

**AUTHORS RESPONSES: BJSP1610**

**Editor's comments**

Dear Professor de la Sablonnière

Thank you for resubmitting your manuscript on social change in South Africa to the BJSP. As I was uncertain myself about the first draft, I sent the manuscript back to one of the original reviewers and, as you will see, s/he feels that the improvements you've made push your paper over the publication threshold.

Having said that, I expect you to address the reviewer's comments below in a final iteration of your paper, which I am provisionally now accepting for publication in our journal, pending some minor revisions. In addition, I would invite you to take one last look at the language. The reviewer mentions grammatical errors and I also felt there were some other moments of inelegance here and there. I'm guessing that you are working in your second language here and, if so, I totally appreciate the difficulties that this entails. However, now that you have in principle a published article on your hands, it may be worth polishing up the language just one more time.

Thank you again for submitting your interesting work to the BJSP. I look forward to receiving your revised article in due course; and well done on your hard work so far.

Regards

John Dixon  
Editor

\*\*\*\*\*

Reviewer #1: This article now makes a clearer contribution to the social psychology literature, and it should be published. I have a few remaining concerns.

1. There are numerous grammatical errors that need to be fixed.
2. The shift to the term 'assumed' change helps but I still found this aspect of the argument under-developed. For example, on p. 3 we are told that "It would be logical to assume that the perception of a group's position would approximate the actual social changes, positive or negative

experienced by a group." Asserting the logic of a statement is not the same as developing a good argument, supported by references. Moreover, are actual changes the same as experienced changes, and how are we to define a group? What, for example, are the actual changes experienced by black South Africans? For the vast majority, there has been no economic upliftment and groups like COSATU would argue that this would be expected or assumed given the adherence to free market economic policies. What I'm concerned about is the purported "objective" nature of the "assumed dramatic change" that underpins the argument in the article.

On p. 22 the question is asked: "Why might some individuals report a stable group trajectory of relative deprivation even in the face of change as dramatic and far-reaching as the fall of apartheid?" Here's an answer: Because the fall of apartheid prompted no economic change for most people. This is certainly more parsimonious than self-concept theory.

3. The temporal divisions. I think it would be wise to admit that the periodization has an arbitrary element. Certainly, it is rather unusual to refer to 1991 as post-apartheid.