, or attempts to understand the complexities of moving countries for young people must be made. While the terrain for global migration has changed to a degree since this research took place, it seems that the demands for certain forms of pedagogy is now needed more than ever.

The data and the findings call for is for proper self-reflective scrutiny of pedagogical practices in our schools, especially from teachers who work in culturally diverse contexts. On the one hand, as John O’Neill (2010) put it, we should rightly celebrate the growing recognition that teaching is a very complex endeavour that requires highly specialised knowledge, skills and dispositions. Given such complexity, we need to accept that there are consequent implications for how teachers interact with students. Inevitably, such transformative pedagogies are tied to inclusive teaching practices and the politics of belonging. Key to this study’s argument is the idea that immigrant boys do not construct identities alone by themselves, rather, and like other youth identities, often
contains contradictions and dualities constructed through dialogues with significant others that individuals negotiate their identity (Taylor, 1994). The idea that even if an individual who is firmly committed to an identity (foreclosure) still requires confirmation from ‘significant others’ is important, since all the participants referred to friends, peers and teachers as those who have had an important role in their lives during adolescence.

As Charles Taylor (1994) explained in his essay, *Multiculturalism and the Politics of Recognition*, the importance of recognition by others in shaping one’s identity:

> Our identity is partly shaped by recognition or its absence, often by the misrecognition of others, and so a person or group of people can suffer real damage, real distortion, if the people or society around them mirror back to them a confining or demeaning or contemptible picture of themselves. Non-recognition or misrecognition can inflict harm, can be a form of oppression, imprisoning someone in a false, distorted, and reduced mode of being...Due recognition is not just a courtesy we owe people. It is a vital human need (Taylor, 1994, pp. 25-26).

Like Taylor, my hope is to awake a general interest in the idea of recognition of others. In this way I am hoping to draw attention to the sorts of things that South African boys bring with them on their journey as they transverse the New Zealand educational landscape that could alert teachers to be more sensitive about the ‘content’ of the backpack that their students carry with them into the classroom. In this sense, the wider social and institutional settings that frame the meaning making for adolescent boys may well, even after a period of ‘trial and error’ account for the varied ways masculine identities are formed. Understanding the dynamic and fluid nature of identity is important for understanding young people’s behavioural patterns. Both Erikson and Marcia, in a number of writings, remarked upon the importance of refraining from labeling adolescents in pejorative legal and psychiatric terms. They advised strongly against ‘diagnosing’ and treating teenagers as criminals, as constitutional misfits, as derelicts doomed by their upbringing. Indeed, labeling pushes young people, for reasons of personal
or social marginality, to choose a negative identity or they may well put their energies into becoming exactly what the careless and fearful community expects of them (Erikson, 1968).

I am also cautiously aware that ‘giving voice’ to young people to tell their stories always runs the risk of being ignored, not being taken seriously, or worse apathy from adults. It is hoped that this is not the case here. All of the narrative show the power of personal stories and that those which the young men shared with me are far too important to just brush aside given that they illustrate that power relationships in the classroom and be empowering or destructive in nature. While I cannot exactly generalise the experiences of adapting to New Zealand social life for all South African boys, I do encourage readers to keep an open mind, and to engage in critical and reflective analysis regarding what the respondents have shared during the interviews.

Given that masculine identities are discursively constructed raises a fundamental question of how schools should go about dealing with new arrivals and whether they need to embrace diversity or not. The study also suggests that retrospective accounts can be a useful strategy in enhancing existing research in the field of youth studies by providing young people a space to speak from. A safe space where they are not subjected to the conventional forms of surveillance, power relations and policing as compared with research conducted from a ‘within-school’ approach. Finally, to stress that schools are decisive in influencing the shaping of a range of different male heterosexual subjectivities does not mean to neglect or underestimate other factors. Dealing with issues of immigration, masculinity and identity formation does not happen in a social vacuum. Given the scanty knowledge about the complex contradictions and tensions within everyday interactions between teachers and immigrant boys (and boys in general) I wish to advocate that future studies in this area are both urgent and necessary.


Phinney, J. S. (2004). *Ethnic, racial, and cultural identity in college students at a predominantly minority institution* (Unpublished manuscript), California State University, CA.
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Appendix A

An Invitation to Participate in a Research Project

**Title of Research Project:** South African boys in New Zealand: Immigrants’ retrospective accounts of adapting to life in a new country during adolescence.

**Researcher:** Mr. Teswell White

Dear Potential Participant,

My name is Teswell White and I am currently enrolled in a PhD programme at the University of Waikato. Ethical approval has been granted by the University to undertake a research project focusing on issues of immigration and boys’ education. Specifically, I am interested in listening to South African males’ accounts of their experiences in New Zealand schools, to try and better understand what factors seem to have helped or hindered their academic success and general enjoyment of school. As a South African male who participated in the pilot interviews, I am inviting you back to participate further in this project because of your high level of articulation and the story of your own experiences at school which is very interesting and informative.

If you are willing to be part of the study then:

- You will be provided with a Participant Information Sheet containing information with regards to the nature of the study, details about your involvement and my contact details.
• I shall make arrangements to conduct the interview at a time and place that is convenient for you.

• You will be reimbursed for your time.

If you would like to participate in this research project, or require more information about it before making a decision, please phone me on 5331373 or email: teswell.white@xtra.co.nz

Thanks for your time.

Yours sincerely,

Teswell White
Appendix B

Participant Information Sheet

Title of Research Project: South African boys in New Zealand: Immigrants’ retrospective accounts of adapting to life in a new country during adolescence.

Researcher: Teswell White

Dear (Participant’s name),

Thank you for expressing an interest in participating in this project. Here is some more information about what it will involve. I will interview you mainly about your experiences of coming to New Zealand, “settling in” here and what it was like to go to secondary school here. While I will ask some questions to prompt you now and again, it will be the kind of informal interview that is more like a conversation.

To record everything we talk about, the interview will be digitally recorded. However, you can ask for the recorder to be turned off during discussion of any sensitive matters if you prefer.

After the interview I will send you a partial transcript of material I might like to use in my thesis. You will be asked to approve this, or indicate anything you want changed or don’t want to be included.

When we meet for the interview, you will be asked to sign a consent form. However, your rights as a participant mean that:

- You can withdraw your participation in the project before the interview, even after we’ve made arrangements.
- You can withdraw fully during or after the interview and have the recording erased.
• You can withdraw during the interview, but allow me to use the discussion up to that point.
• You can decline to answer any particular question during the interview without having to withdraw completely.
• You can ask that all information you have provided be withdrawn from the study up to four weeks after you receive the report noted in (3).

5. Use of a pseudonym in all written materials produced for this project will protect your privacy, and all audio-tapes, transcripts and other information will be confidentially stored.

6. If you decide to become involved in this project, please:
   • Contact me as soon as possible to arrange a time and place for the interview.
   • Think about some of the issues outlined in (1), so you come to the interview with some ideas and stories ready.
   • Bring this sheet with you to the interview, with the information requested on page 3.

7. If you no longer wish to be considered as a participant in this project, please let me know. If you have any concerns about this project that you don’t wish to discuss with me, you can contact my supervisor at the University of Waikato, Associate Professor Monica Payne (Ph: 07 8384466 Ext 8289).

I do hope you will join this project and that you will find it a worthwhile and enjoyable experience. However, whether you decide to participate or not, I thank you for expressing an interest and look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,
Teswell White
(Ph: [09] 5331373; email: teswell.white@xtra.co.nz)
Appendix C

Pro-forma

Please complete the following section, and bring this sheet with you to the interview.

Year of birth:

Year of arrival in New Zealand:

School(s) attended in New Zealand:

School leaving qualifications:

Further qualifications (if any):

Current occupation/employment/study:

Number of siblings:

Occupation of father:

Occupation of mother:

Choose a pseudonym for use in this project:
Appendix D

Consent to participate in research project (personal interview)

Title of Research Project: South African boys in New Zealand: Immigrants’ retrospective accounts of adapting to life in a new country during adolescence.

Researcher: Mr. Teswell White

- I have been given and understood an explanation of this research project. I have had the opportunity to ask questions and have them answered.

- I understand that I can decline to answer particular questions, or withdraw participation completely, at any point during the interview. I also understand that I can also withdraw any information that I have contributed up until four weeks after I have received the transcript excerpts of my interview.

- I agree to the interview being audio-taped.

- I understand that all information I provide will remain anonymous, through use of a pseudonym of my own choosing. I understand that my name will not be used in any written or oral presentation and that my privacy will be respected.

- I understand that the research data may be used for a thesis, journal publications or oral presentations in the public arena and that an electronic copy of the thesis would become widely available.

Name: ____________________________________________

Date: ______________________________________________

Signed: ____________________________________________
TW: Good afternoon Bob. Thank you for your time and your willingness to be part of this research study. As I explained to you earlier, this study is about listening to your secondary school experience. So, please tell me about your secondary school years.

Bob: It was a really interesting experience. I found was that I was actually enjoying the social atmosphere of secondary school so much because my oldest brother was in 11 my other brother was in year 13. I knew all their friends and I was really having a good time. I found that since I was having such a good time, I was neglecting my studies. I had my first not-achieved in Social Studies in year nine and I was scared that my parents would find out. So, I decided to work hard and got a merit and then I got an excellence. In nearly all my classes I got all excellences. At the end of year 9 I got six excellence awards and top scholar at the end of the year awards. I was just overwhelm that I came so far but that achievement was one of the things that probably hindered me the most because I went to year 10 and my brothers would call me a nerd and the teachers would have this expectation of me. But I wasn’t that person. I just worked hard and I found year 9 easy. So, in year ten I went opposite and I stopped working because I didn’t want to be seen as a nerd. I didn’t get any awards in year 10. I barely scraped through. In year 9 and year 10 it’s all about being cool. I felt like by being smart I wasn’t cool. Being the best in the class wasn’t really me. I knew that there were smarter people out there and I didn't want to be the smartest. I never wanted to be the smartest and felt like I couldn't fill that role and at the same time I didn’t wanted to be seen as a nerd. So, year 10 was a really tough time for me. I went through a lot that year. Socially…emotional issues… Slowly I started
to work a bit harder. Slowly I started to work my way up again and by
year twelve I was doing quite well and got some really good marks.
English became my best subject where in year 11 it was my worse
subject. Maths and everything I did quite well. I moved into your 13
which was the most enjoyable but the most difficult year because I
went back to South Africa at the end of year 12, beginning of year 13.
I was very conflicted in my mind coming back because I saw so many
struggles in South Africa which haven't seen for seven years. I felt that
going to university and just getting a degree, getting a job isn’t enough
for me. I struggled to think of what I could do that would be fulfilling
and could never come up with a conclusion and finish year 13. I barely
finished it.

TW: Thanks Bob. Please take your time and think back to your
secondary school days. What are the things that stood out for you and why?

Bob: The diversity of PC. That became quite challenging being a South
African. South Africans are all diverse. You get the White South
African, African South African; Indians like myself and you get the
mix, ‘Coloured’. What I found was that to fit in with the South African
group was the biggest thing for me in secondary school. I couldn't fit
in with any South Africans and I fitted in with people of Chinese
descent like Singapore, Taiwan and China. I think the thing that stood
out the most for me was when I was at primary school. I had to stop
being South African so people could understand me. Sort of fitting in
and trying to be a Kiwi. When I was at secondary school in year 10,
you started getting in with girls and all that. The South African boys
were popular with the girls. Acting cool and speaking with their thick
accents, being all masculine and all the girls were into them. That
wasn’t really me. So, through my whole secondary school life, my
identity, my cultural, and my racial identity I just threw it away. I
threw it away because I found that it had no value because what
people saw as South African wasn’t as I was as a South African. So, I
just sort of adopted a sort of Asian culture and left my South African
heritage behind.

TW: Is it possible to elaborate?
Bob: **Basically it is all about being cool and tough and having a South African accent.** It made them think that they are cool and always with a group of girls. Like the white girls would like them for some reason, I don’t know why and it was almost like you have to have a girl and you have to be popular and be a player in order to be cool. I heard from other South African friends who are a bit older and experienced the same thing. It’s all about sex and the other South African boys would say that you’re not cool because you didn’t lose your virginity. What my friend found was that those guys didn’t lose theirs either. They were real fakers. So, for that reason I didn't wanted to be associated with that.

TW: Tell me about the friends you had at school. Where they important?

Bob: **It's the most important thing. The social pressures if you don't have friends. You don't want to be a loner. That’s not cool. Everybody wants to feel important and everyone wants to feel loved. So, if you don't have friends it becomes difficult. Not just your social life but your academic life, your family, everything gets affected.**

TW: Why did you gravitate toward your Asian friends? Was there a particular reason for doing so?

Bob: I think they just happen to be my friends and I happen to get along with them. We had similar interests and I have always been interested in the Asian culture sort of thing. I think it just happen to be coincidence that I really gravitated towards them. **The funny thing was that I was the only dark skin person among them. I was like the token Black guy. (laugh)**

Even though I was their friend I never really fitted in with them. I was like an outsider. They were all Asian and I was like... *Black as you would say.* I sort of just pretended to myself that they were my friends and now two years out of secondary school we’re not really friends anymore.