

https://dspace.org/

A white community's perception of white youth's interracial friendships.

Freeman, Kevin

2010-08-16
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/8454

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

A White community's perception of White youth's interracial friendships

By

Kevin Freeman
(0712120M)

A dissertation submitted to the School of Human and Community Development, Faculty of Humanities, University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. In partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts of Clinical Psychology, under the supervision of Professor Gillian Finchilescu.

Contents

Declaration……6

Acknowledgements……..7

Abstract……..8

Chapter 1: Introduction……9

Chapter 2: Literature Review……21

2.1. Introduction ……..…….21

2.2. Prejudice…….21

2.3. Contact Hypothesis……...26

2.4. Extended Contact Hypothesis…….30

2.5. Social Identity Theory……32

2.6. Integrated Threat Theory……..36

2.6.1. Realistic Threats…….……37

2.6.2. Intergroup Anxiety……..39

2.6.3. Negative Outgroup Stereotypes…….……40

2.6.4. Symbolic Threats…….……..42

2.7. Research Questions……..47

Chapter 3: Methodology……49

3.1. Research Design……...…….49

3.2. Sample…….49

3.3. Data Collection and Procedure……50

3.4. Measuring Instruments……..51

3.4.1. Demographic Details…….51

3.4.2. Feelings of friendship scale…….……51

3.4.3. Perceived threat scale……..52

3.4.4. Level of social identification scale……..52

3.4.5. Intergrpoup anxiety scale…….52

3.4.6. Social distance scale……53

3.4.7. Affective prejudice scale……..53

3.4.8. Perceived level of outgroup homogeneity scale...53

3.4.9. Interracial contact……54

3.5. Ethical considerations……..54

Chapter 4: Results……55

4.1. Introduction……...55

4.2. Psychometrics of instruments……55

4.3. Descriptive statistics……56

4.4. Contact variables……..58

4.5. Feelings about youth having Black African friends……..60

Figure 4.1: Bar graph showing dichotomised perception of symbolic threat scale……..61

4.5.1. Relationship between feelings about youth having Black African friends and perceptions of symbolic threats…….....63

4.5.2. Variables effecting feelings about youth having Black African friends.....63

4.6. Testing the Contact Hypothesis……..……65

4.6.1. Social Distance as dependent variable of prejudice…….....65

4.6.2. Affective Prejudice as dependent variable of prejudice……..66

4.7. Demographic variables' impact on attitudes and feelings…67

4.7.1. T-tests between gender and all independent variables……..67

4.7.2. Attitudes and feelings as a function of age……...68

4.7.3. Attitudes and feelings as a function of socio-economic status……..70

Chapter 5: Discussion……72
5.1. Introduction……72
5.2. How does a White community feel about their youth having Black African friends?……72
5.3. Relationship between feelings about youth having Black African friends and perceived symbolic threats……74
5.4. Variables influencing feelings about White youth having Black African friends……74
5.5. Testing the Contact Hypothesis……77
5.6. The impact of demographic variables on feelings and attitudes……79
5.7. Conclusion……80
5.8. Limitations of the study……82
5.9. Future Recommendations……83

References……85

Appendix 1: Questionnaire survey……96

List of Tables:

Table 3.1 Frequency distribution of respondents with regard to income……50
Table 4.1: Cronbach alpha coefficients of the seven scales……56
Table 4.2: Descriptive statistics of data……57

Table 4.3: Percentages of participants' contact with Black Africans……60

Table 4.4: Results of the forward stepwise regression……64

Table 4.5: Results of forward stepwise regression (social distance)……..……66

Table 4.6: Results of forward stepwise regression…….67

Table 4.7: Results of t-test……....68

Table 4.8: Results of ANOVA – Age……..…....69

Table 4.9: Results of ANOVA- socio-economic status…….....71

Declaration

This work is submitted for the completion of the degree of Master of Arts in Clinical Psychology at the University of the Witwatersrand. The work herein is that of my own and has not previously been submitted in whole or in part to any other university for the award of a degree. All contributions to the body of work by others has been correctly acknowledged.

_____ Date:_____

Kevin Freeman

Acknowledgements

I would like to extend my gratitude to a few people without whom this body of research would not have been completed.

Gillian Finchilescu, my supervisor, thank you very much for your invaluable help, guidance and patience throughout the long course of this research.

My mother, Myrna Freeman, without whose support and constant encouragement I would not have been able to keep at the task. Thank you for always believing in me.

Steven and Tessa Friedman, my dear friends. Your unconditional love and support, the gift of a sanctuary and your faith in my success allowed the completion of this thesis – allowed me to grow wings. I'm forever grateful. Thank you.

Abstract

This study explores the feelings that a White community have about their youth befriending Black Africans. The study was conducted in Gauteng with most participants from the northern suburbs of Johannesburg. There were 105 adults that participated in the study – 39 males and 66 females. A questionnaire was used to gather data and consisted of eight scales namely: feelings about White youth having Black friends, affective prejudice, social distance, intergroup anxiety, perceived symbolic threats, levels of ingroup identity, perceptions of out-group homogeneity and levels of contact with Black Africans. Participants indicated positive feelings toward White youth having Black African friends. Items in the symbolic threat scale were explored and they were summated into a scale.

A strong positive relationship was found between the perceptions of symbolic threat scale and feelings about youth having Black African friends. In order to determine the impact of the different variables on feelings about White youth having Black African friends, a forward stepwise regression was conducted where two explanatory variables proved to be significant: social distance and perceptions of threats. Social distance was the stronger influential variable on youth having Black African friends. Although not the main aim of the study it was decided to test the contact hypothesis by way of two forward stepwise regression models, the first using social distance as the measure of prejudice and the second using affective prejudice. The variables that proved significance in the first model were intergroup anxiety, having Black African friends, perceptions of outgroup homogeneity, and levels of identification with the White group. And having Black African friends and intergroup anxiety in the second model.

A t-test and ANOVAS were conducted to explore the difference in attitudes and feelings as a function of gender, age and socio-economic levels. There was no significant difference with gender and age. There was, however, a significant difference between high and low socio-economic levels regarding perceptions of homogeneity and affective prejudice.

Chapter 1

Introduction

1652 marked the year that the Dutch East India Company (VOC) established a fort at Table Bay. A decade later this colony had become a complex and racially stratified colony (Thompson, 2006), which provided the basis for the colonial conquest of South Africa that was to come later (Worden, 1994). The Cape became a slaveholding society from as early as 1658 with the introduction of the first shipload of slaves. There was a small community of 'free blacks' in the Cape, but by the late eighteenth century they were required to carry passes when leaving town. The occupations of the slaves in the Cape varied greatly depending on their owners. The rural slaves were generally farm labourers and domestic servants (Thompson, 2006).

Tensions between the colonists and the khoikhoi (the indigenous population) began soon after initial European settlement as a result of land acquisition, the conflict of which was soon controlled by the colonists due to superior weaponry and lack of union amongst the indigenous population. The colonists became increasingly brutal toward the Khoikhoi and those punished for suspicion of crimes were imprisoned on Robben Island. The Khoikhoi became a subordinate caste in this colonized society. Slaves had no rights; they were not allowed to own property, marry, enter legal contracts or leave wills. Due to the constant threat of violence from slaves, their owners enforced their authority through their own violent means (Thompson, 2006).

There were a few interracial marriages between European men and freed slave women as well as a lot of extramarital sexual activity, mostly between White men and slave women, and as a result many European men fathered children by Cape slave (Thompson, 2006).

The colonists that spread out into the interior of the country became known as 'trekboers', and helped themselves to land, displacing the indigenous peoples and evoking resistance among the San and Khoikhoi, who had lost their livestock. In turn the Europeans amounted fierce counter-resistance to stymie such attacks (Thompson, 2006).

The British arrived at the Cape and initially maintained the social structures established by the Dutch, but later advocated that relations between the colony and

indigenous population be kept absolutely separate (Thompson, 2006). The indigenous populations were ruthlessly driven from their land, which was procured by British settlers.

The slave trade ended and laws were introduced by the British to improve the conditions of slaves, although the owners took little notice of such laws and they were not enforced with much zeal by the authorities. Slaves were legally emancipated in 1828, but were left with few alternatives but to work for Whites as they were legal owners of almost all the productive land in the colony. In 1853 a bicameral parliament was introduced with a constitution that allowed for non-racialism, but whites of course dominated the politics and always anticipated exploiting the indigenous populations for labour, and later introduced further acts that severely restricted their rights. The community in the cape Colony became known as the Cape Coloured people and were separated from whites and treated as an inferior community (Thompson, 2006), with a marked increase in social segregation from the 1880's (Worden, 1994).

Due to their dissatisfaction with the British laws being passed in the Cape Colony, some large groups of Afrikaners trekked out north into the interior in the mid 1830's, coming into contact and conflict with the Zulus (Thompson, 2006). As a result of the 'Shepstone system', a system where unclaimed land by whites was given to Africans with the right to cultivate as 'locations' under the rule of African chiefs, who themselves were under 'Native Law' administrated by White magistrates, led to the foundations of segregation in the twentieth century (Worden, 1994).

The discovery of gold and diamonds in South Africa led to a great increase in wealth and changed the structure of the economy. This accelerated the completion of the conquest of the African inhabitants by British regiments, colonial militia and Afrikaner commandos. Whites dominated the African people and regarded themselves as wholly superior in all respects. The disparity in earnings between White and Black gold miners in the early twentieth century was massive, only to increase as the years passed (Thompson, 2006). There was a marked increase in segregation from the 1880's and in 1905 there was compulsory segregation in education (Worden, 1994). The Mines and Works Act (1911) imposed the colour bar. The Natives Land Act (1913) prohibited Africans from purchasing or leasing land from non-Africans outside of the reserves set aside for them, which deteriorated rapidly due to the small amount of land allocated to such a vast population., Education on these reserves was left in

the hands of missionary societies with limited resources. These reserves essentially became pools of cheap, unskilled labour for White exploitation (Thompson, 2006).

Toward the end of the 1930's many whites had gravitated around the main cities and so too had the Africans who could not survive in the reserves and were drawn to the towns and cities by the prospect of jobs. The Africans were subjected to strict pass laws (having to carry documents signed by their employees) similar to those instituted over a hundred years earlier. South African towns and cities had a dichotomous structure to them. There was a modern business sector surrounded by suburbs, the houses of which were served by Black domestic workers, and then a location separate from the town poorly built and serviced where Blacks who worked in the towns resided. The Natives Act (1923) ensured residential segregation in towns. The Natives representation Act (1934) weakened the political rights of Africans by removing their direct voting rights and instead gave them the right to vote for whites as their representatives in parliament (Thompson, 2006).

The government defended the discriminatory legislation by explaining that the 'Native' people had not yet reached a sufficient stage of development in order to own land under conditions of free competition (Thompson, 2006). In 1946 a committee to deal with the 'racial problem' was appointed, which recommended rigorous segregation (social and economic) between Whites and other races and abolishment of representation of Africans in parliament. The label given to such policy was *apartheid* – meaning apartness, which was instituted in order to retain power over a Black majority that was beginning to demand political rights (Thompson, 2006). There were four categorized racial groups: Whites, Coloureds, Indians/ Asians and African. Whites saw themselves as a single nation whereas Black Africans were many, thus making Whites the largest nation in the country. Whites regarded themselves as the civilized race, entitled to absolute control over the state with their interests taking priority over any other group (Thompson, 2006). Social segregation meant that there were separate sections for Blacks in official buildings such as post offices, as well as separate recreational facilities, separate transport facilities and separate churches (Christopher, 1994).

Employment and wage protection was motivated to ensure the continuation of White rule. In a debate in 1954 on the Industrial Conciliation Bill, then Minister of Labour, Mr. B.J. Schoeman had the following to say,

> This provision is against economic laws. The question however, is this: What is our first consideration? Is it to maintain the economic laws or is it to ensure the continued existence of the European race in this country….I want to say that if we reach the stage where the Native can climb to the highest rung in our economic ladder and be appointed in a supervisory capacity over Europeans, then the other equality; namely political equality, must inevitably follow and that will mean the end of the European race.
>
> (Cited in Christopher, 1994, p. 2*).*

The above quote highlights the obvious threat against an existing culture, values and way of life from which the apartheid government saw fit to defend the White nation in a most aggressive manner through the implementation and preservation of apartheid.

The privileged position of Whites was further secured through the legislature passed by the National Party after their accession to power in 1948. These included the Population Registration Act (1950), which classified people into distinct racial groups, the Group Areas Act (1950), which classified residential areas in terms of race and allowed the state to exercise a forced removal of people on a massive scale, demonstrating white power in the crudest sense (Worden, 1994); large populations of Black, Coloured and Indian/Asian were forcibly removed and resettled in specifically designated zones (Christopher, 1994), the Natives Amendment Act (1955) which severely restricted the movement of Africans into towns, and the Promotion of Bantu Self-government Act (1959), which strove for 'separate development', all of which were designed to establish and maintain urban racial residential segregation (Christopher, 1994). Even sexual relationships between individuals from different racial groups were legally prohibited (Immorality Act 1950) and a Mixed Marriages Act was passed in 1949, at which the Minister of the Interior, Dr T.E. Donges

explained: “To check blood mixture, and as far as possible promote racial purity” (Christopher, 1994).

The then Prime Minister, Dr D.F. Malan was most supportive of the Group Areas Bill, debating the following,

> I do not think there is any other Bill, affecting the relations between the different races, the non-Europeans and the Europeans in this country, which determines the future of South Africa and of all population groups as much as this Bill does.
>
> (Cited in Christopher, 1994, p.4).

To ensure separation with regard to intimate relationships the Reservation of Separate Amenities Bill was introduced in 1953 to prevent racial mixing and the filtration of pure European and non-European populations (Christopher, 1994) and to allow for the inequality of public facilities for different racial groups. The White campaign for segregation encompassed a backward mentality fuelled by the horror of the possible leveling consequences of capitalism. *“*….most interpretations of segregation have emphasized the perceived threat to white society posed by rapid African urbanization*”* (Beinart & Dubow, 1995, p. 10). *“*Although segregation was primarily a modernizing ideology, it also reflected widespread fears about the modern age*”* (p. 11) which centred on anxieties pertaining to racial “degeneration” or “deterioration” in an urban context, where boundaries were rather more fluid (Beinart & Dubow, 1995).

The Government never regarded the different population groups as equal to Whites, rather, preferring to see them as either “semi-civilized” or “uncivilized” (Christopher, 1994, p. 4). Education was the area in which inequality was most apparent, with a sub-standard education delivered to the “Natives” so as to quell expectations and avoid frustration, as professional opportunities would not exist for Blacks (Christopher, 1994). This was legalized with the Bantu Education Act (1953), which imposed a standardized curriculum emphasizing separate ‘Bantu culture’ and doing little more for students other than preparing them for manual labour (Worden , 1994).

‘Homelands’ – reserves set aside for the African population were established and eventually made self-governing and independent, depriving the Africans, who were citizens of such homelands, citizenship of South Africa (Thompson, 2006). The government tried to keep all Africans in these ‘homelands’ except for those that were needed to work as labourers for Whites. Although there was a massive increase in the number of Africans settling in the segregated townships adjacent to the cities, they were still regarded as visitors to such settlement whose homes remained in the so -called ‘homelands’. Segregation was imposed on all levels of education (Thompson, 2006). ‘Whites Only’ signs were erected everywhere. Segregation was imposed through laws and regulations for every public facility including benches, lavatories and elevators as well as in the sporting arena where interracial competition and integrated teams were prohibited (Thompson, 2006). The Suppression of Communism Act (1950) gave broad powers to the Minister of Justice to ban any organization that opposed apartheid, thus restricting any form of expression of resistance, thus maintaining a White supremacist position (Worden, 1994).

“Apartheid became the most notorious form of racial domination that the post-war world has known” (Thompson, 2006, p. 184). Through well-established propaganda machinery Whites were sheltered from knowledge of their Black African compatriots in terms of their living conditions, and language, and any contact made with Black Africans was always hierarchical; these relationships were usually employer/employee relationships and Whites were always in position of the ‘boss’ (Thompson, 2006).

Black defiance began in the 1950’s and demonstrations in the 1960’s. Blacks had begun to take a firm stand and fight against the injustice of the colonial system. The Soweto uprising in 1976, spurred on by a decree that half the curriculum in Black schools would be taught in Afrikaans, was a shock to Whites and highly threatening to the established order (Worden, 1994). Lipton (1988) has argued that major instigators to reform in South Africa came about as a result of the realization of the costs of apartheid by both the business and commercial interests as all-out war had became an option that both Blacks and Whites were beginning to entertain (Harvey, 2001).

All this enforced segregation and inequality led to a divided nation with Whites being sheltered from the social horrors that such segregationist policies created. These attitudes and social structures combined with the segregationist policies, employed

by the government made cross-race friendships, and indeed any contact, almost impossible to achieve under such stringent laws, policies and racial propaganda. The White supremacist propaganda espoused from the government and other circles before democracy certainly had a massive influence on White society who were victims and perpetrators of this widespread misinformation; victims and perpetrators of a social system that exerted pressure on conformity to group norms resulting in heightened levels of prejudice (Pettigrew, 1958), and a cultural system that endorsed negative racial views (Nieuwoudt and Nel, 1975), and economic exploitation and impoverishment (Kornegay, 2005). In research conducted in South Africa on contact, Foster and Finchilescu (1986), in fact, called the country a "non-contact society".

The release of Nelson Mandela and the unbanning of the ANC led to the ANC's ascension to power in 1994 signaling the formal end of apartheid. The locus of political power changed and social identities transformed as a result of the changing geographical and social boundaries. Although a new democratic government was voted into power, the cumulative effects of colonialism, apartheid and urbanization still handicapped the nation. Voting in both the 1994 and 1999 elections was overwhelmingly along racial lines (Worden, 2000).

The massive gap between rich and poor was in effect a division between races. Reconciliation was foremost on the agenda with the establishment of a Truth and Reconciliation Committee chaired by Bishop Tutu, this only heightened racial divisions in the country as most people, particularly Whites bitterly opposed the process. Land redistribution and Affirmative Action (AA) policies and Black economic Empowerment (BEE) policies were instituted as a way of redressing the economic disparity in the previous dispensation. A new Black middle class grew significantly in number during the Mandela's presidency, a new class that had political power and prospered and were composed mainly of Africans, resulting in significant development of class structure in South Africa. . With the end of apartheid, the dissolution of segregationist laws and policies allowed for the sharing of public spaces, institutions and work places. By 1999 African students formed increasingly large minorities of what were previously White universities (Thompson, 2006).

However, there are very low levels of contact and friendships between Blacks and Whites in South Africa (Gibson, 2004). Some believe that an insidious "apartheid mentality" still exists in the country today (Gibson, 2004). "South Africans still socialized exclusively with members if their own race", (p. 270-71) just as had been

the case under the apartheid system (Thompson, 2006). Segregation is no longer law in South Africa, but seems to continue as a way of life across the race barrier. “The white population has remained by far the most highly segregated segment of the population of South African towns and cities in the decade since the repeal of the apartheid legislation” (Christopher, 2005, p. 2310).

Although many Whites come into contact with Black Africans to some degree, in work and university environments, the extent of segregation is alarmingly high. Gibson (2004) found that amongst Blacks, very few have White friends and only a small percentage of Whites reported having Black friends. One particularly striking statistic from a survey conducted by Gibson (2004) really highlights the extent of continued segregation in the country; Over 80% of Black South Africans reported that they had never sat down to meal with a White person. Black Africans make up 80%of the South African population and thus it makes sense that most of their friendships would be with other Black Africans (Finchilescu & Tredoux, in press). Christopher (2005) makes a comment on the paucity of change in South Africa since the advent of democracy, “The post-apartheid city continues to look remarkably like its predecessor, the apartheid city” (p. 2305).

Currently Blacks and Whites share the same work, recreational and residential spaces, but being in close proximity to the other does not imply that actual contact takes place. There has been research conducted in South Africa that highlights the inter-connectedness of contact and segregation by viewing it from a different perspective. In a study by Dixon and Durrheim (2003), observing Black and White beachgoers sharing the same South African beach, would, on the surface, suggest contact between the groups, however, on closer inspection it was noted that segregation on the micro-scale was taking place. The Whites would move away from areas of the beach that became densely populated with Blacks, or actually leave the beach altogether.

Regardless of the repeal of segregation laws and efforts to promote cross-race contact, it would seem that a form of voluntary self-segregation continues at the individual and group levels, and even amongst the youth who have lived most of their lives in a democratic South Africa. As above studies have suggested proximity to or opportunity for contact is not sufficient to induce interaction (Tredoux & Finchilescu, in review; Dixon, Tredoux & Clack, 2005; Dixon et al., 2008).

It could be argued that many Whites were victims of the South African propaganda machine - a powerful and well-organized network with far reaching effects and substantial financial resources to support such activity (Laurence, 1979). Such group attitudes once established are enduring and difficult to change. A study conducted by Finchilescu and Dawes (1999, cited in Foster, 2006) in the Western Cape and KwaZulu-Natal among 14- and 17-year-old adolescents, sampled in 1992 and 1996, indicated a continuation of previous racial patterns with English- and Afrikaans-speaking youth scoring highest on anti-African measures and racism scores were found to be higher amongst the White youth in 1996 than in 1992, suggesting perhaps that contact between Whites and Blacks confirmed, and in fact, fuelled previous prejudiced attitudes, supporting Allport's (1954) statement that intergroup contact can also exacerbate prejudice.

It is only in the last few years that a new generation has emerged in South Africa, a generation that shares equal opportunities amongst all race groups. The youth in South Africa have a unique opportunity to form friendships across the colour line, free of hierarchical imbalance. However it has been noted that very little contact between Blacks and Whites is taking place in South Africa, and thus relatively very few friendships are being forged (Gibson, 2004).

Schrieff, Tredoux, Dixon, and Finchilescu (2005) conducted several observational studies of student residences in South African universities, one of which mapped the seating positions of 5299 Black and 1339 White diners over a period of fifty intervals. Although the Black and White students shared common eating spaces, they would in fact dine separately. They would sit at different tables and gather in separate areas (Schrieff et al., 2005). They gravitated toward what Dixon et al., (2008) called racial 'comfort zones'.

The repeal of the Group Areas Act along with other segregation laws in 1991 allowed for the possibility of residential desegregation in South Africa, but efforts on the part of the government to implement integrative planning in cities around the country have taken a back seat to other economic policies aimed at free market growth (Christopher, 2005), resulting in few opportunities for interracial mixing in residential areas. State housing policy, the development of new areas and settlements into these areas has tended to remain almost mono-racial (Christopher, 2005). According to Christopher (2005), 2001 census results indicated that the cities and towns in South Africa remained highly segregated, and the extent of which is specific to

particular urban areas. He makes the valid point that the peripheral townships to the urban centres remain basically mono-racial, but “as it was the White inhabitants who controlled the imposition of segregation for their own benefit, it is their desegregation which provides the symbolic measure of the decline of the apartheid city” (p. 2311). There are a number of explanations for the continued segregation in the cities. Desegregation in White group areas was hindered with the prevention of squatters, the limited opportunities for mortgage finance for non-Whites to purchase houses in these areas, the low levels of migration of whites from these areas, thus non-Whites could only move into these areas once Whites moved on, and there have also been limited areas of integration that have emerged in the transformed towns and suburbs (Christopher, 2005). Christopher (2005) comments on the paucity of change in South African residential demographics since the advent of democracy that sums up the current position, “The post-apartheid city continues to look remarkably like its predecessor, the apartheid city” (p. 2305).

In a survey by Kornegay (2005) Whites showed the least preference for residential integration, with a feeling that this would only lead to a souring of race relations. From the above it would seem that Whites might be grappling with forming a new identity themselves, finding it difficult to negotiate a position they are willing and able to assume in a changed society and maintaining attitudes that prevent real contact and friendships from developing in the New South Africa.

In the survey by Kornegay (2005), Whites indicated the highest percentage, compared with other race groups in South Africa, that ethnicity counted against them in terms of obtaining jobs or promotions. If one’s means of earning a living are thwarted as a result of the group to which one belongs, competition for scarce resources is created and one’s material well-being is threatened, which in turn promotes intergroup animosity (Sherif, 1966; Ashmore & Del Boca, 1976). This coupled with the fact that Whites were found to be against residential integration, suggests that there may be little support at a community level for interracial mixing.

As Finchilescu and Tredoux (in press) suggest, there is a need to understand the predictors for failed contact – where contact does not occur, or does not reduce prejudice as anticipated. There is thus an important need to explore the potential moderators and mediators to the contact-prejudice relationship in South Africa.

The aim of this study is to investigate how a White community feels about their youth having Black African friends. Social and political policies allow for such relationships to develop as opposed to policies in the apartheid era. Universities and other institutions no longer enforce segregation and provide a levelled playing field between races and hence necessary social conditions for contact to occur (Pettigrew, 1998). However, it is possible that the normative White group attitudes have a powerful impact on other Whites' behaviour causing others to comply with the expectations of the group due to the power that the group has to reward, punish, reject or accept members of the group (Abrams et al., 1991). The study looks at the different factors that influence feelings of White youth having Black African friends and the associated attitudes. The different factors explored in this study include: perception of threat resulting from youth mixing with Black Africans, the levels of anxiety associated with intergroup interaction, perceived levels of homogeneity within the Black African group, levels of affective prejudice toward Black Africans, levels of identification with the White group and degrees of social distance from Black Africans. The other factors that this study aims to explore are the contact variables, namely: whether having a Black African friend or knowing a White person with Black African friend influences one's feelings and attitudes about their youth having Black African friends. Demographic variables, such as age, gender, socio-economic levels and education will also be explored for their influence on such feelings. Although segregation laws have been revoked there are still a relatively small number of cross-race friendships in the present day South Africa. This is quite surprising since according to contact theory (Allport, 1954) one would have expected far greater interaction and friendships to have developed. The Black African and White youth are interacting to a greater extent but here too there are still high degrees of segregation. With Whites now filling the position of a minority group in the 'new South Africa' it is possible that the perceived level of threat is of a degree that levels of prejudice are increased and group identity is made more salient. It is known that children are easily influenced by their parent's attitudes (Allport, 1954) and this may perpetuate a segregationist ideology amongst Whites.

There has been no published study in post-apartheid South Africa that measures White's feelings and perceptions of their youth having Black African friends and how the variables of attitude, group identity and perceived threats affect these attitudes and how the aforementioned variables interact with each other to encourage or discourage cross-race friendships. In understanding these variable relationships we are better able to understand the dynamics of racial interaction in the South African

society. This study lays the groundwork for further studies in determining how these factors may influence the White youth in befriending Black Africans as this sheds light on the effectiveness of the reconciliatory measures in place and the work still necessary to reach the point of harmonious race relations in South Africa. It is important to note that this study pertains to the Black African and White dynamic and the findings of such should not be extrapolated to interaction between Whites and other race groups, as Pettigrew and Tropp (2005) mention, “the outcomes of contact vary substantially across different intergroup contexts” (p. 272 – 273).

This chapter has contextualized the study in a post-apartheid South Africa by highlighting the historical events that catalyzed the conflictual race relations between Black Africans and Whites, as well as those events that lead to the eventual political and social transformation in the country. The following chapter reviews a few different theories and concepts with which to explore the race relations pertaining to this study and thus make sense of the different measuring instruments used herein to gage such attitudes and feelings of respondents in this research.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

2.1. Introduction

The research explores the feelings that a White community have about their youth having Black African friends and the variables that influence such feelings of interracial interaction. The variables chosen to focus on in this study are the type and extent of contact that Whites have had or have with Black Africans, the feelings of anxiety associated with such contact, the levels to which they identify with the White group, their perceptions of homogeneity of the Black African group, and feelings of prejudice toward the Black African group and the extent to which their youth's friendships with Black Africans is threatening.

In order to explore these variables around interracial contact in South Africa it is important to review the theories and concepts that best relate to this study. The theories reviewed for the study are the contact hypothesis, extended contact hypothesis, social identity theory and integrated threat theory, and the concepts of prejudice and conformity will also be explored. It was decided to explore the general mixing between Black Africans and Whites in this study, as opposed to intimate relations between the two groups. The term 'Black African' has been used in this study to refer to the group that is also commonly referred to as 'Black' or 'African', as the term 'Black' is also used to refer to Coloureds and Indians in South Africa. Prejudice is a very wide subject and beyond the scope of this study, thus only certain concepts and ideas pertinent to this research will be reviewed.

2.2. Prejudice

It is not possible to isolate the reasons for prejudice in South Africa, to a single cause, but rather a set of interrelated causes, some being normative and socio-cultural factors (Nieuwoudt & Nel, 1975) all working together with various and changeable strengths that change from one context to another and one time frame to another.

“Prejudice”, as defined by Allport (1954), “is thinking ill of others without sufficient warrant” (p.6) and ethnic prejudice as “... an antipathy based upon a faulty and inflexible generalization. It may be felt or expressed. It may be directed toward a group as a whole or toward an individual because he is a member of that group” (p.9). Prejudice also serves an additional function at the social level - together with discrimination it protects economic and political interests. It may be, as Crandall and Stangor (2005) suggest, a social norm. Crandall and Eshleman (2003) believe that “people acquire, early and firmly, prejudice toward racial out-groups. As cultural norms become increasingly negative toward straightforward prejudice, and as people mature, they become motivated and skilled at suppressing many of their prejudices” (p. 416). This suggests that the prejudices may be expressed in rather more subtle ways, such as avoidance of particular group members, and since the climate in South Africa is one of political correctness and sensitivity, this may well be the case. This study has uses two different measures of prejudice; a cognitive measure - social distance, and an affective measure - affective prejudice.

According to Nieuwoudt and Nel (1975), there have been strong anti-African group norms present in South Africa, which have emerged as a result of past relations between Whites and Black Africans. There have been many single-factor theories of prejudice proposed but many suggest the prejudice is in fact multi-faceted. Nieuwoudt and Nel (1975) propose that one must consider three different ‘systems’ when considering the attitudes of an individual.

1. The personality system of the individual: prejudice is fulfilling certain psychological needs. The first function, instrumentality – objects from which individuals receive rewards are cathected with positive attitudes, and those from which individuals receive negative punishment are cathected with negative attitudes. The second function , ego-defensive – attitudes take on a self-protective function. Negative racial attitudes may be espoused as a result of feelings of inferiority. Authoritarian personalities are prone to this behaviour as the world is made safer for themselves through the adoption of such attitudes.
2. The social system in which the individual belongs: group norms often engender various types of racial attitudes. The social system may be a source of racial prejudice as the closer an individual is to a particular group, the more that group is able to exert social pressure on the individual and bring his/her views in line with that of the group. In viewing the social system as a source of racial prejudice certain factors need to be considered: a) the characteristics of the group b) the tendency of the group to be open or closed to interracial mixing c) the way the group socializes its

members d) the extent of stereotypical views towards other groups e) individual conformity to group standards

3. The cultural system in which both the individual and the groups to which he/she belongs are housed: the society in which these groups belong will endorse certain views and values.

Dovidio (2001) suggests that there have been three 'waves' of study through which prejudice has been viewed. Initially prejudice was seen as psychopathology, a social problem that sought to identify prejudiced individuals through the use of authoritarian personality scales. People with authoritarian personalities adhere strongly to group norms (Nieuwoudt & Nel, 1975). In a country like South Africa where prejudice against Africans was the norm, the authoritarian personality would thrive in such an environment, which would fulfill the personality function of such an individual allowing the individual to displace his/her anger on to an appropriate group (Nieuwoudt & Nel, 1975). According to Nieuwoudt and Nel (1975) in such a society an authoritarian person will be more prejudiced compared to a society in which these norms are absent.

The second 'wave' of theory assumed that prejudice was rooted in normal processes such as socialization and social norms. Tajfel and Turner (1979) highlighted the influence of social and individual identity as determinants of prejudice. Normal cognitive processes of stereotyping and bias, an intraindividual perspective, were also seen to lead to prejudice (Hamilton & Trolier,1986, cited in Dovidio, 2001). Bias and prejudice were seen as the norm. Allport viewed conformity as deviant behaviour, however, psychologists now view it as normal and acceptable behaviour, an important mode of functioning in society (Crandall & Stangor, 2005). "Most of people's prejudices are acquired from the local social norms and the culture in which people live" (Crandall & Stangor, 2005,p. 308). Crandall and Stangor (2005) propose that conformity "seems to form the very core of the majority of people's prejudices" (p. 305).

The third 'wave' embraced a multidimentional model of prejudice where theories of subtle and unintentional forms of prejudice emerged (Dovidio, 2001), aversive racism being one such form and with attention focused on the bias of the 'well-intentioned' this was explored to greater degree. Aversive racism can be distinguished from traditional racism by differentiating between explicit attitudes – those of which the individual is aware and projects deliberately, and implicit attitudes – those that the

individual tries to dissociate from his/her self-image, which he/she may regard as non-prejudiced. Implicit attitudes are rooted in habitual reactions and are extremely difficult to change, and are often unconscious, the inertia of which lingers, whereas explicit attitudes can change and evolve over time relatively easily (Dovidio, 2001). The presence of such dual attitudes may result in misperceptions of one's own ideas of how one is perceived by the other, as these attitudes may not correspond with one another. Whites may consider themselves to be non-prejudiced and express their explicit attitudes, but Black Africans may pick up the unconscious implicit prejudiced attitudes thereby receiving a different message than what is thought to be projected (Dovidio, 2001).

Whites were socialized from birth to hold prejudiced views towards non-whites (Marquad, 1962) and strong social sanctions were applied to those who deviated from the norm (Orpen, 1975). Although there were differences between White subgroups in South Africa, all had strong anti-Black feelings (Orpen, 1975).
Although most White South Africans had frequent contact with Black Africans, this contact was superficial contact with minority group members – a condition which has been shown to encourage the development of prejudice and Orpen (1975) is of the opinion that the authoritarian personality has little influence over one's racial attitudes when prejudiced attitudes are the norm, but rather it is the cultural milieu that plays a crucial role in shaping such attitudes.

There are many White sub-groups, each of which holds their own distinct set of group norms and people may be influenced from a number of different sources. Hare (1976, cited in Duckitt, 1991) showed that secondary group norms are weaker influences than primary group norms – the primary group being family, friends and significant others – and therefore it is important to distinguish between the different socio-cultural groups. As Louw-Potgieter (1988) points out, the adherents of apartheid were split into different camps as the socio-political climate changed shape through the years (Du Preez, 1980, cited in Foster, 1991).

Duckitt (1994), however, conducted a study in pre-reform South Africa among university students to explore if conformity to social pressure is an important determinant to prejudice, and particularly if this is so in social groups where prejudice is normative, such as the South African context. He found that prejudice was probably due to socialization and homophilic selection rather than conformity, suggesting that socialization effects can "account for the correlation of attitudes with

pressure from family and relatives" (p.123). He also found that the correlation between prejudice and authoritarian personality was high irrespective of the normative pressure experienced.

Pettigrew (1958) conducted research in intergroup attitudes, comparing a South Africa White society with that of a society in the Southern states of North America, and explored whether personality factors or social norms are the dominant force in adopting prejudiced attitudes. He suggested that both might play a role but found that in the South African context externalized personality predispositions do not account for the prejudiced attitudes of the White South Africans. Where cultural norms positively sanction prejudice, the susceptibility to conform to such norms may be an important psychological component of such attitudes. Therefore externalizing personality factors may be important in historically imbedded racial intolerance, but so too are the socio-cultural factors in accounting for racial hostility (Pettigrew, 1958).

According to Tredoux (1991), there are two ideas behind the theoretical accounts of conformity: (1) "…Individuals are motivated to achieve correct judgments, and will consequently turn to other people for support for their position(s)". (2) "… Conformity is conducive to the success and continued existence of the group. Conformity ensures uniformity within the group, which is vital to its success, and is also a precondition for its continued existence" (p. 409, Tredoux, 1991).

Allport (1954) recognized a relationship between conformity and prejudice and stated, "about half of all prejudiced attitudes are based only on the need to conform to custom" (p286), arguing conformity as an important cause of prejudice due to the following reasons:

- The parents and others closely associated with the child have a profound influence on his/her opinion.
- The same prejudices are shared with people from the same culture.
- People may unlearn their prejudices by being exposed to other influences.

"Behaving in accordance with a normative attitude … validates the self concept and the person's status as a group member" (Terry, Hogg, & Blackwood, 2006, p.147). Moscovici (1976) explains that an individual will spontaneously choose the opinion of the majority or a leader over a deviant or unspecified other, and goes on to quote Newcombe (1964) who expresses that unilateral influence, "of which imitation and

compliance are examples...is most readily accepted from persons who are liked and trusted…and who are thought to share one's norms and values that are immediately relevant" (Newcombe,1964, cited in Moscovici, 1976, p. 15).

Allport (1954) claimed that there is a "survival value" to conforming; In order to survive a child needs to take after his/her parents. "If their design for living is tolerant, so too is his; if they are hostile toward certain groups, so too is he" (p. 293). What may be playing out in the current South African social context is learned prejudice from parents, peers and older generations in the White community that were exposed to the prejudicial propaganda in the apartheid years coupled with the segregationist policies that did not allow for such propaganda to be proven wrong. Pettigrew (1958) found that social conformity among Whites in South Africa correlated strongly with anti-Black prejudice and other studies reproduced such findings (Heaven, Stones, & Bester, 1986; Nieuwoudt & Nel, 1975; Orpen, 1971). Attitudes to Affirmative Action in South Africa may exacerbate already held negative attitudes towards Black Africans that may be held as a result of conforming to the group norm, or provoke negative attitudes toward Black Africans amongst a younger White generation that feel such Affirmative Action policies are unjust and unfair (Franchi, 2006). Conformity may further motivate such attitudes.

2.3. Contact Hypothesis

Allport (1954) was the first to officially propose the contact hypothesis in which he conceived of the reduction of prejudice through intergroup contact. The contact hypothesis suggests that if a person has contact with a member of an out-group that is negatively evaluated by his/her ingroup, this contact could change the attitudes of that person toward the out-group in a positive way. Allport (1954) suggested that the contact would reduce prejudice if four primary conditions were met: the groups in contact are of equal status, they work together in the pursuit of common goals, there is intergroup co-operation, and the contact is supported by authorities, custom or law.

Many studies over the years have explored the contact effects suggested by Allport, some more convincing than others, and many with conflicting conclusions.

Pettigrew (1998) advanced Allport's contact hypothesis and included another condition, which he regarded as crucial for successful contact – 'friendship potential'.

Pettigrew maintained that strong positive effects from contact could arise as a result of intergroup friendship as it involves: a) Learning about the outgroup – negative views and stereotypes of the outgroup may be corrected. b) Changing behaviour – "New situations require conforming to new expectations. If these expectations include acceptance to outgroup members, this behaviour has the potential to produce attitude change", (Pettigrew, 1998, p. 71). c) Affective ties – the presence of emotion is most important in intergroup contact, which can lead to positive (Pettigrew, 1998). d) Ingroup reappraisal – realising that one's customs and social norms are not the only way of negotiating the social world can broaden one's perspective and lead to greater acceptance of outgroups (Pettigrew, 1998).

Pettigrew and Tropp (2006), however conducted a meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory, using 713 independent samples from 515 studies and found "that intergroup contact typically reduces intergroup prejudice", the effects of which "typically generalize to the entire outgroup", and "contact under [Allport's] optimal contact conditions typically leads to even greater reduction in prejudice" (p.751), but, were regarded by Pettigrew and Tropp (2006), as rather more facilitating than essential for prejudice reduction. They also went on to say that Allport's optimal contact conditions "are best conceptualized as an interrelated bundle rather than as independent factors" (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006, p. 751). Although Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) have argued that the abovementioned conditions are not necessary for contact to bring about positive effects, it is important to note that though their findings were robust, the meta-analytic mean effect was $r = |0.21|$, suggesting that sometimes contact may not reduce intergroup prejudice, and thus those conditions, as Tredoux and Finchilescu (in press) argue, may in fact be necessary in contexts like apartheid South Africa.

The study of contact dynamics is relatively undeveloped in South Africa due to the prevention of intergroup ties by the apartheid system (Durrhein & Dixon, 2005). In the apartheid era when conflictual intergroup relations, political oppression and institutionalized racism were present, it was simply not possible to meet these conditions and thus there is little wonder as to the lack of real contact between Black Africans and Whites in South African. There have been studies, although limited, that have explored the contact dynamic that dates from the 1950's and 1960's and thereafter from the 1980's as transformation began to take shape. Contact did indeed occur, but this contact was mostly hierachical or bureaucratic in nature, and often charged with conflict (Finchilescu & Tredoux, in press). However, Luiz and Krige (1981) conducted a quasi-experimental study where a programme of intergroup

activities was implemented over a two-day period. It was found that intergroup attitudes were significantly improved and this was still evident a year later (Luiz & Krige, 1985;cited in Durrheim & Dixon, 2005). Van Dyk (1988, cited in Mynhardt & du Toit, 1991) investigated the attitudes of Whites toward their Black domestic servants, as this was the most extensive form of interracial contact between the two groups, and she found that although their attitudes were generally positive towards their domestic servants, they did not generalise to the Black group as a whole.

Research has shown that prejudice may be exacerbated through contact that is perceived to be anxiety provoking or threatening (Stephan & Stephan,1985; Paolini, Hewstone, Cairns & Voci, 2004). Mynhardt (1980) explored the attitudes of White, English-speaking girls from ten private schools where the classes contained some Black girls. The attitudes were significantly more negative for the White girls from mixed classes than those who had no contact with the Black girls (Mynhardt & du Toit, 1991).

With the exception of the Luiz & Krige (1981) study, other studies during the apartheid era did not support the literature suggesting that contact reduces intergrpoup prejudice. The political and social landscape during this period was too devastating to expect cohesive intergroup contact to occur (Finchilescu & Tredoux, in press). As Pettigrew (1998) emphasized the social context is of most importance in exploring intergroup contact. The status of the different group members involved in the interaction may be equal, but the groups to which they belong may be of majority vs minority status, and thus there may well be different expectations, perspectives and motivations to their interactions, and this has direct implications for the success of contact in reducing bias (Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005).

With the fall of apartheid and the beginning of desegregation, transformation in South Africa proceeded very slowly, with previously White neighbourhoods remaining relatively mono-racial (Christopher, 2005) and thereby limiting opportunities for interracial contact. Post-apartheid studies on race relations and contact in South Africa are still relatively few, but a number of them have found that contact led to positive intergroup attitudes, specifically for the White group. However, it has been argued that it may not have been the contact that brought about more positive intergroup attitudes, and that those who agreed to take part in such studies may have already been less prejudiced (Finchilescu & Tredoux, in press). In order to explore more ‘natural’ intergroup contact and friendships, some research has focused on interracial

interactions in many different contexts with the use of surveys and observational methods. Gibson (2004) conducted a South African survey (N = 3727) in co-operation with the Institute for Justice and Reconciliation (IJR) and reported that the although Whites have some contact with Black Africans, in the work place or other, as many as twenty- five percent reported no social contact at all. It was also found that as little as 6.6% of Whites reported having Black African friends, and most Black Africans reported having no White friends.

The workplace and educational institutions do allow for more 'natural' contact to occur, with universities probably providing the closest equality between racial groups for such inter-action (Finchilescu & Tredoux, in press). As a result there have been a number of studies that have focused on university students and cross race contact.

Schrieff (2005, cited in Finchilescu & Tredoux, in press) conducted a couple studies at the University of Cape Town, a university with a liberal reputation. One study examined the formation of friendships in a mixed race residence among first year students. Although 285 friendships were forged, only 51 of those friendships were cross-race. The second study focused on the seating patterns in the residence dining rooms and found that such arrangements were almost entirely segregated. The fact that there is evidence of self-segregation suggests that an encounter with a member of another race group is does not necessarily lead to contact. An observational study by Dixon and Durrheim (2003) investigated racial interactions on a South African beach. It was noticed that interactions between Black and Whites were very infrequent. Whites and Black would occupy separate spaces on the beach. Whites would arrive early when they were the only ones occupying the beach and would leave when they felt that it was becoming full of Black. This is a stark example of the extent of self-segregation taking place between the two race groups. In yet another university study Tredoux, Dixon, Underwood, Nunez and Finchilescu (2005) observed consistent patterns of self-segregation between Black and White students in an informal space on the university campus. Black and White students gravitated separately and around the same spaces on a daily basis.

From the studies mentioned above it is apparent that contact is simply not taking place in South Africa. Not only is there evidence of extremely low levels of mixing between Black Africans and Whites, but also there seems to be evidence of deliberate avoidance in the form of self-segregation. The obvious question – What is the reason

for the limited contact in South Africa? Why are people from different racial groups choosing to avoid one another?

Voci and Hewstone (2003) mention anxiety and threat as two important negative factors in intergroup interraction which may well have special relevance on contact between Black Africans and Whites in South Africa. Pettigrew and Tropp (2004, cited in Pettigrew and Tropp, 2005), in a meta-analysis testing for anxiety, found that a lowering of anxiety in intergroup contact accounted for almost twenty-five percent of positive contact effects. One way of eliminating anxiety through cross-group friendship is indirect contact.

2.4. Extended Contact Hypothesis

Although Pettigrew (1997), has shown that contact in the form of cross-group friendship is particularly effective in reducing prejudice, it is often accompanied by anxiety associated with intergroup contact. Indirect contact (the mere knowledge that a member of one's ingroup has friends from the outgroup), however, eliminates the anxiety, thus allowing positive intergroup attitudes to develop (Wright, Aron, McLaughlin-Volpe, & Ropp, 1997).

'Indirect contact', otherwise known as 'extended' or 'vicarious' contact is simply the impact on prejudice as a result of one's knowledge of an ingroup member having an outgroup friend (Hewstone, 2006).

Research conducted by Wright et al. (1997) showed that respondents belonging to either majority or minority groups, who knew an ingroup member with an outgroup friend, reported weaker outgroup prejudice on a consistent basis than did those respondents who did not know of such relationships. And an inverse relationship was found between prejudice and indirect friends.

Wright et al., (1997), proposed a number of mechanisms that underlie and promote the extended contact effects. Firstly, ingroup norms have a very powerful influence on intergroup attitudes and contact effects (Jetten, Spears, & Manstead, 1996), by generating positive perceptions about the outgroup. As is the case in South Africa, when norms for interaction with the outgroup are not firmly established or are in a state of change, observing positive behaviour of an ingroup member toward an

outgroup member leads the observer to the perception that positive ingroup norms exist with regard to the outgroup, which in turn influences the observer's outgroup attitude (Wright et al., 1997).

Secondly, the anticipation of intergroup contact can be anxiety provoking (Stephan & Stephan, 1985), which, as Islam and Hewtone (1993) have found, is associated with negative attitudes toward the outgroup. However, observing an ingroup member's positive interaction with an outgroup member should reduce the negative expectations one may have about future outgroup interactions. The observation is also void of possible anxiety of initial intergroup interaction. Communication between the ingroup member and the observer could further enhance outgroup attitudes by way of reducing ignorance about the outgroup (Wright et al., 1997).

Thirdly, observing an outgroup member behaving in positive ways with an ingroup member, shows that the outgroup is interested in positive intergroup relations, by providing information on attitudes and norms of the outgroup. This occurs when the group memberships are salient (Wright et al., 1997).

Lastly, leading on from the previous point, when individuals self-categorize (see themselves in terms of group membership) the ingroup is included in the self (Smith & Henry, 1996). Wright et al., (1997) explain the process as follows; when an ingroup-outgroup friendship is observed, the ingroup member is seen to be part of the self. The outgroup member is part of the ingroup member's self which in turn means that outgroup member is part of the observer's self. Furthermore, the outgroup is part of the outgroup member involved in the interaction, and is thus also integrated as part of the observer's self, thus eliciting positive attitudes about the outgroup.

Turner, Hewstone, Voci and Vonofakou (2008) conducted a study testing the extended contact hypothesis proposed by Wright et al. (1997), where White undergraduates were asked about their direct and extended cross-group friendships, as well as their attitudes towards Asians. The results supported the hypothesis finding the above mechanisms to mediate the relationship between extended cross-group friendships and prejudice.

2.5. Social Identity Theory

> That some kinds of identification have very few if any defensive components…is well established, but some psychoanalytic thinkers continue to regard many instances of identification as motivated by needs to avoid anxiety, grief, shame, or other painful effects; or to restore a threatened sense of self-cohesion and self-esteem.
>
> (Mc Williams, 1994, p. 135)

"Realistic group conflict" (RCT) as coined by D.T. Campbell (1965, cited in Tajfel & Turner, 1979), simply states that intergroup conflict arises as a result of real conflicts of interests between groups, and the greater the conflict, the more members of opposing groups will act toward each other as "a function of their respective group memberships" (Tajfel and Turner, 1979, p. 94).

Tajfel (1972; cited in Turner & Haslam, 2001).defined Social Identity as "that part of an individual's self-concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership of a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership" (p.273).

Social identity theory suggests that one's own group (in-group) is favoured over another group (out-group) as a way of elevating one's group status and hence one's own self-esteem (Fein & Spencer, 2000). It is premised in social identity theory that people have collective and personal identities and that these identities are linked so that a sense of self worth is derived from a group to which a person belongs.

A fundamental assumption of the theory is that people seek to build and maintain a positive self-esteem and hence a positive social identity. As one's social identity becomes salient, one goes through a process of depersonalization (identification shifts from the personal to the group) and defines oneself as a member of a particular group (Reynolds & Turner, 2006).

It has been shown in number of investigations that both the need for, and the expression of social identity can change (Brewer, 1991). The identity that is claimed depends on the situational cues that fit with the priorities of the individual (Deaux & Major, 1987; Oakes, 1987). When social identity is unsatisfactory individuals will strive to leave their existing group and move to a more positively distinct group or make their existing group more positively distinct (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). According to Billig (1976) identification is a process that is social, transitive and dialectical and is placed within an historical context. If the threat to the identity is severe enough it may question the existence of the identity, or the meanings and values associated with the identity may be questioned, which is particularly likely when associated with race (Breakwell, 1986). Abandoning the identity due to threats is unlikely, but individuals may well alter their identity (Frable, Wortman, Joseph, Kirsch & Kessler; 1994, cited in Ethier & Deaux, 1994).

> Cultural identities come from somewhere, have histories. But, like everything which is historical, they undergo constant transformation. Far from being eternally fixed in some essentialized past, they are subject to the continuous "play" of history, culture and power. Far from being grounded in mere "recovery" of the past, which is waiting to be found, and which when found, will secure our sense of ourselves into eternity, identities are the names we give to the different ways we are positioned by, and position ourselves within, the narratives of the past.
>
> (Stuart Hall, Cultural Identity and Diaspora Cited in Steyn, 2001, p. 23).

When the dynamics between groups change, those individuals affected are forced to reassess their identities and may lead to changes in in-group norms (Breakwell, 1986, cited in Korf & Malan, 2002). Moving from one position to another in the social matrix may come about as choice, or a change in social circumstances (Breakwell, 1986), which requires a revision of identity. Goldschmidt (2003) explains that as the

South African society transformed into a democracy, many were unsure of the identification label they ought to claim. She examined the relationship between political change and university students' sense of identity in South Africa during a ten-year period at Rand Afrikaans University. She found that those students in 1990 who claimed an Afrikaner identity for themselves no longer did so even though 8% said it was their mother tongue. It was also found that there was a significant movement in identity perception over a generation – explored by asking the students how they thought their mothers would identify themselves. And language was found to be the most important characteristic in defining one's identity – "90 % of the students believed that language is deeply ingrained in their sense of self" (Goldschmidt, 2003, p. 217). Finchilescu, Tredoux, Pillay and Muianga (2007) explored the many possible reasons that act as obstacles to interracial mixing with a large sample of Black African and White students, and also found language to be crucial in this regard. There was a large majority of students that claimed language to be an obstacle to interracial mixing.

The values, identity, and self-esteem are issues, which many Whites have to consider or reconsider in light of the changed dispensation (Steyn, 2001). Threats to self-esteem encourage individuals to justify negative behaviours toward an outgroup (Katz & Glass, 1979; cited in Stephan & Stephan, 1985). "The hunger for status is matched by a haunting fear that one's status may not be secure. The effort to maintain a precarious position can bring with it an almost reflex disparagement of others" (Allport, 1954, p. 371). And if one perceives a threat to one's group identity, intergroup bias, when evaluating group differences, is encouraged, which in turn fuels ethnocentrism (Stephan and Stephan, 1985). There is an accusation that stands among members of student groups that those who mix cross-racially are rejecting their own group and aspiring to be like the other group (Durrheim & Mtose, 2006). These attitudes deter racial mixing as Tajfel & Turner (1979) point out it is extremely difficult for one to think about betraying one's own group or moving to the other group, and this would have great significance in South Africa's politically charged social landscape.

According to both social identity and self-categorization theories (Turner et al.,1987), if a particular context changes in a way that increases the salience of one's identity, one may experience an increase in group identification (Oakes, 1987; Waddell & Cairns,1986). There have been a number of studies that have all shown that "social categorization per se - is sufficient to trigger intergroup discrimination favouring the

in-group" (Tajfel & Turner, 1979, p.99), and the interaction between superior and inferior groups moves behaviour away from interpersonal patterns toward intergroup patterns. Real conflicts of interests between groups create antagonism between the groups and also create greater identification within, and positive attachment to the in-group. The level of identification with members to the in-group as well as the nature of the relationship between the two groups are important factors in determining the extent of the threat felt from the out-group, and the subsequent level of prejudice felt toward the out-group (Tajfel & Turner, 1979).

It is thus possible that a change in the South African social and political landscape has brought about an increase in the levels of group identification amongst Whites. An increase in group identification brings about an increase in the probability that the group norms are more easily met, and thus, in the case of White South Africans a more rigid adherence to prejudicial attitudes.

Previously in South Africa there was an unequal distribution of resources and power, which promoted antagonism between Black Africans and White groups (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). The antagonism arises if the previously subordinate group rejects the status quo, its previous negative image, and works toward a positive group identity, as in the case with the Black group in South Africa. "The dominant group may react to these developments either by doing everything possible to maintain and justify the status quo, or by attempting to find and create new differentiations in its own favour, or both" (Tajfel & Turner, 1979, p. 98).

In a study by Tredoux and Finchilescu (in review), the relation between contact and prejudice was explored in a large and diverse non-probability sample of South Africans. They found that both Blacks and Whites reported a low percentage of cross race friends, and that both groups had very high levels of group identification. Also it was found that for Whites, the strength of group identification was the strongest mediator of the contact-prejudice relationship.

When dominant groups believe their superiority to be legitimate, they will react with greater discrimination toward threats in order to change the situation, but with less discrimination when their superiority is unstable (Tajfel & Turner (1979), in Hogg & Abrams, 2001). It could be argued that the perceived superiority of Whites is certainly unstable, and perhaps this does lower overt discrimination, but this may play out in

much more subtle ways. And there may be White subgroups that maintain the belief of their own superiority.

Integrated threat theory argues that because group identity is of such importance, “people who identify strongly with their in-group are likely to be attuned to threats from out-groups” (Stephan et al., 2002) and the feelings of threat will be increased if there was any prior negative contact. If, as has been the case in South Africa, there has been an extensive history of inter-group conflict, the greater the threats are likely to be felt by both groups and the greater the salience of those threats with the perception of unequal status between the groups (Stephan et al., 2002).
The following section reviews integrated threat theory and the impact of threats on interracial interaction between Black Africans and Whites.

Social groups attempt to differentiate themselves from one another due to the pressures that they feel to positively evaluate their own group through comparisons with their own, and other groups (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). “The aim of differentiation is to maintain or achieve superiority over an out-group on some dimensions. Any such act, therefore, is essentially competitive” (Tajfel & Turner, 1979, p.102).
The following section will look at the threats that may exist for members of different groups involved in perceived competition.

2.6. Integrated Threat Theory

The following section explores the different feelings of threat experienced by Whites in relation to Black Africans, and the associated impact on intergroup relations. Research has found that contact which is perceived as threatening or anxiety provoking can in fact lead to higher levels of prejudice as opposed to expected diminishing levels (Stephan &Stephan, 1985; Paolini et al. 2004).

According to Stephan et al., (2002) there are four basic threats that may lead to prejudice between groups. These are realistic threats, symbolic threats, inter-group anxiety and negative stereotypes which are all interrelated with one another.

2.6.1. Realistic Threats

Firstly, perceived realistic threats posed by the out-group are threats felt against the existence of the in-group ie. threats to the political and economic power, the physical or material well-being of the group members, or to the members of the ingroup (Ashmore & Del Boca, 1976; Sherif, 1966). These threats may arise due to competition for scarce resources and threats to group welfare. In the South African context competition for jobs, promotions, power, educational opportunities, land and other economic resources as well as maintaining a certain socio-economic level would be felt as realistic threats against the White group.

In South Africa today, specifically in the working environment, there are policies in place that aim at addressing the previously imbalanced distribution of wealth. Policies such as Black Economic Empowerment (BEE) and Affirmative Action (AA), place Black employees and entrepreneurs at, what may be perceived as, a present day advantage in the business and working environment as compared with Whites (Kornegay, 2005). It may thus act as a barrier against greater improvement to intergroup relations and thus exacerbate prejudice. It also creates anxiety as it may promote competition, evoking feelings of threat (Stephan & Stephan, 1985).

As mentioned earlier, according to Kornegay (2005) many Whites did indeed feel that their ethnicity counted against them in terms of their professional careers. Whether or not they feel this is fair in light of the past, is questionable. However, people will be unlikely to support a policy that they deem unfair or violating justice norms. Withholding opportunities for job promotions and educational opportunities is liable to impact on one's status. Bogardus (1959) regards status as the most important component in social distance situations and says that a sense of prejudice develops when one's social status is attacked or lowered by another, or where one feels that another is preventing him/her form reaching desired goals, thereby increasing the personal distance between the two. The perception of threat according to Bobo (1988), is subjective as opposed to a rational assessment of group interests, suggesting that regardless of any positive group attitudes towards Black Africans, be it due to political sensitivity, political correctness or other, White individuals may feel quite differently as a result of such economic policies, and thus feel less inclined to interact with or befriend Black Africans.

Maio and Esses (1998) found that unfavourable perceptions and attitudes were expressed toward a group as a result of affirmative action, and went on to say that “it appears that the presence of affirmative action exerts similar effects on perceptions of individuals and of groups” (p. 70 –71). They cite Steele (1990) as suggesting that those receiving the benefits of affirmative action may cause others to view minority groups as inferior due to their need for such assistance, thus highlighting an obstacle to contact as a result of a status differential between individuals.

As Dovidio and Gaertner (1996) mention, subtle, modern racism (support for the status quo) is an important factor in one’s reactions to affirmative action programs, and argue it is in fact the threat to an economic order, that is believed to work well and be fair in principle, that evokes opposition to such programs. Many whites may believe themselves to be non-discriminatory and non-prejudiced, but, as mentioned above, mere opposition to programmes that restrict opportunities for Blacks due to the threat of one’s own advantaged status (Dovidio & Gaertner,1996), is exactly that – prejudice – which may well be recognized as such by Blacks and thus evoke negative attitudes towards Whites, perpetuating the cycle of prejudice. Bobo (2000, cited in Krysan, 2000) showed that racial policy beliefs to do with affirmative action are not just political calculations but rather were found to correlate with measures of symbolic racism and perceived threat amongst other factors.

It has been proposed that symbolic prejudice may be one of a few different kinds of prejudice (Kinder & Sears, 1981). It is argued that traditional prejudice was expressed in the form of White supremacy, racial segregation and Black inferiority, the expressions of which are no longer acceptable in the South African society. Symbolic racism replaces these overt sentiments and is arguably a more subtle, sophisticated, socially acceptable and covert expression of racial prejudice. Kinder and Sears (1981) explain, “Symbolic racism represents a form of resistance to change in the racial status quo based on moral feelings that Blacks violate such traditional American values as individualism and self-reliance, the work ethic, obedience and discipline” (p. 416). It has been shown that symbolic racism has been a stronger predictor of voting along racial lines (Kinder & Sears, 1981) and opposition to affirmative action (Jacobson, 1985), both of which are the case in South Africa. Weigel and Howes (1985) point out that “people justify their discriminatory behaviour toward minorities in ways that change over time under the pressure of what society considers respectable” (p. 124).

2.6.2. Intergroup anxiety

A second factor in integrated threat theory, and perhaps a larger obstacle to interaction between Black Africans and Whites in South Africa, due to its relation to prejudice, is inter-group anxiety (Islam & Hewstone, 1993). Intergroup anxiety is a term that refers to the feelings of threat and uncertainty that one may experience when interacting with members of another group (Stephan & Stephan, 1985). The anxiety stems from the anticipation of negative consequences, both psychological or behavioural, for the self, and negative evaluations by members of the outgroup and the ingroup (Stephan & Stephan, 1985). Feelings of embarrassment, confusion, frustration, guilt, loss of self-esteem and a sense that one's group identity will be threatened, are some of the concerns that fuel the anxiety in the anticipated interaction. With little knowledge of another's culture, interaction between members from different groups may leave such members feeling incompetent, fear making mistakes or being rejected as a result of the interaction, which may be even more complicated if they do not share the same language (Stephan & Stephan,1985).
In a longitudinal study by Levin, van Laar and Sidanius (2003), data was collected from over 2000 White, Asian, Latino, and African American college students. The results showed that the students who exhibited more intergroup anxiety and more ingroup bias at the end of their first year had more ingroup friends and fewer outgroup friends at the end of their second year. The segregation in South African universities may be due to similar causes, which may also have been a factor in Schrieff's findings (2005, cited in Finchilescu & Tredoux, in press) mentioned earlier.

This anxiety may be heightened when the groups have had a history of conflict, minimal past contact, perception of dissimilarity between the groups, ignorance for one another, are ethnocentric, and the groups interact in unstructured competition (Islam & Hewstone, 1993; Stephan & Stephan 1985), all of which may be said of the dynamics between Black Africans and Whites in South Africa. Due to the minimal contact in the past between these two groups, the many years of conflict and separation, there is a high level of ignorance amongst Whites of Black Africans and extremely moulded group perceptions (Spears, Jetten, & Doosje, 2001 cited in Foster 2006) which can remain lasting without contact or other factors to mediate these attitudes. There is also a fear that members of one's own group will disapprove of one's interactions with outgroup members (Durrheim & Mtose, 2006), or a fear that they may be identified with the outgroup (Stephan & Stephan,1985), and thus

perceived in a negative light. Durrheim and Mtose (2006) found that students used the term “wannabe” for those who befriended members from other racial groups.

Avoidance is most often the chosen response to many forms of anxiety (Pancer et al., 1979), which in itself, as mentioned earlier, is an expression of prejudice. As Blalock (1967) points out, “One of the most pervasive and subtle forms of minority discrimination is that of avoidance, particularly in situations implying social equality or involving potential intimacy” (p. 51). Thus by avoiding intergroup interaction one is able to avoid intergroup anxiety (Pancer et al., 1979), or reduce the length of contact in order to reduce the anxiety.

2.6.3. Negative Out-group Stereotypes

Thirdly, Stephan and Stephan (1985) propose negative out-group stereotypes as a perceived threat. These threats are closely associated with intergroup anxiety in that an in-group member has a certain expectation of behaviour from an out-group member based on a stereotype. If this stereotype is negative the anticipated behaviour is expected to be negative and thus the anticipated interaction is negative (Stephan & Stephan, 1985).
Stereotypes and prejudice are very similar in definition to one another (Dixon & Rosenbaum, 2004), however, where prejudice may contain an element of feeling toward another individual or group, stereotypes lack that affective component.

Allport (1954) had the following to say about stereotypes: “Whether favourable or unfavourable, a stereotype is an exaggerated belief associated with a category. Its function is to justify (rationalize) our conduct in relation to that category”. (p.191). “The fault lies not in any malicious intent but in the culture-bound traditions” (p. 202). “The human mind must think with the aid of categories…. Once formed, categories are the basis for normal prejudgment. We cannot possibly avoid this process. Orderly living depends upon it” (p20).

Prior intergroup cognitions are made up, of what is referred to as, ‘outgroup schemata’ – “cognitive structures that organize ingroup members’ knowledge about the outgroup” (Stephan & Stephan,1985, p. 162). “Outgroup schemata contain knowledge about the culture of the other group, stereotypes and prejudices concerning the outgroups, ethnocentric beliefs, expectations for intergourp

interaction, and perceptions of ingroup-outgroup differences" (Stephan & Stephan, 1985, p. 162). The knowledge is determined by the amount of prior contact. When an ingroup is ignorant of an outgroup, the schemata are relatively simple.

The media in South Africa, during the apartheid years, helped to propagate negative stereotypes of Black Africans, and due to the minimal contact between Black Africans and Whites, and the associated ignorance, these stereotypes were easily adopted. "[Stereotypes] are socially supported, continually revived and hammered in, by our media of mass communication…" (Allport, 1954, p.200). Wilder (1986; in Islam & Hewstone, 1993) pointed out that a "typical" outgroup member would be attributed negative characteristics if the stereotype of the outgroup, to which that member belongs, is negative. Duncan (1996) undertook a discursive study by looking at 186 articles on violence in what was considered to be a liberal newspaper (The Star) and in so doing, showed that the media aided in producing racist ideology.

Heightened arousal is associated with a narrowing of cognitive and perceptual focus and thus an increase in reliance on information based on stereotypes as it fits the need for simplified information (Stephan & Stephan, 1985).
The anxiety prompts an individual to simplify his/her processing task resulting in cognitive biases against the outgroup. Under such conditions, it is unlikely that positive changes to the outgroup schemata will take place (Stephan & Stephan, 1985). So with such low levels of contact between Black Africans and Whites taking place, it would seem that stereotypes become very difficult to change and greatly influence anticipated interactions between the groups. This is further exacerbated by a reliance on ingroup norms when dealing with unfamiliar groups; "such amplified normative responses contributes to group stereotypes" (Stephan and Stephan, 1985, p. 166). Thus the higher the anxiety, the more rigid the stereotypes elicited.

In another study by Stephan et al., (1998), integrated threat theory was used to predict attitudes toward immigrant groups in Spain and Israel and it was found that intergroup anxiety and negative stereotypes "were more powerful predictors of prejudicial attitudes toward immigrants than were realistic threats or symbolic threats" (p. 559).

“Open-mindedness is considered to be a virtue. But strictly speaking, it cannot occur. A new experience must be redacted into old categories”. (Allport,1954, p.20).

Allport succinctly sums up the need for contact between racial groups in South Africa in order to combat misconceived ideas of large segments of the South African population between who so little is shared.

2.6.4. Symbolic Threats

Lastly, symbolic threats are felt as those that concern the perceived differences between groups in their values, morals, norms, standards, beliefs and attitudes and are experienced as threats when the in-group feels as though their system of values is being undermined by the out-group (Stephan et al., 1998). These threats are experienced because the in-group believes in the moral rightness of their system of values (Sumner, 1906). For those Whites who have the belief that their value systems are the only right systems, that their morals, beliefs and attitudes and language are being challenged and that they may well lose a tradition and social status that they strongly held on to in the past, these symbolic threats may be a very serious concern, particularly if they perceive their youth to be embracing a new and unfamiliar culture and ideology.

It was found in the study by Stephan et al., (2002) that attitudes of Blacks and Whites toward each other were predicted by realistic threats, symbolic threats and intergroup anxiety, and the researchers went on to say, “Policies such as affirmative action have made the realistic threats posed by Blacks a highly salient issue for some Whites”, (p. 1250). The central finding of this study was that threat perception by an in-group is an important factor in the prediction of negative racial attitudes toward the out-group. Those who have the most negative attitudes toward the other group are those who believe that they are under threat from the other group both economically and politically and that their central values are challenged, and they are also those who have anxiety about interacting with the other group. They are also those who believe there to be substantial status differences and are strong identifiers with their in-group, (Stephan et al., 2002).

The Black African group in South Africa is indeed in the process of rearranging itself in the social hierarchy, and as a consequence, the White group's position has to change. According to the above discussion this poses a great threat to the White group and the opportunities to quell this threat become limited; the stereotypes are reinforced which may act as major obstacles to contact and prejudice reduction. Foster (2006) believes that racism persists in South Africa as a result of the fact that there has not been a shift in the power and status relations between Black and Whites. As has been mentioned, the perceived threats by Whites result in a bid to maintain these relations through whatever means available. According to Blumer (1958, cited in Dixon, 2006), upon initial historical contact between dominant and minority groups, the the dominant group, through use of its power, prestige and skill, defines the minority group's position in society, along with the creation of negative stereotypes. He further believes that the racial/ethnic hierarchy is held firm in culture. Thus contemporary prejudice, according to Blumer, is a result of the threat felt by the dominant group to the possibility of groups rearranging themselves in the hierarchy. He suggests that contact will do little to reduce prejudice because the hierarchies are so crystallized in culture that any 'movement' is viewed as that of a group entity.

According to Stephan and Stephan (2000) realistic and symbolic threats can cause prejudice, especially with those who possess a strong identification with their ingroup. These threats are powerful predictors of one's attitude toward social policy (Kinder & Saunders, 1996, cited in Stephen & Stephan 2000). It was found in a study by Duran and Stephan (1999; cited in Stephan & Stephan, 2000) that both realistic and symbolic threats, together with intergroup anxiety, group identification and negative stereotypes, all play an important role in determining one's attitude toward those who benefit from social policies, such as affirmative action in South Africa. The results also showed that the personal relevance of the social policy is related to one's perception of the above four threats. Kornegay (2005) found that Whites did indeed have negative feelings regarding Business Economic Empowerment and Affirmative Action policies.

Do Whites perceive themselves to be superior to Black Africans? How is interracial mixing perceived by the White community and by one's White peers? And do these attitudes deter individuals from contact with Black Africans and subsequent friendships?

Steyn (2001) explored how the White population's identity is changing within the context of a changed South Africa. Previously, Whites certainly did see themselves in positions of privilege – a position that was taken for granted with a general sense of superiority (Steyn, 2001). As a few respondents revealed:

> "I grew up in a house where "black" was viewed as being less human, less intelligent".
>
> (p. 52).

> "…I grew up thinking that everything associated with whiteness was better. Black was definitely "less than" and to be related to with distancing or in a condescending way".
>
> (p.53).

> "I was comfortable that I was in a high status position, but aware that without such "protection" my whiteness was very fragile".
>
> (p.55).

Whites previously subscribed to an extremely parochial and ethnocentric belief system where family and community attitudes to interracial mixing were highly sensitive and negative. Group attitudes were severe, the extent of which may best be expressed by conveying the true and sad story of Sandra Laing. Sandra was born in the fifties in South Africa to a White Afrikaans couple. Due to regressive Black genes Sandra was born with coloured skin, but brought up as though she were White. The Population Registration Act (1954), however, classified all South Africans according to race. She was left grappling with her identity, as were her parents. She was ostracized by her peers at school and jailed by her own father when she became involved with a Black man. Her father eventually disowned her, and they never spoke again (Sharky, 2009). This story conveys the extent of how race and the corresponding social norms were able to separate and divide people, even those in the same family. This highlights the strength of the extremely moulded White group attitudes toward people of a different colour skin in the 'old' South Africa, and may well do so today.

The Sandra Laing story took place in the early part of the apartheid era. Attitudes to interracial mixing were extremely negative. The very low levels of recorded contact between Black Africans and Whites today suggest that these attitudes may still linger and peer, community and family pressure to conform to such attitudes may have a strong influence on an individual's attitudes to interracial mixing. There has been very little research conducted on peer, community and family attitudes to mixing in modern day South Africa. Durrheim and Mtose (2006), however, conducted focus groups among Black and White university students to discuss explanations for, experiences of, and preferences for segregation. They found that "racial imagery and hierarchy are still very apparent in the talk of these White students". "Whiteness is set up as the standard against which blackness is found to be deficient" (p. 161). And at the same time the students in the Black focus groups articulated an identity that corresponded with the White students' conception of their Black identity. Although Whites support desegregation, they expressed that the gap between Black and White is decreasing as Blacks become more westernised. Whites differentiated between different categories of Blacks – "black-blacks", "white-blacks" and "coconuts". Within such a mindset of racial categorization it is implicit that West is best, that White is superior and that desegregation may succeed, but only as long as Blacks shed race-typical characteristics. Such attitudes place Blacks in a continued dynamic of oppression at the level of identity (Durrheim & Mtose, 2006). Although this was a student population it is possible that these attitudes extend to White group as a whole.

In exploring the different narratives with which White South Africans are able to construct their new evolving identities in the new South African dispensation Steyn (2001), however, observes that Whites are no longer reassured by an assumption of superiority and entitlement guaranteed by the previous system. Nor is there a unified narrative of White identity in the current context. She notes that White identities range from fundamentalist to those who refer to themselves as White Africans. They admit their racialization but are involved in constructing an identity free of the previous White supremacist ideology.

From what Steyn (2001) observes it is clear that the belief system that one subscribes to in terms of one's White identity determines one's sense of position or entitlement in the social hierarchy, and hence one's perception of threat in this regard. Depending on this belief system, Steyn (2001) explains, one may either

experience a sense of loss of legitimacy, autonomy, relevance and honour, or locate an identity in a new social matrix where these values are not experienced as lost but negotiated to their benefit in a mixed society.

The findings from Durrheim and Mtose (2006) and those of Steyn (2001) suggest that some Whites are indeed threatened by cultural differences, reinforcing the idea that symbolic threats create obstacles against interracial contact. Yet there are others that may have negotiated an identity and a value system for themselves in a new South Africa that allows for positive attitudes and a non-threatening mode of interracial interaction.

For almost fifteen years there has been a new democratic government in South Africa that supports interracial contact and a reduction of prejudice, yet the contact statistics between Black Africans and Whites remain extremely low (Dixon & Durrheim, 2003; Gibson, 2004). These findings were quite understandable in the previous social and political dispensation, but in the 'new' South Africa there is institutionalized support for contact, allowing conditions for contact that previously did not exist. However, the extent of self-segregation occurring at South African universities suggests a pervasive sense of prejudice lingering from an earlier period, as this younger generation grew up in a democratic South Africa, unlike their parents. Due to new social, political and economic policies put in place, White South Africans have to negotiate new identities for themselves (Steyn, 2001) amidst a climate that may feel rather threatening to some. Their material wellbeing may not be the only threat, as a result of new economic policies that aim to redistribute wealth in the country (Stephan & Stephan, 1985), but their values, culture and way of life may be changing due to a new social order, thus exacerbating such threats. Whites may identify more strongly with their group as a way of maintaining self-esteem as their status in the South African social hierarchy begins to change. A stronger sense of identify with their group may increase the salience of such threats (Stephan & Stephan, 1985), and as a result have more negative feelings and attitudes toward Black Africans. Increased levels of prejudice would result in lower levels of contact (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006) with Black Africans, and as a result these Whites would have negative feelings about the White youth befriending Black Africans. A cycle of prejudice is thus maintained. Pettigrew (1998) points out the importance of heeding the social context in exploring intergroup relations, a highly salient issue in contemporary South Africa society. This study aims to explore a White community's feelings about its youth having Black African friends and some of the factors that

influence such feelings and in so doing, gain some insight into interracial interaction in South African society.

Paying heed to the previous literature and the findings within, the following research questions are posed.

2.7. Research questions

1. What does a White community feel about their youth having Black African friends?
2. Are the white respondents' feelings explained by the following variables?:

- Friendship and extended friendship: it is hypothesized that those Whites who have Black African friends will indicate lower levels will have positive feelings about their youth having Black African friends.

- Symbolic threats: it is hypothesized that the higher the perception of symbolic threats, the more negative one's feelings will be toward the youth in the White group befriending Black Africans.

- Level of contact with Black Africans: based on the contact hypothesis, it is hypothesized that those Whites who have Black African friends, or who know other White people with Black African friends (extended contact hypothesis), will be more likely to have positive feelings about the youth befriending Black Africans.

- Intergroup Anxiety: it is hypothesized that those White people who experience anxiety whilst interacting with Black Africans will be more inclined to hold negative feelings about the youth befriending Black Africans.

- Level of group identification: the study hypothesizes that those Whites who strongly identify with their group will be more inclined to negative feelings about their youth involved in interracial mixing with Black Africans.

- Measures of prejudice (social distance and affective prejudice): it is hypothesized that those Whites who have low levels of prejudice will have positive feeling about White youth befriending Black Africans.

- Perceptions of outgroup homogeneity: it is hypothesized that Whites who perceive the Black African group to be homogenous will be inclined to have negative feelings toward White youth befriending Black Africans.

3. Do demographic variables, namely age, gender, socio-economic status and education impact on the feelings about youth befriending Black Africans?

The following chapter explains the measuring instruments used in the questionnaire survey, the sample obtained for the study, the research procedure and the research design.

Chapter 3

Methodology

3.1. Research Design

The research was quantitative in nature and made use of a questionnaire survey with a demographic section and eight instruments to measure the variables associated with prejudice and contact.

Originally a questionnaire was developed and piloted amongst 10 prospective participants. The questionnaire was then adapted; instructions were made clearer and the format altered for the sake of clarity.

The data for this study was collected by means of a questionnaire survey completed by a sample of one hundred and five White males and females from the age of eighteen upwards. The questionnaire consisted of a demographic section that captured the age, gender, level of education, occupation, living arrangement, language, race, nationality and combined household income and eight scales capturing attitudes and feelings and contact.

Statistical analysis was performed on the data from the study using the Computer Programme SAS (Cary, N.C. 2000).

3.2. Sample

The sample consisted of 105 White adults, of which 39 were male and 66 female. The ages ranged from 18 to 60+. Exact ages were not requested; five age groups were made available for selection.
The sample age distribution was: 17.14% in age range 18 – 25 years; 24.76% in range 26-35 years; 24.76% in range 36-45 years; 17.14% in range 46 – 60; and 16.19% were older than 60 years.

The general level of education was relatively high with 76.19% of the participants having completed tertiary education and 43.81% percent of the participants having gained a degree or postgraduate degree and 28.6% qualified with a diploma or

tertiary certificate. Most participants indicated that they were professionals with 54% claiming combined annual incomes from R 200,000 upwards. Table 3.1 shows the breakdown of the respondents into the respective income brackets. Seven respondents in the study did not indicate their annual income.

Table 3.1 Frequency distribution of respondents with regard to income

Annual Income	N	%
Less than R20 000	10	10
R20 000 – R80 000	13	13
R80 000 – R200 000	22	23
R200 000 – R400 000	25	26
R400 000 – R600 000	12	12
More than R600 000	16	17

N = 97

Participants were asked to provide their spoken language. The responses indicated that 16% were Afrikaans speakers, 64% English speakers and 19% spoke both English and Afrikaans. One participant indicated that he spoke IsiZulu.

The majority (49.5%) of the participants indicated that they were married, 9.5 % divorced, 24.7% single and 12.5 % living with someone. A few participants (4) indicated that they were widowed, although the questionnaire did not provide that category. Fifty-six percent (56%) of the respondents reported that they had children.

3.3. Data Collection and Procedure

The sample was conveniently selected from White communities in the Gauteng region. Some of the participants resided in the southern suburbs of Johannesburg, but most were from the northern suburbs of Johannesburg, and a few from Pretoria. The particular sample was selected as the researcher had easy access to these areas and was able to easily train a few people residing in the area, to collect data.

The researcher found participants by visiting places of work and residences. The aim and purpose of the study was explained and the participants asked to complete a

questionnaire survey. These were collected later in the day or whenever was convenient. The researcher also trained assistants who went about gathering data in the same manner as the researcher.

More than one hundred questionnaire surveys were handed out as some of them were collected incomplete (one or more of the scales were left unanswered), whilst others were returned without any intention to answer. Males were more reluctant to participate than females; many males expressing negative sentiments regarding the race relations and some explicitly expressed their fears regarding opportunities in the market place. It was the impression of the researcher that many males were reluctant to explore their feelings and attitudes regarding race relations, which was understood by the researcher as expressing feelings of threat in this regard.

3.4. Measuring Instruments

The questionnaire survey contained 8 scales, measuring specific variables, and a set of demographic question. See Appendix 1 for questionnaire.

The 8 scales used were feelings of friendship, affective prejudice, social distance, intergroup anxiety, perceived symbolic threats, levels of ingroup identity, perceptions of out-group homogeneity and levelsof contact with Black Africans.

3.4.1. Demographic Details

Participants were asked to provide information regarding their gender, age, level of education, Living arrangement –single, married, divorced etc, number of children – if any, occupation, language, race, nationality and annual combined household income.

3.4.2. Feelings of friendship scale

This scale was designed by the researchers and measures the participant's feelings regarding their youth having Black friends. The instrument consisted of 8 items consisting of bipolar adjectives separated by a seven point Likert scale. The scores were reversed, such that a high score on the scale represents negative feelings towards youth having Black friends. The Cronbach Alpha for the scale was .94.

3.4.3. Perceived threat scale

The extent to which participants perceived that a threat would be posed by their white youth having black friends was measured by a 9 item scale. Responses to the items were made on a six point Likert scale, ranging from (1) Strongly Agree to 6 (Strongly Disagree). The participant's perception of outcomes as a result of interracial friendships was explored through questions such as – "*White youth having Black African friends will lead them to forget their own culture*", and "*White youth having Black African friends will lead them to behaving in ways that are unacceptable in our culture*". The scores on the relevant items were reversed, such that a high score represented high levels of perceived threat by the participant. The items were developed for this research. The Cronbach Alpha for the scale was .82.

3.4.4. Level of social Identification scale

The level of identification with the white race group was measured by 10 items on a five point Likert scale. Questions such as "*I think my group has little to be proud of*", "*I would rather not tell I belong to this group*" and "*It upsets me when people speak negatively about my group*", were used to measure the strength of the participant's identity with his/her group. The response format was a 5-point scale ranging from (1) Never to 5 (Very Often). The scale was adapted from the one used with South African participants by Finchilescu and Tredoux (2007). A high score reflected strong levels of identification with the White group. The Cronbach Alpha for the scale was .86.

3.4.5. Inter-group anxiety scale

The 5-item Likert scale measures the self-reported level of anxiety experienced by the participant when interacting with Black people. This scale was used by Paolini et al., (2004) in Northern Ireland to measure the intergroup anxiety levels between Catholics and Protestants. The scale asked participants how they felt when they met Black African people. Five adjectives are provided *(Relaxed – Awkward - At ease - - Self-conscious - Tense)*. The response format consisted of a 5-point scale, ranging from (1) (*Not at all) to 5 (Extremely)*. The Cronbach Alpha for the scale was .82 compared with that of Paolini et al., (2004) at .90.

3.4.6. Social distance scale

The scale was a measure of prejudice and consists of 4 items on a 3- point Likert scale. Participants were required to indicate the extent to which they would mind; "*Not mind, Mind little or Mind a lot*" for statements such as "A suitably qualified Black African person was appointed your boss", and "*A close relative married a Black African person*". The scale used by Finchilescu et al (2006) was found to have a Cronbach Alpha of .87 when administered to all races. A high score on this scale reflected high levels of prejudice towards Black African people. The Cronbach Alpha for the scale was .71.

3.4.7. Affective prejudice scale

The scale was used to measure the levels of affective prejudice that participants feel towards Black African people. The scale consisted of 5 items on a 7- point Likert scale (*warm = 1, cold =7; friendly =1, hostile= 7; suspicious =1, trusting =7; respect = 1, disrespect = 7; admiration = 1, disgust = 7*). These choices were made in response to the statement "*I feel the following toward Black African people in general*". The scale was used by Finchilescu et al., (2006), in South Africa with university students, with a reported Cronbach Alpha of 0.89 when administered to White students. The Cronbach Alpha measured in this study had the same figure. A high score on this scale reflected high levels of affective prejudice.

3.4.8. Perceived levels of outgroup homogeneity scale

This scale was used to measure the participant's perceptions of the extent to which Black African people differ from one another. There were 3 items to which participants were asked to respond. The responses were measured on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1(*Not at all*) on one pole to 5 (*Extremely*) on the other. An example of the statements read: "*There are many different types of Black African people in Black African groups*". The scale was developed by Kashima and Kashima (1993) and used in Northern Ireland by Paolini et al. (2004) with a Cronbach Alpha of .73.. It was altered to suit this study. A high score indicated perceptions of homogeneity amongst Black African people. The Cronbach Alpha for the scale was .58.

3.4.9. Interracial contact

Three questions were used to determine the amount of contact, Black friends and extended friends that participants had with Black African people. Participants were asked to indicate whether or not they knew any Black African people, or had any Black African friends. They were also asked if they knew any White people who had Black African friends. Participants score 1 for responding yes to the questions and 0 for a negative response. They were also asked to indicate the number of Black African people they knew, the number of Black African friends they had, and how many people they knew with Black African friends.

3.5. Ethical Considerations

Completion and submission of the questionnaire surveys were regarded as willingness to participate in the study. The aims of the study were made clear to the participants by verbal explanation on initial contact and prior to engagement with the questionnaire survey. The participants were anonymous as no identifiable information was requested. They were also assured of the confidentiality of their responses. They were made aware that participation is entirely voluntary and there were no negative consequences for refraining to participate, or complete the questionnaire survey. The participants were not harmed or made vulnerable in any way as a result of their participation in, or withdrawal from the study.

In the following chapter the psychometrics of the measuring instruments are explained, the statistical analyses are presented, along with an analysis of the symbolic threat scale. The contact hypothesis is also tested as are various relationships between the different variables.

Chapter 4

Results

4.1. Introduction

This chapter presents the psychometric properties and descriptive statistics of the seven scales in the study. The analyses investigating the participants' feelings about White youth having Black African friends are presented along with an investigation into the responses on the symbolic threat scale. Lastly, the factors that impact on the participants' feelings of White youth befriending Black Africans, is explored along with a test of the contact hypothesis with the data from this study.

4.2. Psychometrics of Instruments

For each scale, In order to arrive at a consistent scoring structure, the necessary items on each instrument were reversed. An Internal reliability coefficient (Cronbach alpha) was determined for each of the seven instruments. None of the items had to be removed as all had sufficiently high item total correlations. Table 4.1 shows the reliabilities of the scales.

Of the seven scales used in this study, some were self-constructed whilst others were adapted from previous studies. All scales except perceptions of homogeneity had sufficiently high tests for normality with Cronbach Alphas above 0.7. Since the homogeneity scale consisted of few items, the Cronbach Alpha was considered sufficiently high, as was the social distance scale, which was also somewhat low. Table 4.1 below shows the Cronbach alpha coefficients of the seven scales.

Table 4.1 Cronbach alpha coefficients of the seven scales

Scale	Number of Items	Cronbach Alpha	N
Feelings about youth having Black friends	8	.94	100
Perceptions of threats	9	.82	104
Intergroup Anxiety	5	.82	105
Perceptions of Homogeneity of Black People	3	.58	104
Social Distance	4	.71	105
Affective Prejudice	5	.89	104
Social Identification	10	.86	105

4.3. Descriptive Statistics

The results of the basic descriptive statistics from each of the seven scales are shown below in Table 4.2, comprising of the mean values, standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis scores.

The responses of the items on each scale were averaged after reversal of scores on the “Feelings of youth having Black friends scale”, the “Perceived threats scale” and the “Perception of homogeneity of outgroup scale”. The scales were reversed before summation of the scores in order to allow for high scores in each scale to correlate with strong feelings and attitudes measured in the respective scales.

Table 4.2 Descriptive Statistics of the scales

Variable	Mid-point of scale	Mean	Std Dev.	Skewness	Kurtosis	N	Meaning of high score
Feelings about Youth having Black Friends	4	2.32	1.2	0.64	-0.61	100	Negative attitudes to mixing
Perceptions of Threats	3.5	2.21	0.73	0.57	0.1	104	Strong belief in negative threats
Intergroup Anxiety	3	1.91	0.72	0.58	-0.42	105	High anxiety
Perceptions of Homogeneity of Black People	3	2.29	0.78	0.26	-0.27	104	High perception of homogeneity
Social Distance (Original)	2	1.35	0.42	1.15	0.37	105	High level of prejudice
Social Distance (Transformed)	2	0.26	0.28	0.77	-0.6	105	High level of prejudice
Affective Prejudice	4	2.94	1.06	-0.03	-0.62	104	High affective prejudice
Social Identification	3	3.81	0.62	-0.19	-0.6	105	Strong identity with White group

The statistical information for each instrument in Table 4.2 may be described as follows:

The skewness and kurtosis coefficients indicated that six of the scales could be accepted as normally distributed as they fell between -1.0 and +1.0. The skewness coefficient of the social distance scale was greater than +1.0, so the scale was transformed using a log transformation, which succeeded bringing the skewness coefficient into the acceptable range.

The *Feelings about youth having Black friends* scale is very slightly positively skewed (0.64), but can be treated as normal, with a mean score of 2.32 and a standard deviation of 1.19. The statistical data suggest that on average the participants indicated positive feelings about their youth having Black friends.

The *Perception of symbolic threat* scale is also very slightly positively skewed (0.57) with a mean of 2.21 and a standard deviation of 0.73. These results show that on average the participants indicated very low levels of perceived threat as a result of youth befriending Black African people.

The *Intergroup Anxiety* scale is positively skewed (0.58) with a mean of 1.91 and a standard deviation of 0.72. This data shows that participants, on average, indicated relatively low levels of anxiety when interacting with Black African people and there was little variation from these feelings amongst the participants.

The *Perception of Outgroup Homogeneity* scale is not significantly skewed. It has a mean of 2.29 and a standard deviation of 0.78. These statistics suggest that participants' indication of their perception of outgroup homogeneity were widely spread over the scale. The mean suggests that participants on average indicated a slight favour toward heterogeneity amongst Black African people.

Once transformed the scores on the *Social Distance* scale were still positively skewed (0.77) but are in the range acceptable for the assumption of normality. The new mean is 0.26 and standard deviation of 0.28.

The *Affective Prejudice* scale is not skewed (-0.03) with a mean of 2.94 and a standard deviation of 1.06, suggesting that responses were widely spread over the scale with the mean below the midpoint.

The *Social Identification* scale is slightly negatively skewed (-0,19) with a mean of 3.81 and a standard deviation of 0.62. The data shows that participants indicated that on average they quite strongly identified with the White group, with the mean falling above the midpoint and little variation amongst the sample.

4.4. Contact variables

Three dichotomous (yes/no) questions asked the respondents (i) whether they knew Black African people; (ii) whether they had any Black African friends, or (iii) whether they knew anyone who has a Black African friend. Below is a description of the dichotomous contact variables.

Answering positively to the first question qualified participants to then indicate how many Black African people they knew. The responses were arranged into three groups. Knowing between 1 and 5 people qualified for group 1, between 6 and 10 people qualified for group 2, and 11 people and above qualified for group 3. A large majority of the participants, 70.5% knew eleven or more Black African people.

The second question regarding contact requested participants to indicate whether or not they had any Black African friends. 75.2 % (79 participants) of the participants indicated that they had Black African friends, with a 100% response to this question.

As in the first question, those who had indicated having Black African friends were asked to quantify their response. The responses were grouped as in the first question with the number of friends between 1 and 5 as group 1, 6 to 10 as group 2, and 11 and above as group 3. The majority of the participants (45%) fell into the first group, ie, they had between 1 and 5 Black African friends. The second group contained 32% of the respondents and the third group consisted of 23% of the participants. Eight of the 79 respondents failed to disclose this figure.

The third and final question regarding contact requested the participants to indicate whether or not they knew any White people who had Black African friends (see table 4.3 below). Almost every participant (100 of the 104), 96.2% responded positively to this question. One participant did not respond at all.

Table 4.3 Percentages of participants with different levels of contact with Black Africans

	Yes	No
Know Black African people N = 105	100%	0%
Friends with Black African people N = 105	75.24%	24.76%
Know other Whites who have Black African friends N = 104	96.2%	3.8%

From the above statistics it would seem that knowing a Black African person may translate into having Black African friends. All 105 respondents knew a Black African person, with 79 respondents reporting having Black African friends. This is quite a high percentage, and it would seem that knowing Black African people increases the chance of having Black African friends. There also seems to be a positive correlation between knowing someone that has a Black African friend and having a Black African friend oneself. 96.2% of the respondents knew other Whites who had Black African friends and 75.24% of the respondents had Black African friends. Also, 100% (105 respondents) of the participants knew Black African people and 96.2% (100 of 104 respondents) knew White people who had Black African friends.


4.5. Feelings about youth having Black African friends


In order to answer the main question of the research – participants' feelings about their youth having Black African friends – the perceptions of symbolic threat scale is explored together with the scale measuring feelings about youth having Black African friends. The perception of symbolic threat scale was dichotomised so as to more easily consider the responses and analyse the perceptions of threats with other scales (see figure 4.1below). The scale was dichotomised into *agree* or *disagree;* ie. each item was dichotomised so that responses, *strongly agree, agree and slightly*

agree, were grouped as *agree* and the responses, *slightly disagree, disagree and strongly disagree,* were grouped as *disagree.*

Figure 4.1 below is a bar graph showing the percentage of the participants that agreed and disagreed with each item.

Figure 4.1 Bar graph showing dichotomised perception of symbolic threat scale





The participants' responses as shown in the above graphs indicate that 83.8% of the participants disagreed that White youth having Black African friends will lead them to forget their own culture. And consistent with the responses on the first item, 89.5% of the participants agreed that White youth having Black African friends will contribute to South Africa becoming a better place. 79% of the participants disagreed that White youth having Black African friends will lead them to behaving in ways that are unacceptable in White culture. Although this is a positive response to interracial mixing amongst the youth it is somewhat less so than the previous items on the scale. The next couple items were consistent with this slightly more conservative response in that 74.3% of the participants disagreed that White youth having Black African friends will lead to them adopting undesirable values from their own, and 78.1% disagreed that youth befriending Black Africans would lead to them becoming less skilled in their own language. However, an overwhelming majority of participants, 95.2%, agreed that such friendships would lead to White youth having a better understanding of the South African society. Similarly, a large majority, 92.4% agreed that such relationships would reduce or breakdown racial prejudice, and the same percentage of participants (92.4%) agreed that White youth having Black

African friends would not constitute a betrayal of their community. Although still a majority, only 76.2% of the participants agreed that such friendships would not lead them to being rejected by their own community compared with the previous item.

The responses to the items in the scale suggest that there are concerns in areas related to unacceptable behaviour, adopting undesirable values, a loss of skill in own language and being rejected by one's own community as a result of befriending Black Africans. These factors are more personal and community specific, as opposed to the other items that suggest more of a national cohesion where the average responses were more positive in this regard. The scale shows relatively low levels of threat on average amongst the participants. The averaged responses to the items in the scale do not conflict with one another, suggesting a rather consistent response amongst participants to these items in the symbolic threat scale.

4.5.1. Relationship between feelings about youth having Black African friends and perceptions of symbolic threats

In order to test the relationship between feelings about youth having Black African friends and the perceptions of threats, a Pearson test of correlation was conducted. The resulting correlation coefficient of $r = 0.54$; $p < 0.0001$ was found. This is a fairly strong positive correlation. Thus those who had positive feelings toward their youth befriending Black Africans also perceived little threat as a result of such relationships.

4.5.2. Variables effecting feelings about youth having Black African friends

The main question in this study is to determine a community's feelings about their youth having Black African friends, and the factors that influence these feelings. In order to answer this question a multiple linear regression was conducted, using feelings about youth having Black African friends as the dependable variable, to determine whether the following independent variables had a significant impact on these feelings: -

- Perceptions of threat
- Intergroup anxiety
- Perceptions of homogeneity

- Affective prejudice
- Levels of identity
- Social distance
- Have Black African friends

The transformed social distance scale was used in the analysis. A linear regression model was conducted. Testing for multicollinearity, the collinearity diagnostics in the regression analysis indicated a condition index of 27.69, which is below, but very close to the acceptable index of 30. On the basis of this high index score a forward stepwise regression was conducted after removing an outlier score and 4 influential scores. Table 4.4 shows the results of the forward stepwise regression.

Table 4.4 Results of the forward stepwise regression

Variable	**b**	**Standardized b**	**t value**	**Pr > |t|**
Intercept	0.67		2.32	0.02
Perceptions of threat	0.52	0.33	3.83	0.0002
Social Distance (transformed)	1.89	0.45	5.24	<.0001

The final model emerging from the forward stepwise regression is statistically significant ($F(2, 95) = 38.39$; $p < .0001$). The model explained 45% of the variability of feelings about youth having Black African friends. In this model two explanatory variables proved to be significant: social distance and perceptions of threats. Social distance was the stronger influential variable on youth having Black African friends ($b = 0.45$) compared with perceptions of threats ($b = 0.33$). This indicates that the participants' feelings about youth having Black African friends is best explained by social distance and perceived threat. Those who perceive higher levels of threat as a result of youth befriending Black African people will have more negative attitudes to mixing, and those that have feelings of greater social distance between themselves and Black Africans will also tend to have more negative attitudes to mixing. The

smaller the experience of social distance the more positive one would tend to feel about youth having Black African friends.

It was not completely unexpected that social distance would prove to be the most influential of the explanatory variables, as social distance is one of the measures of prejudice. It is thus somewhat logical to assume that the higher the level of prejudice experienced by an individual toward Black Africans, the more negative one's attitudes to youth befriending Black Africans. The other variables, namely: intergroup anxiety, affective prejudice, perceptions of homogeneity and level of group identity did not prove to be influential upon participants' feelings about youth befriending Black Africans.

4.6. Testing the Contact Hypothesis

Even though this was not the original intention of the study, it was decided to test the contact hypothesis. In so doing, two linear regression models were conducted, one with social distance as the dependent variable of prejudice and the other with affective prejudice as the dependent variable. The independent variables entered into the regression models were: levels of intergroup anxiety, perceptions of outgroup homogeneity, levels of identification with the White group and whether or not participants had Black African friends.

4.6.1. Social Distance as measure of prejudice

A linear regression model was conducted after having found and removed four influential cases (see table 4.5 below). The collinearity diagnostics showed a condition index of 22.73 indicating that multicollinearity was not a problem as this was below the acceptable index of 30, but was rather high. However, on the basis of this index score it was decided to conduct a forward stepwise regression. The forward stepwise regression was statistically significant ($F (4, 95) = 13.61$; $p < 0.0001$). The model explained 36% ($R^2 = 0.364$) of variability of perceptions of social distance. Table 4.5 below indicates the parameter estimates for the model.

Table 4.5 Results of forward stepwise regression (social distance)

Variable	b	Standardized b	t value	Pr > |t|
Intercept	-0.68	0	-3.46	0.0008
Have Black African friends	-0.11	-0.17	-2.01	0.0475
Intergroup Anxiety	0.18	0.45	5.25	<.0001
Perceptions of homogeneity	0.09	0.22	2.70	0.0081
Level of identification	0.13	0.27	3.22	0.0017

There are four significant explanatory variables regarding social distance: Intergroup anxiety, level of identification, perceptions of homogeneity and having Black African friends. Of these four variables, intergroup anxiety is the strongest predictor of participant's prejudice (b = 0.45), with level of identification with the White group (b = 0.27) and perceptions of homogeneity (b = 0.22) somewhat weaker predictors of participant's prejudice as measured by perception of social distance.. The data indicates that the greater the levels of anxiety associated with intergroup interaction, the greater the levels of identification with the White group, and the more homogenous the Black group is perceived, the greater the social distance experienced by participants. Having Black African friends is also a significant predictor of participants' perceptions of social distance (b = -0.17). The more Black African friends one has the less social distance one would experience between Black Africans.

4.6.2. Affective Prejudice as measure of prejudice

A linear regression model was conducted after having found and removed one outlier and four influential cases (see table 4.6 below). Multicollineraity was not found to be a problem as the condition index (22.62) was below the acceptable index of 30, but once again rather high. It was thus decided to do a forward stepwise regression. The model was statistically significant ($F(3, 95) = 25.93$; $p < 0.0001$) and explained 35%

of the variability of affective prejudice (R^2 = 0.353). Table 4.6 below shows the parameter estimates for the model.

Table 4.6 Results of forward stepwise regression (affective prejudice)

Variable	b	Standardized b	t Value	Pr > |t|
Intercept	1.71	0	5.57	<.0001
Have Black African friends	-0.43	-0.17	-2.15	0.0340
Intergroup anxiety	0.80	0.54	6.51	<.0001

Only 2 variables emerged as significant predictors of affective prejudice –intergroup anxiety and having Black African friends. Of the significant explanatory variables, intergroup anxiety is by far the stronger predictor of affective prejudice (b = 0.54), suggesting that the higher the level of anxiety experienced in intergroup interaction by the participants, the higher the levels of affective prejudice toward Black African people. A much weaker predictor of affective prejudice is having Black African friends (b = -0.17). This suggests that those participants that have Black African friends would experience little prejudice toward Black Africans. Levels of identity and perceptions of homogeneity did not prove to be significant variables in testing the contact hypothesis using affective prejudice as the dependent variable.

The relationships between these predictor variables of social distance and affective prejudice, suggests that the contact hypothesis is supported by this study.

4.7. Demographic variables' impact on attitudes and feelings

4.7.1. T-tests between gender and all independent variables

T-tests were conducted to determine whether there was a difference between men and women in their feelings, perceptions and attitudes as measured by the seven scales in the study (see table4.7 below). The assumption of homogeneity of variance was not violated thus the t test was calculated with pooled variances. The results

were not significant which means that there is no difference between men and women's feelings about black youth having white friends.

Table 4.7 below shows the results of each of the variables from the t-tests.

Table 4.7 Results of t-test

Variable	Gender	Mean	Std Dev	N	t Value	p
Feelings about youth having Black African friends	M	2.51	1.16	38	1.25	0.21
	F	2.92	1.21	62		
Perceptions of symbolic threats	M	2.25	0.78	38	0.43	0.67
	F	2.2	0.71	66		
Intergroup anxiety	M	1.9	0.72	39	-0.15	0.88
	F	1.92	0.73	66		
Perceptions of homogeneity	M	2.17	0.81	39	1.41	0.16
	F	2.02	0.76	65		
Affective prejudice	M	2.63	1.01	39	0.12	0.92
	F	2.7	1.1	65		
Levels of identity	M	3.49	0.69	39	1.22	0.23
	F	3.73	0.58	66		
Social distance (transformed)	M	0.18	0.31	39	0.61	0.55
	F	0.18	0.27	66		

4.7.2. Attitudes and feelings as a function of age

An ANOVA was performed to explore the possibility of a difference in attitudes and feelings as a function of age. The results were not significant, thus there does not seem to be a relationship between age and the variables used to measure attitudes and feelings. Table 4.8 below shows the mean scores and standard deviations of each age range associated with the different variables, as well as the F ratios and p values as a function of age.

Table 4.8 Mean scores, standard deviations of the seven variables with and F ratios and p values as a function of age

Variables		Age					F	p
		18-25y	26-35y	36-45y	46-60y	61+y		
Feelings about youth having Black African friends	Mean	2.76	1.83	2.23	2.50	2.51	1.98	0.10
	St. Dev.	1.21	0.99	1.20	1.27	1.25	df=4, 99	
	n	18	25	24	16	17		
Perceptions of symbolic threats	Mean	2.42	2.21	2.09	2.38	2.00	1.12	0.35
	St. Dev.	0.63	0.85	0.71	0.81	0.53	df=4, 99	
	n	18	26	26	18	16		
Intergroup anxiety	Mean	2.26	1.94	1.95	1.72	1.65	1.99	0.10
	St. Dev.	0.87	0.64	0.73	0.60	0.70	df=4, 100	
	n	18	26	26	18	17		
Perceptions of homogeneity	Mean	2.59	2.03	2.22	2.37	2.41	1.61	0.18
	St. Dev.	0.89	0.71	0.71	0.68	0.92	df=4, 99	
	n	17	26	26	18	17		
Social distance (transformed)	Mean	0.35	0.19	0.22	0.22	0.35	1.49	0.21
	St. Dev.	0.30	0.28	0.29	0.25	0.26	df=4, 100	
	n	18	26	26	18	17		
Affective prejudice	Mean	3.30	2.97	3.04	2.93	2.39	1.77	0.14
	St. Dev.	1.07	1.09	1.06	1.16	0.78	df=4, 99	
	n	18	25	26	18	17		
Levels of Identity	Mean	3.88	3.76	3.99	3.56	3.81	1.40	0.24
	St. Dev.	0.62	0.69	0.67	0.41	0.60	df=4, 100	
	n	18	26	26	18	17		

4.7.3. Attitudes and feelings as a function of socio-economic status

ANOVA's were performed to explore the possibility of a difference in attitudes and feelings as a function of socio-economic status, which was categorized into six levels. Socio-economic status was the dependent variable and all other variables in the study acting as independent variables. Two variables were found to have significant effects, perceptions of homogeneity and affective prejudice. Pairwise comparisons were conducted for both variables:
Table 4.9 below shows the mean scores and standard deviations of each age range associated with the different variables, as well as the F ratios and p values as a function of socio-economic status.

Perceptions of homogeneity: there was a significant difference between two sets of pairs, meaning that respondents who had a combined household income of less than R20 000 per year had a significant difference in their perceptions of homogeneity of Black African people (they had a greater perception of homogeneity) compared with those who had a combined household income of R200 000 – R400 000 and R400 000 to R600 000.
Affective prejudice: significant differences were found. The highest affective prejudice scores were found by those that had a combined household income of R20 000 to R80 000 followed by those with a combined household income of R80 000 to R200 000 The lowest affective prejudice scores were found by those who had a combined household income of R200 000 to R400 000 followed by those with a combined household income of R400 000 to R600 000.

Table 4.9 Mean scores, standard deviations of the seven variables with and F ratios and p values as a function of socio-economic status

Variables		Annual income in thousands of Rand							
		<R20	R20-R80	R80-R200	R200-R400	R400-R600	R600+	F	p
Feelings about youth having Black African friends	Mean	2.78	2.79	2.21	2.02	2.25	2.02	1.23	0.30
	St. Dev.	1.02	1.48	1.02	1.08	1.19	1.26	df=5, 87	
	n	9	13	21	24	11	15		
Perceptions of symbolic threats	Mean	2.42	2.25	2.46	1.99	2.00	2.21	1.32	0.26
	St. Dev.	0.58	0.73	0.90	0.67	0.94	0.42	df=5, 91	
	n	9	13	22	25	12	16		
Intergroup anxiety	Mean	1.84	2.00	1.89	1.82	1.85	1.88	0.13	0.99
	St. Dev.	0.62	0.93	0.65	0.66	0.77	0.67	df=5, 92	
	n	10	13	22	25	12	16		
Perceptions of homogeneity	Mean	3.00	2.23	2.24	2.07	2.08	2.38	2.68	0.03
	St. Dev.	0.94	0.70	0.65	0.65	0.87	0.67	df=5, 91	
	n	10	13	21	25	12	16		
Social distance (transformed)	Mean	0.37	0.37	0.23	0.18	0.15	0.29	1.64	0.16
	St. Dev.	0.30	0.35	0.30	0.23	0.19	0.26	df=5, 92	
	n	10	13	22	25	12	16		
Affective prejudice	Mean	2.88	3.40	3.29	2.68	2.28	2.85	2.37	0.045
	St. Dev.	0.99	1.10	1.22	0.88	0.78	1.05	df=5, 91	
	n	10	13	22	25	12	15		
Levels of Identity	Mean	4.18	3.91	3.74	3.59	3.75	3.83	1.45	0.21
	St. Dev.	0.57	0.58	0.61	0.60	0.78	0.58	df=5, 92	
	n	10	13	22	25	12	16		

Chapter 5
Discussion

5.1. Introduction

The aim of the research was to investigate how a White community feels about their youth having Black African friends, and to explore the variables that influence these feelings. The variables considered were: perceived symbolic threats as a result of such friendships, levels of anxiety resulting from interaction with Black Africans, perceptions of homogeneity of Black Africans and the groups to which they belong, levels of affective prejudice toward Black Africans, the extent to which Whites identify with their own group, and their perception of social distance. There were also three contact variables used in order to make sense of such feelings; knowing Black African people, having Black African friends, and knowing a White person with a Black African friend.

5.2. How does a White community feel about their youth having Black African friends?

This question was the main focus of the research. It was examined in two ways: a feelings scale (feelings about youth having Black African friends), and a threat item scale were used in the study.

The perceived threat scale indicated a low level of participant's perceived symbolic threat on average. There was consistency in the responses among the participants.
A very large majority of the participants disagreed with White youth forgetting their own culture due to friendships with Black Africans and similar majorities agreed that White youth having Black African friends will contribute to South Africa becoming a better place, to having a better understanding of South African society and that such friendships will lead to a reduction in racial prejudice. These positive responses toward White youth befriending Black Africans suggests that the majority of the sample support the improvement of interracial relations in South Africa. Interestingly this is a lower figure compared with the findings by Finchilescu et al., (2007) where 14% of the university students in the study believed that their peers' interracial mixing constituted a betrayal of their community. The finding in this study is further supported by the majority of participants disagreeing that White youth befriending

Black Africans would constitute a betrayal of their own community, and a majority, although not as great a majority, of participants also disagreed that such friendships would lead to them being rejected by their own community. The difference between these two items may be explained by the fact that the White community condones such friendships amongst the youth, feeling that this is a necessary step to racial harmony between groups, the behaviour of which does not directly effect their own lives as such. They may, however, feel that others may not want to mix with Black Africans, and as a result keep a distance from those Whites who do. Steyn (2001) notes that there are a range of White identities, some far more open to interracial mixing than others, a fact with which the White sample are probably aware. Also, group norms and conformity to such norms act as such strong motivators of behaviour (Moscovici, 1976).

There were three items that were slightly higher in levels of perceived threat than the previous items, those being in areas regarding behaviour, language and values. Although the responses highlighted a little more concern in these areas, there was still a large majority of participants that disagreed that youth having Black African friends will lead them to behaving in ways that are unacceptable in their culture, that they will become less skilled in their language as a result of such friendships and that these friendships will lead them to adopting undesirable values.

The majority of participants are not threatened by loss of language. English is not only the global language but is the lingua-franca amongst the middle classes and intelligentsia across race groups in South Africa and will continue to be so for the foreseeable future (Alexander, 2001). A certain status amongst Whites is thus inherently maintained by virtue of this fact. A number of the Afrikaans participants, of which there were 16%, and another 19% indicated both English and Afrikaans speaking (first language unknown) may have been relatively more concerned that their language would be lost due to youth befriending Black Africans, as Afrikaans has been considered the language of apartheid – the oppressor's language -, one of the reasons it has been rejected by many Black Africans (Heugh, 1987).

These low levels of threat may be explained by the fact that there are many Black Africans that are adopting 'White culture', trying to behave like Whites and speaking like Whites and are referred to as 'coconuts' by both Black Africans and Whites for this reason (Durrheim & Mtose, 2006). It would seem that being aware of such behaviour on the part of Black Africans may reduce feelings of threat amongst

Whites regarding White youth losing language skill, adopting undesirable values and behaving in unacceptable ways as a result of having Black African friends.

5.3. Relationship between feelings about youth having Black African friends and perceived symbolic threats

There was a strong positive relationship between feelings about youth having Black African friends and perceived symbolic threats, confirming the initial hypothesis. The test thus shows that those participants who had felt negatively about their youth befriending Black Africans were likely to perceive high levels of symbolic threats as a result of these friendships. Conversely, those participants who felt positively about their youth befriending Black Africans were not likely to perceive threats as a result of these friendships. It would seem that addressing the threats that one is likely to experience due to interracial mixing amongst the youth, would prove to be a valuable step in clearing the obstacles toward more harmonious group relations in South Africa social landscape.

5.4. Variables influencing feelings about White youth having Black African friends

Two variables were shown to be significant in explaining participant's feelings about their youth having Black African friends. These variables were perceptions of threat and social distance. Of these two variables, the regression indicated that social distance was the stronger predictor in determining the participant's feelings about their youth having Black African friends. The analysis thus reveals that those participants who desire less social distance between themselves and Black Africans have more positive feelings toward their youth having Black African friends. It is assumed that the more positive one's feelings are toward interracial friendships amongst the youth, the more one would be inclined to support and encourage such relationships. Since conformity to group norms is such a powerful predictor of behaviour, and youth's attitudes are so easily influenced by their parents and other role models in their communities (Duckitt, 1994), these positive attitudes to befriending Black Africans would greatly contribute to breaking down racial barriers by encouraging such friendships and eliminating prejudice. Social distance is a measurable form of prejudice. Effectively then, what the analysis reveals is that those

participants with lower levels of prejudice toward Black Africans are inclined to hold positive feelings about their youth having Black African friends.

Perceptions of threats is the second variable that explained participant's feelings about their youth having Black African friends. Although not as strong a predictor as social distance, it still has a significant impact on these feelings. The analysis thus explains that the greater one's perception of threats as a result of youth befriending Black Africans, the more negative one's attitudes are toward such relationships. Hence, those participants perceiving little or no threat are more inclined to have positive feelings about their youth having Black African friends. The relationship between youth having Black African friends and perceptions of threat in the forward stepwise regression is consistent with the findings of the same relationship in the Pearson correlation test, which indicated a strong positive correlation between the two variables.

The other variables, namely; having Black African friends, intergroup anxiety, perception of homogeneity, affective prejudice and levels of group identity did not prove to be significant variables in determining feelings about youth having Black African friends.

It was, however, expected that having Black African friends would prove to be a significant predictor of such feelings. There may be a number of reasons that the analysis suggested otherwise. Firstly, as the literature suggests, having a cross race friend does not necessarily extend a reduction of prejudice to the group as a whole (Pettigrew, 1998). Thus Whites having a Black African friend does not necessarily lead to positive feelings about their youth having Black African friends as the effects of such a friendship may not extend to the Black African group as a whole, and thus may not lead to lower levels of prejudice (as measured in this study by social distance and affective prejudice), or to lower levels of perceived threat.

Secondly, the participants' indicated levels of contact with Black Africans was very high. This is perhaps not that surprising considering the demographics in the country. There are many opportunities for Whites to come into contact with Black Africans. What is surprising though, is the high levels of recorded friendship between participants in the study and Black Africans. This is contrary to general findings on contact research in South Africa (Dixon & Durrheim, 2003; Gibson, 2004; Schrieff, 2005). The Black Africans that the Whites in this particular sample are befriending fit

into a particular category of Blacks termed ‘Coconuts’ – a constructed category of Blacks that behave like Whites (Stevens & Lockhart, 1997). Durrheim and Mtose (2006) found that Whites felt that the social gap between themselves and Black Africans became smaller when Black Africans were able to shed race-typical characteristics and became more westernized. These feelings and attitudes may thus not extend to the Black African population as a whole and thus the friendships forged remain with a very particular group, a group that may notbe seen by Whites as representative of the Black African group. The category of Black Africans termed ‘Coconuts’ is a middle class population. The Whites from this study (higher socio-economic, professional sample) would be more likely to come into contact and befriend such a group as opposed to any other Black African group.

Thirdly, the term friend was not defined in the questionnaire, thus allowing participants to interpret the term “friend” in their own idiosyncratic way. A “friend” may mean different things to different people (Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, & Asai, 1988). It is possible that many participants allowed the term “friend” to extend to and incorporate “colleague”, “acquaintance”, “employee” and other. Some may conceptualise the term “friend” as somewhat less intimate than others, thus excluding the opportunity to learn about and trust such people as would be the case with more intimate friends. Intimacy in intergroup contact is an important factor in reducing prejudice (Amir, 1976). And perhaps due to the political zeitgeist in South Africa, which encourages cross race friendships, those participants that did not in fact have “genuine” Black African friends, may have taken the liberty to label their work colleagues and other Black Africans with whom they have quite a lot of contact, as “friends”.

This somewhat looser definition of friend may also be encouraged by the establishment of relatively recent digital social networks such as *Twitter* and *Facebook*, where one is encouraged to invite others, old school acquaintances, business associates and other people with whom they have recently come into contact, to become their “friends” on such internet sites. Most of the participants are likely to make regular use of the internet, as a result of their vocations, and be well acquainted with such social networks, the impact of which may have influenced a reconstruction, to some degree, of the term “friend”.

It is worth considering such explanations, however, the analysis showed that having Black African friends did not prove to be a significant predictor of people's feelings about White youth befriending Black Africans.

It was surprising that intergroup anxiety did not prove to be a significant predictor of feelings about youth having Black African friends. It certainly is a variable that impacts on people's feelings and attitudes to interracial interaction (Stephan & Stephan, 1985). The reason why this dependent variable did not emerge as a significant predictor is as a result of the strong relationship between anxiety and prejudice and the large overlap between the two dependent variables in the regression model.

Perceptions of homogeneity was another variable that did not have a significant impact on feelings about youth having Black African friends. The reason for this is not apparent. There were two more variables, namely: affective prejudice and levels of identification with the White group, that did not prove to be predictors of people's feelings about their youth having Black African friends. Although it was expected that those that identified strongly with the White group would be less inclined to positive feelings about interracial mixing the analysis did not indicate this. It is not clear why this variable did not appear to be a predictor of such feelings. A possible explanation is that on average, most participants did in fact identify strongly with the White group, because they are members of high status groups and thus according to social identity theory they are able to glean positive self-esteem as a result thereof (Fein & Spencer, 2000). It could be argued that this particular sample White group are dominant, or perceive themselves to be so in light of their economic and professional power, but are justified in questioning their superiority in light of the changing social, political and economic landscape. It is also unclear as to the reason for affective prejudice to have little impact on these feelings.

5.5. Testing the Contact Hypothesis

Although not an aim of the study, it was decided to test the contact hypothesis as the variables necessary to do so were present in the study. In testing the contact hypothesis two forward stepwise regression models were conducted: one used social distance as the measure of prejudice and the other was conducted with affective prejudice as the measure.

Firstly, focusing on the model using social distance as the measure of prejudice, the variables that proved to be significant predictors of prejudice were intergroup anxiety, having Black African friends, perceptions of outgroup homogeneity, and levels of identification with the White group. The model explains that those participants with Black African friends are inclined to show less prejudice toward Black Africans. Also the more homogenous participants perceive Black Africans the more prejudice they show, and the more they identify with members of their own group the more inclined to feelings of prejudice, as measured by social distance.

Looking at the second model using affective prejudice as the measure, just two variables proved significant in predicting prejudice, namely: intergroup anxiety and having Black African friends. Intergroup anxiety was the much stronger predictor, but nonetheless, the model explains that those participants who have Black African friends show lower levels of prejudice toward Black Africans. Also, the higher the levels of anxiety associated with interaction with Black Africans, the higher the levels of prejudice shown toward Black Africans as measured in this model by affective prejudice.

In testing the contact hypothesis this study thus proves to be consistent with contact literature (Petigrew, 1997, 1998; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2005,2006). As Stephan and Stephan (1985) have stated, “The dominant response to many forms of anxiety is avoidance, because it so often reduces anxiety” (p. 161), suggesting that high levels of anxiety as a result of intergroup interaction with Black Africans leads participants to distance themselves socially from such a group.

Participants’ identification with the White group and their associated levels of prejudice against Black Africans, again confirms previous literature that suggests that those who have a strong identification with their group will be more inclined to prejudice against the outgroup (Taijfel & Turner, 1979), and as in this case, fewer friends from other race groups (Tredoux & Finchilescu, in press).
Although not a particularly strong predictor of prejudice, yet certainly significant was having Black African friends. The analyses were once again aligned with the contact literature, which suggests that those who have friends from other race groups are less inclined to prejudice against such groups (Pettigrew, 1997).

It is interesting that the two models using different components of prejudice differ in the number of significant predictor variables. The model using social distance, which

is a behavioural component of prejudice indicates perceptions of outgroup homogeneity and levels of identity as predictor variables over and above the two variables indicated in the model using affective prejudice as the component. Affective prejudice, as the term suggests, is a more 'feelings' oriented measure of prejudice as opposed to the cognitive form of social distance. This may explain the difference in the predictor variables that were indicated in the two models. Perceptions of homogeneity of the outgroup and levels of identification are also cognitive measures. The fact that intergroup anxiety proves to be a stronger predictor of prejudice in the affective prejudice model compared with its strength in the social distance model may be explained by emotions being more of a knee-jerk reaction than the cognitive process called for in the cognitively measured instruments. Pettigrew and Tropp (2005) have stressed that affective dimensions of prejudice are critical in understanding contact-prejudice effects.

5.6. The impact of demographic variables on feelings and attitudes

A t-test was performed to explore if there was any differences between men and women on the feelings and attitude variables in the study. There was no significant difference on any of these variables.

An ANOVA was performed to see if there was a difference in any of the variables as a function of age. There was no significant difference, suggesting that there is no relationship with this sample between age and the variables measuring feelings and attitudes.

Lastly, an ANOVA was performed to explore the difference in any of the variables as a function of socio-economic status. Perceptions of homogeneity and affective prejudice proved to have significant differences. Those respondents who had lower combined household incomes had a greater sense of homogeneity and higher levels of affective prejudice than those with higher combined household incomes, but not above t R600 000. A possible explanation for this may be that those Whites who are relatively poorer may feel that they lack job opportunities (Kornegay, 2005), have a greater sense of realistic threats and hence higher levels of prejudice, which is a relationship supported by Stephan and Stephan (1985). Interestingly, there was no significant difference between the lower income level and the highest level of R600 000+,suggesting perhaps that those between the levels of R200 000 and R600 000 may be quite content, but the higher earners who are more inclined to be business

owners and entrepreneurs may feel that they are missing out on business opportunities as a result of BEE policies in South Africa, hence evoking greater levels of prejudice than those on the lower socio-economic levels.

5.7. Conclusion

Many of the participants responded with intrigue at hearing the aim of the study explained as "*How a White community feel about their youth having Black friends*". Some expressed their support for such a study and others acknowledged the need for such concern. There were others, still, that displayed discomfort at the obvious reflection that such a questionnaire would demand. And then there were a few that relished the opportunity to express their prejudiced attitudes toward Black Africans.

The study was able to answer the main question of how a White community feels about their youth befriending Black Africans, and the factors that affect such feelings. The findings garnered suggest that the sample White community on the whole, feel positively toward their youth having Black African friends. On average the levels of threat that is experienced as a result of such friendships is relatively low, and possibly due to the fact that the levels of prejudice on average were low too.

Although there were predominantly positive attitudes indicated toward such friendships, there were a few areas where a little concern was indicated relative to the other items. These areas were: unacceptable behaviour in White culture, adopting undesirable values, losing skill in their own language, and rejection by their own community as a result of such friendships. Also indicated as a concern, but not to the same extent, was 'forgetting their own culture'. These concerns appear to be more culture specific and indicate anxiety associated with the loss of one's culture and a traditional way of being.

The participants indicated very positive responses regarding their youth befriending Black Africans in the areas concerning social understanding, cohesion and harmony. These items referred to South Africa becoming a better place, gaining a better understanding of the society, a reduction or breakdown of racial prejudice and an acceptance of such friendships by their own community. These responses indicate the importance for such a community to extend into and become part of the greater South African community, whilst at the same time retaining their cultural beliefs and traditions, which is an ideology encouraged on a national level. It would seem that

when one feels that the preservation of one's culture and the associated values and beliefs are assured, one is more inclined to support and promote interracial interaction and friendship.

In light of the contact studies in South Africa (Gibson, 2004) it was surprising that such a high number of participants indicated having Black African friends (75.2%). It must be born in mind that the sample was a higher socio-economic status predominantly in the northern suburbs of Johannesburg. Many of the Black Africans that they come into contact with may belong to a particular group that is termed by other Black Africans as AmaCoconuts (Stevens & Lockhart, 1997). This group of Black Africans are so named as they are perceived to be very similar to the higher socio-economic White group in terms of their socio-economic status and the way they behave, ie as though they were actually White, hence the name coconuts (Stevens & Lockhart, 1997). Poorer Black Africans suffering the hardships of poverty, those that regard themselves as having fought the struggle against apartheid, refer to themselves as Amacomrades, and perceive the AmaCoconuts as a distinctly different group that do not embrace the traditional Black African culture (Stevens & Lockhart, 1997). One must take heed of this when focusing on the high levels of reported contact with Black Africans in this study, as this may be the reason why such positive feelings to White youth befriending Black Africans were indicated.

It was hypothesized that there would be a strong relationship between feelings about youth having Black African friends and the perceived symbolic threats. The study proved this to be true. Those participants that perceived low levels of threat as a result of such friendships were inclined to have positive feelings about such relationships. The different variables that influence feelings about youth having Black African friends were analyzed and it was found that prejudice, measured by social distance, was the stronger predictor of such feelings, the other significant predictor being perceptions of threats. This finding supports the contact literature as it suggests that lower levels of prejudice would lead to more positive attitudes to interracial mixing. Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) suggest that contact is most effective in reducing prejudice. Since a large majority of the participants of the study indicated having Black African friends, the study may suggest that contact with Black Africans has led to prejudice reduction and thus positive feelings about youth having Black African friends.

In testing the contact hypothesis, the variables found to be significant predictors of prejudice were intergroup anxiety, ingroup identification and having Black African friends, which, once again confirmed the literature on contact (Hewstone, 2006).
The demographic variables, gender and age did not prove to be statistically significant in their impact on the variables measuring feelings and attitudes. However, there was a significant difference between the low and higher socio-economic levels regarding perceptions of homogeneity and affective prejudice. Those of lower socio-economic status were more inclined to greater perceptions of homogeneity and higher levels of affective prejudice.

5.8. Limitations of the study

This was a quantitative study investigating people's feelings about interracial mixing through the use of a self-report questionnaire. There is a limit to responses obtained through such a method of data capturing. The responses are precoded with fixed response options and may be somewhat leading. This leaves the questionnaire somewhat prone to the desirability effect. A qualitative aspect to the study may have been worthwhile and allowed for a richer study.

Convenient sampling was used as a means to gather data. The sample was thus not random since the entire White population of South Africa did not have equal chance of being included in the study. This suggests that the responses and findings in the study may describe the properties of the sample used rather than the properties of the general White population, suggesting that the properties of the sample may over- or under-estimate the true population values. There is also the risk of bias introduced into the selection of the sample by either the researcher or his assistants as a result of there being a non-probability sample.

The respondents were predominantly from the northern suburbs of Johannesburg, a well-established and affluent area in South Africa, which resulted in a very homogenous sample. The researcher originally intended to gain access to a working class White population in the Southern suburbs of Johannesburg. Most respondents in this area indicated high levels of education and placed themselves in higher socio-economic brackets. Since access could not be gained to a White working class community, it was decided to concentrate the study on a White population in the northern suburbs that would probably be well educated and in a higher socio-economic bracket. The respondents that were found in this area were mostly

educated to tertiary levels (76%), of which 44% of all participants had degrees and postgraduate degrees. Of the respondents that declared their socio-economic status, 54% indicated a combined annual salary above R 200 000. Since this was a community that was previously of very high status, and now arguably having to now relinquish such status, it brought interesting aspects of this dynamic to the study.

The term 'friend' was not defined in this study, allowing for the term to be interpreted according to the respondents' own construction of the term. As a result the contact variables may have been somewhat over-exaggerated, skewing the findings to some degree.

With self report questionnaires, such as the one used in this study, that call for racial stereotyping and other self-report measures, there is evidence that those responding to such questionnaires will often systematically respond in ways to appear more democratic than they actually are (Roese & Jamieson, 1993), so that changes across time may in fact be compliant to what is socially desirable rather than actual internalised non-prejudiced values. Since the political and social zeitgeist in South Africa calls for such attitudes, it is possible that this may have played some role in this study.

5.9. Future Recommendations

It would be most beneficial to incorporate a qualitative aspect to such a study in the future. Many respondents voiced their keenness to discuss and report their experiences of the political, social and economic changes that have taken place in South Africa since democracy. Such material could provide rich and meaningful data with which to explore such attitudes and their influences to a greater depth.

A future study using a random sample would allow for findings to generalize to the population with far greater accuracy than this study is able to claim, and allow for a more heterogeneous sample.

A clearly defined meaning for the term 'friend' should be included in any future questionnaires related to similar studies. Digital social networks have led to the term 'friend' being used in a much looser capacity as was previously socially constructed.

“No person knows his own culture who only knows his own culture”

(Allport, 1954, p. 486).

References

Abrams, D., Wetherell, M., Cochrane, S., Hogg, M.A., & Turner, J.C. (1991). Knowing what to think by knowing who you are: self-categorization and the nature of norm formation, conformity and group polarization. In M.A. Hogg & D. Abrams, (Eds), *Intergroup Relations*. (pp. 270-288). Philidelphia, USA. Psychology Press.

Alexander, N. (2001). Language Politics in South Africa. In S. Bekker, M Dodds & M Khosa (Eds.) *Shifting African Identities*. (pp.141 – 147). Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council.

Allport, G.W. (1954), *The Nature of Prejudice*. Boston, Massachusetts: the Beacon Press.

Amir, Y. (1976). The role of intergroup contact in change of prejudiceand race relations. In P. A. Katz, *Towards the elimination of racism*, (Ed.), pp. 254 – 280. New York: Pergamon.

Ashmore, R. D., & Del Boca, F. K. (1976). Psychological approaches to understanding intergroup conflict. In P.A. Katz (Ed.), *Toward the elimination of racism*. New York: Paragon Press.

Beinart,W. and Dubow, S. (1995). *Segregation and apartheid in twentieth-century South Africa*. London and New York. Routledge.

Billig, M. (1976). *Social psychology and intergroup relations.* London: Academic Press.

Blalock, H. M., Jr. (1967). *Toward a theory of minority-group relations*. Capricorn Books.

Bobo, L. (1988). Attitudes toward the black political movement: trends, meaning and effects on racial policy preferences. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *51 (4)*, 287 – 302.

Bogardus, E. S. (1959). *Social Distance*. Ohio: The Antioch Press.

Breakwell, G. M. (1986). *Coping with threatened identities*. London: Metheun.

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

Cary, N.C. (2000). *Getting started with SAS system: version 8*. United Kingdom: SAS Institute

Christopher, A.J. (1994). *The atlas of apartheid*. London and New York. Routledge.

Christopher, A. J. (2005). The Slow Pace of Desegregation in South African Cities, 1996 – 2001. *Urban Studies*, *42 (12),* 2305 – 2320.

Comas-Diaz, L. & Grenier, J.R. (1998). Migration and acculturation. In Sandoval, J., Frisby, C.L., Geisinger, K.F., Scheuneman, J.D. & Grenier, J.R. (Eds.), *Test interpretation and diversity: Achieving equity in assessment (pp.213-239).* Washington DC: American Psychological Association.

Crandall C.S. & Eshleman, A. (2003). A justification-suppression model of the expression and experience of prejudice. *Psychological Bulletin, 129*, 414 – 446.

Crandall, C. S. & Stangor, C. (2005). Conformity and prejudice. In J. F. Dovodio, P. Glick & L.A. Rudman (Eds.), *On the nature of prejudice: Fifty years after Allport*, (pp. 295 – 309). Oxford, UK. Blackwell Publishing.

Deaux, K. & Major, B. (1987). Putting gender into context: An integrative model of gender-related behaviour. *Psychological review*, *94*, 369 – 389.

Dixon,J.C. (2006). The ties that bind and those that don't: Toward reconciling group threat and contact theories of prejudice. *Social Forces; 84, 4*; ProQuest Psychology Journals, 2179-2205.

Dixon, J., & Durrheim, K. (2003). Contact and the ecology of racial division: Some varieties of informal segregation. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 42*, 1-23.

Dixon, J.C., & Rosenbaum, M.S. (2004). Nice to know you? testing contact, cultural, and group threat theories of anti-Black and anti-Hispanic stereotypes. *Social Science Quarterly, 85,* 257.

Dixon, J.A., & Tredoux, C.G. & Clack, B. (2005). On the micro-ecology of racial division: A neglected dimension of segregation. *South African Journal of Psychology, 35 (3),* 395-411.

Dixon, J., Tredoux, C.G., Durrheim, K.L., Finchilescu, G., & Clack, B.T. (2008). 'The inner citadels of the color line': mapping the micro-ecology of racial segregation in everyday life spaces. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *2,* 1547 – 1569.

Dovidio, J. F. (2001). On the nature of contemporary prejudice: The third wave. *Journal of Social Issues*, *57 (4),* 829 – 849.

Dovidio, J. F. & Gartner, S. L. (1996). Affirmative action, unintentional racial biases, and intergroup relations. *Journal of Social Issues*, *52*, 51 – 75.

Duckitt, J. H. (1991). Prejudice and racism. In D. Foster & J Louw-Potgieter (Eds). *Social psychology in South Africa*. Johannesburg, South Africa: Lexicon Publishers.

Duckitt, J. (1994). Conformity to social pressure and racial prejudice among white South Africans. *Genetic, Social & General Psychology Monographs, 120,* 121 – 143.

Duncan, N. (1996), Discourses on public violence and the reproduction of racism. *South African Journal of Psychology*, *26 (2),* 172-182.

Durrheim, K., & Dixon, J. (2005). *Racial encounter: The social psychology of contact and desegregation.* London & New York: Routledge.

Durrheim, K., & Mtose, X. (2006). Being-black-in-the-new-South-Africa. In G. Stevens, V. Franchi, & T. Swart (Eds.), *A race against time: Psychology and challenges to deracialisation in South Africa* (pp.153-169). Pretoria, South Africa: Unisa Press.

Ethier, K. A., & Deaux, K. (1994). Negotiating social Identity when contexts change: Maintaining identification and responding to threat. In M. A. Hogg & D. Abrams (Eds.), *Intergroup Relations: Essential Readings* (pp. 254-265).UK & USA: Psychology Press.

Fein, S., & Spencer, S.J. (2000), Prejudice as self image maintenance: Affirming the self through derogating others. In Stangor, C. (Ed.), *Stereotypes and Prejudice*. (pp172-190). Psychology Press.

Finchilescu, G., Tredoux, C., Muianga, L., Mynhardt, J., & Pillay, J. (2006). *Testing contact theory in South African: A study of four universities.* Paper presented at the conference, "Contact and Intergroup Relations: 50 Years On", held at Ithala Game Lodge, South Africa, 6-9 July

Finchilescu, G., Tredoux, C., Pillay, J., & Muianga, L. (2007). Accounting for lack of interracial mixing amongst South African university students. *South African Journal of Psychology*, *37*, 720- 737.

Finchilescu, G. & Tredoux, C. (in press). Intergroup contact, social context and racial ecology in South Africa. In U. Wagner, L. Tropp, G. Finchilescu, & C. Tredoux (Eds.). *Improving intergroup relations: Building on the legacy of Thomas F. Pettigrew.* Blackwell Publications.

Foster, D, (1991). Social influence I: Ideology. In D. Foster and J. Louw-Potgieter (Eds.), *Social Psychology in South Africa*. Johannesburg, South Africa: Lexicon Publishers.

Foster, D. (2006). Theoretical and metatheoretical frames in intergroup psychology: Three competing perspectives. In K.Ratele (Ed.), *Inter-group relations: South African perspectives* (23 – 65). Cape Town, South Africa: Juta and Co.

Foster, D. & Finchilescu, G. (1986). Contact in a non-contact society: The case of South Africa. In M. Hewstone & R. Brown (Eds.), *Contact and conflict in intergroup encounters* (pp. 119-136). Oxford, U.K.: Basil Blackwell.

Franchi, V. (2006). Affirmative Action in South Africa: epistemological challenges and issues related to training. In G. Stevens, V. Franchi, & T. Swart (Eds.), *A race against time: Psychology and challenges to deracialisation in South Africa* (pp.153-169). Pretoria, South Africa: Unisa Press.

Gibson, J.L. (2004). *Overcoming Apartheid: Can truth reconcile a divided nation?* HSRC Press.

Goldschmidt, M.A. (2003). Identifying labels among university students in the new South Africa: A retrospective study. *Journal of Black Studies*, *34*, (2), 204 – 221.

Harvey, R. (2001). *The fall of apartheid: The inside story from Smuts to Mbeki*. Palgrave: Hampshire and New York.

Heavens, P., Stones, C., Bester, C. (1986). Attitudes to a South African liberation movement. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 30*, 487 – 496.

Heugh, K. (1987). Trends in language medium policy for a post apartheid South Africa. In D. Young (Ed.), *Language: Planning and medium in education*. Cape Town: The Language Education Unit, University of Cape Town and SAALA.

Hewstone, M., (2006) Living apart, living together? The role of intergroup contact in social integration. Based on the British Academy/British Psychological Society Lecture presented at the Academy, March 14.

Islam, M. R. & Hewstone, M. (1993). Dimensions of contact as predictors of intergroup anxiety, perceived out-group variabilty, and out-group attitude: An integrative model. In M. Hogg and D. Abrams (Eds*.), Intergroup relations*. USA & UK: Psychology Press.

Jacobson, C.K. (1985). Resistance to affirmative action: self-interest or racism? *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 29 (2),* 306 – 329.

Jetten, J., Spears, R., & Manstead, A.S.R. (1996). Intergroup norms and intergroup discrimination: Distinctive self- categorization and social identity effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *71*, 1222 – 1233.

Kinder, D. R., and Sears, D. O. (1981). Prejudice and politics: Symbolic racism versus racial threats to the good life. *Journal of personality and Social Psychology, 40,* 414 - 431.

Korf, L., & Malan, J. (2002), Threat to ethnic identification: The experienve of White Afrikaans participants in post-apartheid South Africa. *Journal of Social Psychology*, *142, (2),* 149 -178.

Kornegay, F. (2005). Race and ethnic relations barometer: A Narrative analysis of findings from the Centre for Policy Studies. *Social Identity Survey:* Center for Policy Studies

Krysan, M. (200). Prejudice, politics, and public opinion: Understanding the sources of racial policy attitudes. *Annual Review of Sociology, 26*, ProQuest Psychology Journals, 135 – 68.

Laurence, J. C. (1979). *Race, propaganda and South Africa.* London, UK. Victor Golancz Ltd.

Levin, S., van Laar, C., and Sidanius, J. (2003). The effects of ingroup and outgroup friendships on ethnic attitudes in college: A longitudinal study. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 6*, *76-92*.

Linville, P.M., & Jones, E.E. (1980). Polarized appraisals of out-group members. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38, 689 – 703*.

Lipton, M., (1988), 'Capitalism and apartheid'. In J. Lonsdale (Ed). *South Africa in question*. Cambridge University, African Studies Centre, 52 – 63.

Louw-Potgieter, J. (1988). *Afrikaner dissidents*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Luiz, D. & Krige, P. (1981). The effect of social contact between South African white and coloured adolescent girls. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 113*, 153-158.

Maio, G. R., & Esses, V. M. (1998). The social consequences of affirmative action: Deleterious effects on perceptions of groups. *Personality and SocialPsychology Bulletin,* 24, 65-74.

Marquard, L. (1969). *The peoples and policies of South Africa*. London,UK: Oxford University Press.

McWilliams, N. (1994). *Psychoanalytic diagnosis: Understanding personality structure in the clinical process*. New York, London. The Guilford Press.

Minard, R.D. (1952). Race relations in the Pocahontas coal fields. *Journal of Social Issues*, *8,* 29-44.

Moscovici, S. (1976). *Social Influence and Social Change*., London, New York & San Francisco. Academic Press.

Mynhardt, J. (1980). Prejudice among Afrikaans and English-speaking South African students. *Journal of Social Psychology*, *110*, 9 – 17.

Mynhardt, J. & du Toit, A. (1991) Contact and change. In: D. Foster & J. Louw-Potgieter (Eds.) *Social psychology in South Africa.* Lexicon, Johannesburg, South Africa, (pp. 271-314).

Nieuwoudt, J. M. & Nel, E. (1975). The relationship between ethnic prejudice, authoritarianism and conformity among South African students. In S. Morse & C. Orpen (Eds.), *Contemporary South Africa: Social psychological perspectives* (pp. 91 – 102). Johannesburg, South Africa: Juta and Co.

Oakes, P.J. (1987). The salience of social categories. In J.C. Turner (Ed.), *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory* (pp. 117 – 141). Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.

Orpen, C. (1971). Prejudice and adjustment to cultural norms among English-speaking South Africans. *Journal of Psychology, 77*, 217 – 218.

Orpen, C. (1975). Authoritarianism revisited: A critical examination of "expressive" theories of prejudice. In S. Morse & C. Orpen (Eds.), *Contemporary South Africa:*

Social psychological perspectives (pp. 103-111). Johannesburg, South Africa: Juta and Co.

Paolini, S., Hewstone, M., Cairns, E., and Voci, A. (2004). Effects of direct and indirect cross-group friendships on judgments of Catholics and Protestants in Northern Ireland: The mediating role of an anxiety-reduction mechanism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30*, 770-786.

Pancer,S.M., McMullen, L.M., Kabatoff, R.A., Johnson, K.G., & Pond, C.A. (1979). Conflict and avoidance in the helping situation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *37*, 1406 – 1411.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1958). Personality and socio-cultural factors in intergroup attitudes: A cross-national comparison. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, *2*, 29 – 42.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1997). Generalized intergroup contact effects on prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *23*, 173-185.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *49*, 65-85.

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2005). Allport's intergroup contact hypothesis: Its history and influence. In J.F. Dovidio, P. Glick and L.A. Rudman (Eds.), *On the nature of prejudice: Fifty years after Allport.* (pp. 262 –277). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *90*, 751-783.

Reynolds, K.J., & Turner, J.C. (2006), Prejudice as a group process: The role of social identity. In Augoustinos, M. & Reynolds, K.J. (Eds.), *Understanding prejudice, racism and social conflict*. (pp. 159-178). London, UK: Sage Publications.

Schrieff, L., Tredoux, C.G., Dixon, J.A. & Finchilescu, G. (2005) Patterns of racial segregation in residence dining halls. *South African Journal of Psychology, 35*, 433-43.

Sharky, B., (2009). A South African family divided by race. Movie review. (October 30, 2009). The LA Times.

Sherif, M. (1966). *Group conflict and cooperation: Their social psychology*. London, UK. Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Smith, E.R., & Henry, S. (1996). An ingroup becomes part of the self: Response-time evaluation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *22*, 635 – 642.

Stephan, W. G. and Stephan, C. W. (1985). Intergroup anxiety. *Journal of Social Issues*, *41*, 157-175.

Stephan, W. G., and Stephan, C. W. (2000). An integrated threat theory of prejudice. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination* (pp. 23-46). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Stephan, W.G., Boniecki, K.A., Ybarra, O., Bettencourt, A., Ervin, K.S., Jackson, L.A., McNatt, P.S. & Lausanne Renfro, C. (2002). The role of threats in the racial attitudes of Blacks and Whites. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *28*, (9), 1242-1254.

Stephan, W.G., Ybarra, O., Martinez Martinez, C., Schwartzwald, J. & Tur-Kaspa, M. (1998). Prejudice toward immigrants to Spain and Israel: an integrated threat analysis. *Journal of Cross-Cultural psychology*, *29,* 559-577.

Stevens, G. & Lockhart, R. (1997). "Coca-cola kids": Reflections on Black adolescent identity development in post-apartheid South Africa. *South African Journal of Psychology, 27 (4),* 250-255.

Steyn, M. E. (2001). *"Whiteness just isn't what it used to be". White identity in a changing South Africa*. State University of New York Press Albany.

Sumner, W.G. (1906). *Folkways*. New York: Ginn.

Tajfel, H., (2001). Social stereotypes and social groups. In M.A. Hogg & D. Abrams, (Eds), *Intergroup relations*. (pp. 132-145). Psychology Press. Philidelphia, USA.

Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. (1979); An intergrative theory of intergroup conflict. In M.A. Hogg & D. Abrams, (Eds.), *Intergroup relations*, (pp. 94-109). Psychology Press. Philidelphia, USA.

Terry, D.J., Hogg, M.A., Blacckwood, L. (2006). Prejudiced attitudes, group norms and discriminatory behaviour. In M. Augoustinos & K.J. Reynolds, (Eds.), *Understanding prejudice, racism and social conflict*. (pp. 140-155). London, UK: Sage Publications.

Thompson, L. (2006). *A history of South Africa*. Johannesburg & Cape Town, South Africa: Jonathan Ball Publishers.

Tredoux, C. (1991). Social influence II: majorities and minorities. In D. Foster and J Louw-Potgieter (Eds), *Social psychology in South Africa*. Johannesburg, South Africa: Lexicon Publishers.

Tredoux, C.G., Dixon, J.A., Underwood,S., Nunez, D. & Finchilescu, G. (2005). Preserving spatial and temporal dimensions in observational data of segregation. *South African Journal of Psychology*, *35*, 412 – 432.

Tredoux, C., & Finchilescu, G. (in press). Mediators of the contact-prejudice relation amongst South African students on four university campuses. In U. Wagner, L. R.. Tropp, G. Finchilescu, and C. Tredoux (Eds.), *Improving intergroup relations - Building on the legacy of Thomas F. Pettigrew* (pp. 107-124). Oxford, UK and Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Triandis, H. C., Bontempo, R., Villareal, M. J., & Asai, M. (1988) Individualism and collectivism: Cross-cultural perspectives on self-ingroup relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54,* 323-338.

Tropp, L. R., & Pettigrew, T. F. (2005). Differential relationships between intergroup contact and affective and cognitive indicators of prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31*, 1145-1158.

Tropp, L. R. and Pettigrew, T. F. (2005b). Relationships between intergroup contact and prejudice among minority and majority status groups. *Psychological Science, 16*, 951-957.

Turner, R. N., Hewstone, M., Voci, A., and Vonofakou, C. (2008). A test of the extended intergroup contact hypothesis: The mediating role of perceived ingroup and outgroup norms, intergroup anxiety and inclusion of the outgroup in the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95,* 843-860.

Turner, J.C. & Haslam,S.A. (2001), Social identity, organizations and leadership. In Turner, M.E., (Ed.), *Groups at work: Theory and reseach.* (pp. 25-65). London, UK: LEA Publishers.

Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. New York. Basil Blackwell

Voci, A., & Hewstone, M. (2003). Intergroup contact and prejudice toward immigrants in Italy: The mediational role of anxiety and the moderational role of group salience. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, *6,* 37-54

Waddell, N. & Cairns, E. (1986). Situational perspectives on social identityin Northern Ireland. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *25,* 25-32.

Wiegel, R. H., and Howes,P. W. (1985). Conceptions of racial prejudice: symbolic racism considered. *Journal of Social Issues, 41,* 117 –148.

Worden, N., (1994). *The making of modern South Africa: Conquest, segregation and apartheid*: Oxford, UK and Cambridge, USA. Blakwell.

Wright, S. C., Aron, A., McLaughlin-Volpe, T., and Ropp, S. A. (1997). The extended contact effect: Knowledge of cross-group friendships and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73,* 73-90.

Appendix 1

Questionnaire:

Demographic Information

Please put a cross (X) on the appropriate box

1. Gender

Male□ Female □

2. Age

18-25 years □ 36-45 years □ 61years + □

26-35 years □ 46-60 years □

3. Highest Level of Education

Primary (grade) □ Secondary (grade) □

Tertiary:

Certificate □ Degree □

Diploma □ Postgraduate □

4. Living Arrangements

Single □ Divorced □ Married □ Separate □ Living with someone □

Children : Yes □ No □ Age _____

5. Occupation _____

6. Language

IsiZulu □ Sesotho □

IsiXhosa □ Setswana □

IsiNdebele □ Sepedi □

IsiSwati □ Xitsonga □

XhiVhenda □ English □

Afrikaans □ Other (Specify)_____

7. Race

Black/African □ Coloured □ Indian □ White □

Other (Specify) _____

8. Nationality

South African □ Other (Specify) _____

9. Living Standard Measure (LSM)

Please indicate an approximation of the combined annual income of your household

Annual Income	**Tick (√)**
Less than R20 000	
R20 000 – R80 000	
R80 000 – R200 000	
R200 000 – R400 000	
R400 000 – R600 000	
More than R600 000	

In South Africa today, there are many places in which youth of different races mix. For example, they mix at schools, churches, clubs and sports. We are interested in how you feel about youth from your community who make friends with Black African people.

Please circle the number on each line that best shows your feelings for each of the pairs below:

1. I feel the following about youth from my community having Black African friends:

Unhappy	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	Happy
Worried	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	Unconcerned
Anxious	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	Calm
Bad	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	Good
Ashamed	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	Proud
Outraged	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	Joyous
Surprised	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	Indifferent
Shocked	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	Pleased

Please answer the following questions by placing a circle around the answer that you choose

StA = Strongly Agree; A= Agree; SlA= Slightly Agree; SD= Slightly Disagree; D=Disagree and StD= Strongly Disagree

1 White youth having Black African friends will lead them to forget their own culture.

1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
StA	A	SlA	SlD	D	StD

2 White youth having Black African friends will contribute to South Africa becoming a better place.

1	2	3	4	5	6
StA	A	SlA	SlD	D	StD

3 White youth having Black African friends will lead to them behaving in ways that are unacceptable in our culture.

1	2	3	4	5	6
StA	A	SlA	SlD	D	StD

4 White youth having Black African friends will lead to them adopting undesirable values from our own.

1	2	3	4	5	6
StA	A	SlA	SlD	D	StD

5 White youth having Black African friends will lead to them becoming less skilled in their own language.

1	2	3	4	5	6
StA	A	SlA	SlD	D	StD

6 White youth having Black African friends will lead to them having a better understanding of the South African society.

1	2	3	4	5	6
StA	A	SlA	SlD	D	StD

7 White youth having Black African friends will constitute a betrayal of their own community.

1	2	3	4	5	6
StA	A	SlA	SlD	D	StD

8. **White youth having Black African friends will reduce or breakdown racial prejudice.**

1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
StA	A	SlA	SlD	D	StD

9. White youth having Black African friends will lead to them being rejected by their own community.

1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
StA	A	SlA	SlD	D	StD

<u>Please answer the following questions by placing a circle around the answer that you choose and place a number on the line if appropriate:</u>

1. Do you know any Black African people?
   1. Yes 2. No
   If yes, how many? _____
2. Do you have any Black African friends?
   1. Yes 2. No
   If yes, how many and where from? _____ _____
3. Do you know anyone who has a Black African friend?
   1. Yes 2. No

<u>Please circle the number that best shows your feelings</u>

1. **When you meet Black African people, do you feel:**
   …Relaxed

1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Not at all	A little	Some	Quite	Extremely

2. **…Awkward**

1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Not at all	A little	Some	Quite	Extremely

3. **…At ease**

1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Not at all	A little	Some	Quite	Extremely

4. **…Self-conscious**

1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Not at all	A little	Some	Quite	Extremely

5. **…Tense**

1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Not at all	A little	Some	Quite	Extremely

Please circle the number that best shows your feelings

1. There are many different types of Black African people in Black African groups

   Not at All **1** **2** **3** **4** **5** Extremely

2. The members of Black African people are Similar to one another

   Not at All **1** **2** **3** **4** **5** Extremely

3. Black African people are completely different from each other

   Not at All **1** **2** **3** **4** **5** Extremely

Please circle the option that best fits your opinion.

Please indicate the extent to which you would mind if:

1. **A suitably qualified Black African person was appointed as your boss**

1	**2**	**3**
Not Mind	Mind a little	Mind a lot

2. **A Black African person moved next door**

1	**2**	**3**
Not Mind	Mind a little	Mind a lot

3. **A close relative marrying a Black African person**

1	**2**	**3**
Not Mind	Mind a little	Mind a lot

4. **You were at a social event with a Black African person**

1	**2**	**3**
Not Mind	Mind a little	Mind a lot

<u>Please circle the response that best represents your feeling.</u>

I feel the following toward Black African people in general.

1	Warm	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	Cold
2	Friendly	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	Hostile
3	Trusting	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	Suspicious
4	Respect	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	Disrespect
5	Admiration	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	Disgust

<u>Please circle the option that best fits your opinion.</u>

Please indicate the extent to which you would mind if:

1. I think my group has little to be proud of.

1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Often	Very Often

2. I feel good about my group.

1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Often	Very Often

3. I have little respect for my group.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Often	Very Often

4. I would rather not tell that I belong to this group.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Often	Very Often

5. I identify with other members of my group.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Often	Very Often

6. I am like other members of my group.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Often	Very Often

7. My group is an important reflection of who I am.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Often	Very Often

8. It upsets me when people speak negatively about my group.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Often	Very Often

9. I dislike being a member of my group.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Often	Very Often

10. I would rather belong to the other group.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Often	Very Often