

https://dspace.org/

Living in a gated community: The subjective experience of sense of community and social cohesion

Talbot, Vicky

2016
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/19426

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

Living in a gated community: The subjective experience of sense of community and social cohesion

Vicky Talbot

Student number: 315487

Supervisor: Professor Tanya Graham

A research report submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Masters of the Arts in Community-based Counselling Psychology in the Faculty of Humanities, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, 2015.

Declaration

I declare that this thesis, entitled 'Living in a gated community: The subjective experience of sense of community and social cohesion' is my own unaided work. It is submitted for the degree of Master of Arts in Community-based Counselling Psychology, at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before for any other degree or examination at any other university.

Signed this_____ day of _____ 2015

_____

Vicky Talbot

Acknowledgements

Thank you to the following people:

To my supervisor, Tanya Graham, who, from our very first interaction around this research project, set me on a journey that altered my thinking and my actions and enabled me to forego my 'seat on the fence'; my deepest gratitude for solidifying the community psychologist within me. Thank you also for your constant support and motivation, as well as your unique mentorship throughout the completion of this research.

To my family, for their unfaltering support and understanding throughout the research process. Your unceasing belief in me and your own efforts in enabling me to complete this research were extraordinary.

To my participants, thank you for your willingness to share your experiences with me. Without you this research would not have been possible.

Table of Contents

Chapter One: Introduction 1
- Reflexive preface 1
- Focus of the study 2
- Aims 3
- Rationale 4
- Structure of the report 6
- Conclusion 7

Chapter Two: Literature review 8
- Introduction 8
- Defining residential gated communities 8
- The dilemma surrounding gated communities 9
  - The crime concern 10
  - Elitism, status and exclusivity 12
  - Race and gated communities 13
  - Privatisation of public services and public space 18
  - Evaluating the gated community dilemma 20
- The interconnection between place, attachment and social interaction 21
- Gated communities and sense of community 23
- Gated communities and social cohesion 27
- The influence of contextual factors on sense of community and social cohesion 29
- Theoretical framework 32
- Gaps in the literature 42
- Conclusion 45

Chapter Three: Method 46
- Introduction 46
- Research questions 46
- Research paradigm 46
- Participants 47
- Sampling 48
- Data collection tool 50
- Procedures of data collection 51
- Data analysis 52
- Establishing quality 54
- Ethical considerations 55
- Reflexivity 57
- Conclusion 65

Chapter Four: Findings and discussion 66
- Introduction 66
- Inter-group relations 66
  - Social interaction 67
  - Integration 83
  - Social exclusion 91
  - Trust 92
- Culture and values 94
- Power and control 101
  - Influence within the gated community 102
  - Influence by the gated community 105

Monitoring 110
Wealth, status, class and exclusivity 114
Lifestyle 119
Conclusion 122
Chapter Five: Conclusion 123
Introduction 123
Overview of the findings 123
Strengths and contributions to knowledge 131
Limitations 133
Directions for future research 135
Final comment 136
References 137
Appendices 147
Appendix A: Interview guide 147
Appendix B: Participant information sheet 149
Appendix C: Participant consent form 150
Appendix D: Participant consent to audiotape the interview 151
Appendix E: Ethics clearance 152

Chapter One: Introduction

Reflexive Preface

My own socio-spatial positioning, particularly my own residential space and associated relations, contributed to the choice to take this particular approach as a research project. My home may be considered to stand in contrast to those that fall on either end of the spectrum of advantage, from poverty stricken informal settlements to extravagant houses found in exclusive enclaves. However, this may even be up for debate when my position as a privileged white individual is considered and the meaning of advantage is defined; however, such a discussion would serve as a digression at this point. Homes situated in gated communities had never received a great deal of my attention other than at occasional visits to family and friends, and when noting the encroachment of these homes into previously undeveloped areas. It was the exposure to the complexity of these spaces in a year of study that increased my awareness around the meanings of gated communities, particularly when these communities are located in a context as multi-faceted as that of South Africa. Despite previously recognising the contrast between gated communities and their houses and surrounding living areas, I was now mindful of the multiple, and often unseen, factors involved in this distinction. I realised that the function of a gated community was in no way limited to providing safe and attractive housing, but instead constituted unspoken practices and objectives which typically centred on social relations, both within the gates and between gated communities and outside spaces. I realised that there was more to these spaces than I had ever considered, and that numerous questions about them were being asked, but remained unanswered.

This realisation did not, however, come with complete clarity. I contemplated my own home, distanced from either end of the spectrum of advantage – poverty and extravagance, from a different vantage point. Specifically, issues of safety arose and the benefit of extensive security measures appeared valid. Furthermore, the idea of friendly communities with frequent social interaction differed from the limited contact I had experienced with my own neighbours. While I acknowledged these potential advantages of gated community living, my brief introduction to their drawbacks, particularly those of a relational nature between residents and non-residents, created an internal conflict. I experienced a dilemma; there appeared to be pros but also cons, supporters but also fervent critics, news and talk of serious crime but also assertions of crime masking the intentional social inequality (Hook &

Vrdoljak, 2006). My new-found knowledge of what a gated community may actually be, came with a sense of uncertainty about the functions and effects of these spaces.

Living within a gated community is stated by residents to offer benefits (Blandy & Lister, 2005; Geniş, 2007; Landman, 2000a) while other research communicates the damaging effects of these spaces (Durington, 2006; Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006; Landman, 2002a; Lemanski, 2004; Lemanski, Landman, & Durington, 2008; Low, 1997; Roitman, 2005). My interest in gaining more knowledge about these locations and the practices surrounding them led me to the decision to research them. Of particular interest were the social relations within the gates, and also those between residents and non-residents, given the strong disagreement with the existence of gated communities due to their influence on these relations and the consequences of this for South Africa (Durington, 2006; Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006; Lemanski, 2004; Lemanski et al., 2008). Asking for the residents' own experiences, focusing on relational elements of sense of community and social cohesion, offered me one way to further my knowledge and to work on my own internal dilemma about the existence of gated communities. Completing this research has significantly changed my perspective on these spaces and I certainly no longer sit on the fence; the damaging consequences of GCs, particualry on a social and inter-group level, is now apparent to me.

Focus of the Study

This study focuses on the sense of community (SOC) and social cohesion within gated communities (GCs) through an investigation of residents' experiences. GCs are often defined as being residential areas; however, they do not refer solely to these. Office blocks and GCs that serve recreational purposes are additional types (Landman, 2000a). Enclosed neighbourhoods, where existing streets have been boomed off, and apartment blocks are examples of residential GCs (Lemanski et al., 2008). So too are residential security estates, recognisable by their inaccessible boundaries and intense security measures, such as round-the-clock interior patrols and their elaborate entrance gates (Landman, 2002b; Lemanski et al., 2008), and these are the focus of this research. Residents' associations manage these communities and control the administration and rule enforcement (Roitman, 2005). A code of conduct stipulates both the appropriate social behaviour required from residents as well as regulations concerning construction within the community (Roitman, 2005). GCs are common in middle- and upper-income areas (Lemanski et al., 2008), resulting in mostly middle- and upper-income residents (Roitman, 2005). This, together with the rules,

regulations and the cost of housing are said to make GCs homogenous places when compared to the diversity of the wider society (Roitman, 2005). This research explores the experience of residing in a gated community (GC) and how this experience reflects SOC and social cohesion.

GCs are a fast growing phenomenon worldwide (Lemanski et al., 2008) and in South Africa, this phenomenon is not limited to metropolitan areas (Landman, 2004). Multiple reasons are provided for why individuals choose to live in GCs. These include the fear of crime (Landman, 2000c; Lemanski et al., 2008; Roitman, 2005), ineffective police services (Landman, 2000c; Lemanski et al., 2008), unsatisfactory municipal services (Lemanski et al., 2008) and alternative and/or enhanced lifestyles (Landman, 2000c; Lemanski et al., 2008; Tanulku, 2011). There is much debate around their existence, and both benefits and costs have been discussed in research (Lemanski, 2004; Manzi & Smith-Bowers, 2005; Tanulku, 2011; Vesselinov, Cazessus, & Falk, 2007). It has been argued that the apparent necessity for GCs is in fact a façade, concealing the elitism and privilege that they offer residents (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006). Similarly, questions have been raised around the benefits of living in a GC, including whether or not they increase SOC (Sakip, Johari, & Salleh, 2012).

Housing is central to the creation and maintenance of social cohesion in urban environments (Cameron, Gilroy, & Miciukiewicz, 2009) and community ties are said to be influenced by neighbourhood design, such as gated and non-GCs (Sakip et al., 2012). Additional factors such as natural environments, safety, common space and similarity between residents have been found to contribute to community relations (Chavis & Wandersman, 1990; Geniş, 2007; Pretty, Bishop, Fisher, & Sonn, 2006). SOC has been shown to be higher in GCs in comparison to non-GCs (Blandy & Lister, 2005); however, alternative research demonstrates the opposite (Sakip et al., 2012). This study contributes to this area of research by exploring and analysing the experience of residing in a GC and how this experience reflects the SOC and social cohesion within GCs.

Aims

This study aimed to explore residents' subjective experiences of residing in a GC. It furthermore aimed to identify how living in a GC influences daily social interaction and inter-group relations, for example, the influence it has on daily interaction with neighbours and recreational interaction within the GC, including that between different groups.

Through an exploration of the experience of residing in a GC, this research further intended to identify how this experience reflected the SOC and social cohesion within a GC.

Of particular interest was whether the experience indicated a SOC and social cohesion within the GC and to what extent, and the factors that either enhanced or detracted from the SOC and social cohesion.

By employing an interpretive paradigm, the subjective experiences of the residents' were studied (Terre Blanche & Durrheim, 2006), allowing for an exploration and understanding of the experiences within GCs. The interpretive focus of this study was complemented with critical commentary, allowing my own voice to be present within this research.

Rationale

GCs are changing the social, political and economic organisation of metropolitan areas, and in South Africa these communities are not uncommon in non-metropolitan areas (Spocter, 2011). Much criticism is aimed at GCs. In South Africa, it has been argued that they resemble an alternative form of apartheid (Lemanski, 2004), hindering the country's post-apartheid political agendas, such as integration and equality (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006). In addition, segregation, urban planning, racism, exclusivity, power relations and more are concerns surrounding GCs (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006; Landman, 2000c; Lemanski et al., 2008). Conversely, reasons such as high crime rates, ineffective public services, and a greater SOC within the gates are provided as reasons for the existence of GCs and the choice to reside in one (Durington, 2009; Lemanski et al., 2008). The suggested effect that GCs are said to have on the society as a whole - economically, socially and politically (Spocter, 2011) - as well as the dilemma surrounding GCs, with both sides putting forward seemingly equally valid arguments, makes them a pertinent area of research.

For people wishing to live in a GC, reasons such as those provided above are motivating factors. Exploring the experience of residing in a GC offers a way of determining whether the reality of living in a GC had indeed met the anticipated experience. Considering the support for GCs and their increasing numbers (Evans, 2010), subjective accounts from residents may be valuable in ascertaining their expectations and actual experience. Of particular importance to this study is the experience of SOC and social cohesion within the GC.

Research on inter-group relations reveals sensitive and controversial aspects of society, particularly within South Africa (Campbell, 2006; Neves, 2006; Ratele, 2006). Research on GCs offers views on the influence that they have on inter-group relations, both positive (Manzi & Smith-Bowers, 2005; Pow, 2009) and negative (Durington, 2006; Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006). In the context of GCs, inter-group relations do not refer only to relations

between those inside and outside, but also to relations within the community. Investigating SOC and social cohesion within GCs may enhance the understanding of the effects that GCs have on inter-group relations, particularly valuable in South Africa where inter-group relations are strained, such as between different racial groups (Ratele, 2006). More research appears to have focused on the effects that GCs have on inter-group relations between those who live inside GCs and those who do not, particularly the perceived negative effects (including, Blandy & Lister, 2005; Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006; Lemanski, 2004; Vesselinov et al., 2007) in comparison to research focusing on relations inside the GCs. Interviewing residents of GCs about their experience of residing in one offers one approach to investigating social relations within GCs. It is claimed that residents of South African GCs do not wish to be integrated with others outside the gates (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006) and have a "racist fear of difference" (Lemanski, 2004, p. 101). However, factors such as crime in South Africa (Dirsuweit, 2002) and unreliable municipal services (Burger, 2009; Vena, 2011) present a vastly different view on why residents choose to live in GCs. First-hand accounts of residing in a GC, including of social cohesion and SOC, may assist in clarifying residents' intentions in terms of inter-group relations with those inside and outside the GC.

Research on GCs from the perspective of the residents is unique; with much previous research centring on their "institutional and structural development" (Durington, 2006, p. 152). In relation to neighbourhood research, there is a need for qualitative research (Parkes, Kearns, & Atkinson, 2002). Subjective measures, such as residents' perceptions of community spirit, crime and friendliness, are predictors of community cohesion and satisfaction (Parkes et al., 2002) reinforcing the importance of subjective research. The focus of this research is on the experiences of residents who live in GCs, thus gaining first-hand, subjective accounts from within the community.

SOC (McMillan & Chavis, 1986) and social cohesion (Kearns & Forrest, 2000; Novy, Swiatek, & Moulaert, 2012) appear to be rarely used as theoretical frameworks in GC research, specifically in South Africa, and a review of literature thus far has not revealed research which makes use of both concepts and their elements as a theoretical framework. Given the fact that GCs are social spaces (Durington, 2006) and seeking community is one motivation for choosing to live in one (Lemanski et al., 2008), SOC and social cohesion and their respective elements and multidimensionality (Kearns & Forrest, 2000; McMillan & Chavis, 1986) have theoretical value for this study.

Finally, this research may have practical value. Factors identified as positively impacting residents' SOC and social cohesion and, thereby, influencing inter-group relations within the

GC may be applicable to non-GCs. Introducing these into non-GCs may improve residents' SOC and social cohesion. In this way, inter-group relations within the community may be enhanced, this being a nation-wide goal in post-apartheid South Africa.

Knowledge about possible ways to improve relations between people is important worldwide and should be continuously sought. Considering aspects of SOC and social cohesion is valuable in the South African context. The segregation, inequality and multiple forms of diversity in South Africa (Lemanski, 2004; Ratele, 2006) makes research on relations between people important. Contributing to this area of knowledge is thus beneficial.

Structure of the report

This research study is organised into four remaining chapters, which include the literature review, research method, presentation of the findings and related discussion and a conclusion chapter.

Academic literature and information relevant to the focus of this research is presented in chapter two, the literature review. Residential GCs, the type of GC under investigation in this study, are initially defined. Following this, the multiple dilemmas surrounding these enclaves are discussed, with an evaluation of these opposing stances offering a summation to this discussion. Central to this research is the interaction between social relations and physical space, thus, a review of literature which speaks to the interconnection between place, attachment and social interaction is presented. Expanding on this interaction, but with specific focus on the GC space and associated social relations, SOC and social cohesion are discussed. Furthermore, the influence of contextual factors on SOC and social cohesion are presented, with international findings compared with those from South African research. The theoretical framework used in this research is then presented. Finally, gaps in the literature are discussed. The importance of taking the South African context into account when researching GCs has been previously noted (Durington, 2009; Landman, 2000b; Lemanski et al., 2008) and the significance of this context is relayed throughout the literature review.

The method chapter is intended to provide a thorough understanding of how the research was conducted. The questions guiding this research are presented first. The interpretive paradigm and qualitative nature of the study are then discussed. Relevant details regarding the sample of the study and sampling procedures are provided, followed by explanations of the data collection tool and the procedures followed to collect the data. The method of data analysis, namely thematic content analysis, is thoroughly discussed, with the specific steps

that were taken in this study set out. The establishment of quality, ethical considerations and reflexivity are then discussed.

The presentation of findings and discussion chapter includes the results of the thematic content analysis conducted. The results are situated within existing literature and the theoretical framework is applied to allow for an interpretation of the findings.

Chapter five forms the conclusion chapter of this research. It includes a summary discussion in specific relation to the study's research questions. The strengths of the research and its contributions to knowledge are presented, as well as the limitations and directions for future research.

Conclusion

This chapter has included a reflexive preface to offer the reader an understanding into the researcher's reasons behind carrying out this study and taking the approach presented in the remainder of the report. It has introduced the focus of the study, thereby providing context for the investigation, and the aims and rationale have been set out. The following chapter provides a review of literature that is relevant to the focus of this research and gaps in the literature are identified, in order to situate the contribution of this study.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

Introduction

This research study engages with the interaction of social relations and physical space. The literature review is intended to present academic literature and information relevant to this focus, specifically that of GC spaces and related social relations, both within and outside the gates. Residential security estates are the type of GC under investigation in this research, thus, a definition of these GCs is initially provided. The dilemmas surrounding GCs are presented, with particular attention given to issues emerging in the South African context. This discussion illustrates the multiple tensions connected to these spaces. The interconnection between place, attachment and social interaction is discussed, followed by a review of SOC and social cohesion in relation to GCs. The effect of contextual factors on SOC and social cohesion are then considered, specifically commonalities and divergences between international and local research. Thereafter, the theoretical framework of this research is presented, followed by a discussion of the gaps found in the literature.

Defining Residential Gated Communities

> Homes, or domestic spaces, locate the material, spiritual, psychological, and social dimensions of human existence. (Mathiti, 2006, p. 221).

Residential GCs are a specific type of housing development that is becoming increasingly popular worldwide (Li, Zhu, & Li, 2012). A GC is defined by Hook and Vrdoljak (2006, p. 237) as "a residential area, a potentially public space that has subsequently become privatised, fenced off, controlled by access points that deny non-residents entry". Recreational facilities such as tennis courts, club houses and landscaped gardens are available to all residents and are viewed as encouraging community building (Li et al., 2012). The private development and management of GCs (Pow, 2009) creates a type of private governance under which residents have more control over their area and services (Dupuis & Thorns, 2008). A code of conduct typically exists to which residents must abide and management of the GC may be carried out by the residents (Atkinson & Blandy, 2005). This management can be in the form of Home Owners' Associations (HOAs) whose authority resembles that of local governments and through which facilities of the GC come to be legally owned by the property owners (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006).

Residential GCs serve varied purposes. Blakely and Snyder (1999) developed a frequently cited typology separating GCs into three categories: lifestyle, prestige, and security zone. Within lifestyle communities, leisure activities are the focus, with golf courses and clubs being common features (Blakely & Snyder, 1999). The privatisation and control of public space is more of "a social statement than…a safety device" (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006, p. 237). Prestige communities are those that exist for the image-conscious resident (Grant & Mittelsteadt, 2004). Impressive entrances and high-quality security reflect their focus on status and exclusivity (Blakely & Snyder, 1999). Last, security zone communities offer protection from crime and outsiders. Barriers are an attempt at preventing crime, decreasing traffic and strengthening feelings of community (Blakely & Snyder, 1999). These diverse functions and characteristics are not, however, mutually exclusive and can merge within one GC, as is the case in some of South Africa's GCs (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006), for example, residential security parks. These and other functions are the centre of much debate around GCs. The arguments in support of, and in opposition to, GCs have created a dilemma for which seemingly valid reasons exist for both.

The Dilemma Surrounding Gated Communities

Ideology, history and separation or integration that is experienced influences rationalisation about GCs (Grant & Rosen, 2009). This is unquestionably the situation in South Africa, where the history of apartheid colours the way in which GCs are viewed. Worldwide the concern is that GCs are separating citizens and creating fragmented and unequal societies, and in South Africa this is viewed as perpetuating "the social divisions that were inherent in the apartheid state into the post-apartheid context" (Lemanski, 2004, p. 101). Housing, and its "development, construction and, availability" in South Africa is a key obstacle in trying to create a fair society (Durington, 2009, p. 72), and GCs, specifically residential GCs, are said to contribute hugely to this obstacle (Lemanski et al., 2008). For example, they are believed to create social, class and economic segregation (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006). Fear of crime, a major motivating factor for GCs, is even said to act as a defense for the actual reason for these communities, namely, racism (Lemanski, 2004). Likewise, exclusivity, prestige and bolstering social class is claimed to be closely tied to the wish for protection and security (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006). It may very well be that crime prevention, in the case of 'gating' (Lemanski et al., 2008) encompasses "exclusivity, social status, and…a peaceful, quality lifestyle" (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006, p. 246). From this perspective fear of crime may

essentially be a mask, covering up the actual reasons for living in GCs (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006).

The Crime Concern

Functions of GCs cannot, however, be removed from their context (Geniş, 2007). Globally, crime is a major motivating factor for GCs. Johannesburg, Durban, and Cape Town all experience high crime and are viewed internationally as dangerous places. Within these cities, property crime within South Africa remains significant (Lemanski et al., 2008). In response to this, South Africans have intensified their home security, enclosed their streets, and developers have constructed GCs (Lemanski et al., 2008). From this perspective then, GCs are necessary and do offer security and peace of mind to the residents. In addition, GCs that are not status-based exist; they house minority residents with modest incomes and they reflect a worry around security, not status (Sanchez, Lang, & Dhavale, 2005). These communities desire safe and secure environments, and appear to be unconcerned with exclusivity and prestige.

In South Africa, it is generally perceived that the police are ineffective at deterring crime (Durington, 2009) and that the state has failed to fight crime (Lemanski et al., 2008). Communities, therefore, unite to prevent crime by enclosing their neighbourhoods (Lemanski et al., 2008) and invest in private security companies and developments (GCs) that do what the police seem unable to do (Durington, 2009). In this way the "privatisation of policing" is occurring and, in South Africa, is increasing (Lemanski et al., 2008, p. 138). Crime concerns are certainly not limited to South Africa; New Zealand has likewise experienced inefficient police services (Dupuis & Thorns, 2008) and in the United Kingdom a motivator for GCs is the "concern about crime, vandalism and anti-social behaviour" (Manzi & Smith Bowers, 2005, p. 11). Gating to provide a sense of security has been shown to be effective by previous research, where residents felt safer with gates and guards (Low, 2001).

Interestingly, the question arises whether the fear of crime in South Africa is rational, based on the crime statistics (Durington, 2009). It appears that the fear of crime may be more significant than the actual high crime levels, causing the development of GCs (Lemanski et al., 2008). Furthermore, fear of crime has been found to be higher in a residential GC in comparison to a non-gated one (Abdullah, Salleh, & Sakip, 2012) and also to result simply from residing in a GC (Geniş, 2007). In addition, conflicting evidence exists as to whether GCs do indeed decrease crime, and for professional criminals the gates may not act as a

deterrent (Landman, 2000a). Moreover, it is deprived "black social groups and spaces" where crime is concentrated due to the socio-spatial legacy of apartheid (Lemanski, 2004, p. 104). This is not to say, however, that middle- and upper-income areas do not experience crime, they do, but it prompts the consideration as to whether GCs are developed for reasons other than fear of crime (Lemanski, 2004).

Further questions exist around the reality of crime. A curious idea has been put forth with regard to the role that the media plays in the context of gating. It has been suggested that the media benefits financially through the advertising of GCs, and thus has an incentive in increasing perceptions of crime as out-of-control as it supports the 'fear industry' and increases advertising (Durington, 2009). "Intense media coverage and contradicting statistics" result in citizens perceptions of crime and their fear of it increasing irrespective of actual changing crime rates (Glassner, as cited in Vesselinov et al., 2007, p. 11).

Despite suggestions that crime may be overstated so as to justify separation, there is no doubt that crime in South Africa and in certain places internationally is a problem, and for many people GCs do offer safety, security and peace of mind (Grant & Rosen, 2009; Lemanski et al., 2008; Low, 2001). It does not seem feasible for citizens to place integration and de-segregation above their own safety, and GCs do offer people a certain level of security (Lemanski et al., 2008). Crime is a major concern in many countries worldwide and where people cannot be assured of "law and order", gates will be stronger (Grant & Rosen, 2009, p. 587). In addition, strong relations between residents of GCs can be forged (Geniş, 2007) and although this does not necessarily allow for integration with those outside, it at least fosters it inside the gates, which perhaps does not occur as much in non-GCs. In South Africa, as much as the human right to freedom might be seen to be negated by the restriction of access to GCs (Lemanski, 2008), the human right "to be free from all forms of violence from either public or private sources" (Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996) is similarly not being upheld in the country due to the crime. In the United States, residents explain how living in a GC has provided them with a freedom they did not have before (Low, 2001). South African GCs are similar to those worldwide; however, the conditions surrounding them are unique, including factors such as racial identity, history, culture and local governance (Durington, 2009). These factors, particularly South Africa's apartheid history, are so pertinent that "in no other country in the world would road enclosures or GC development be elevated to the possibility of a human rights violation" (Durington, 2009, p. 75).

Elitism, Status and Exclusivity

Elitism through gating is an additional factor contributing to segregation. GCs, whether residential estates, boomed-off areas, or well-protected houses, are costly developments and occur predominantly in middle- to upper-class suburban areas with the aim of "exclusivity, prestige and leisure" (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2002, p. 196). Similarly, Geniş (2007) illustrates through a case study of a GC how social heterogeneity outside of the community is avoided. In Israel, affluence was found to be the primary feature desired in residents, thus forming "an exclusive and modern club" based on wealth (Grant & Rosen, 2009, p. 579). This research illustrates a desire by residents of GCs to be separate and part of an elite community in which one interacts with 'like-minded' individuals (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006). The physical barriers of GCs are "a material representation of exclusivity for members" (Vesselinov et al., 2007, p. 111). Socio-spatial segregation and division of culture is thus said to be encouraged by these enclaves on an immense scale (Geniş, 2007). The exclusivity surrounding these communities is emphasised by a development representative in Canada: "The fact that there are gates at the entrance to this project almost automatically tells you that there is something inside that is special" (Grant & Rosen, 2009, p. 580). Such a statement brings into consideration the picture created of the areas and people outside these communities and its subsequent effect. Hook and Vrdoljak (2006) offer some insight in this regard. The separation, exclusion and prestige come to be seen as justified due to the way in which spaces outside GCs are constructed. They are emphasised as dangerous and crime-ridden, compared to the clean and natural environments of GCs. The "perilous, damaged, irretrievably lost" outside world serves as a way to warrant the exclusion and segregation brought about by GCs (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006, p. 250).

It is believed that GCs are maintaining massive social imbalances of wealth and deprivation (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006); residents remain privileged while those outside the gates are living in poverty. The wealthy are believed to intentionally isolate themselves from lower income groups and create communities on a common foundation of a particular lifestyle, culture and identity (Geniş, 2007). Furthermore, it appears that this segregation then results in an altered experience of 'outsiders' and the world beyond the gates, prompting distrust (Geniş, 2007). A vicious cycle thus appears to ensue: residing in a GC to satisfy the desire for homogeneity and exclusivity results in a new or increased fear and uncertainty of the world outside, which in turn increases the desire for separation and isolation. This same cycle applies to fear of crime and the need for security. Given this, goals of equality and integration seem increasingly difficult to attain. However, as much as the prestige and

exclusivity that GCs offer has been criticised (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006), it is possible that they evolved out of the initial need for safety and protection. Particular GCs were, and are, likely developed primarily for separation and prestige; however, factors such as poor service delivery and "high crime rates" are key reasons for gating (Lemanski et al., 2008, p. 143).

Race and Gated Communities

Additional criticism is aimed at GCs that relates to the perpetuation of racism and classism. This criticism is closely aligned with the social heterogeneity and socio-spatial segregation discussed above (Geniş, 2007). Race has transitioned in meaning over time, yet the categorisation of racial groups remains a contested phenomenon. Defining race is thus not straightforward. Stevens, Duncan and Bowman (2006) provide a discussion around race, racial categorisation, racialisation and racism. These authors convey how, historically, racist ideology came to comprise the notion of fundamentally unequal and dissimilar biological races and that over time, increasing numbers of social scientists have suggested the abandonment of the concept of race. Concerns around race as a category are relayed by Kiguwa (2006, p. 112-113):

> Think of how the category of 'race', for instance, is perceived to be naturally existent, fixed, and devoid of any ideological construction, so that it makes perfect sense to speak of 'different races'. In assuming that 'race' and other human groups exist naturally, what is implicitly undermined is the question of why 'race', as well as other groupings, came into being at all. Is it really natural to categorise people? How are groups given an essence that effectively functions to either marginalise or reify them?

The discrediting of the scientific basis behind different race groups does not suggest that views of their social existence and the consequences thereof do not occur significantly in social reality, and "the concept of race can...be viewed as a social construct which continues to be integrally linked to the ideology of racism" (Stevens, Duncan, & Bowman, 2006, p. 59). For the purpose of the presentation of findings and related discussion in this study, the existing and highly concerning concepts of race and racial categorisation are considered applicable. However, a stance of transformation, and not of entrenchment of this concept and related categorisations, is taken within this study.

Racism is a serious social problem in South Africa that is considered to be reinforced by GCs (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006; Lemanski, 2004). The apartheid strategy involving the removal of urban black people to outlying settlements so as to remove the 'problem' is

evident today in the form of GCs, promoted as necessary due to their protective function (Lemanski, 2004). Similarly, these enclaves prevent poor black people from travelling in affluent areas because of the controlled access to GCs, a phenomenon comparable to 'passes' needed by black people during apartheid (Lemanski, 2004). Furthermore, a particular GC in Johannesburg has been accused of racist action because black contract workers must present their Identity Documents (ID) before entering, whereas white contractors do not have to do so (Oliphant, as cited in Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006). Once again, this is alarmingly familiar to the past South African context, when during the apartheid era black citizens had to carry passes, sign registers, and receive permission to access an area (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006). Furthermore, although black citizens are not restricted from living in GCs, the enduring economic effects of apartheid mean that the majority of residents are white (Lemanski et al., 2008). It is evident, however, that exclusion based on class now appears to override exclusion based on race (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006). This demonstrates how "powerful class and race divisions are thus re-inscribed…in the…form of barred-off roads, electrified fences, booms, and razor wire" (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006, p. 246).

Given South Africa's history, current class divisions are intricately tied with those of race (Neves, 2006) and, although an individual may be excluded from a GC due to his lower class status (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006), the significant likelihood of that individual being a non-white citizen is not coincidental. The development of a space in South Africa in which only middle- and largely, higher-class people can choose to live (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006) immediately excludes the majority of the country's population, that being black citizens (Statistics South Africa, 2013). Thus, it would seem that the intentional development of such a space serves a very particular function in terms of who it keeps out and who it allows into the space and, in the South African context, those kept out are predominantly black individuals (Lemanski et al., 2008). As these individuals gain more ground economically, the racial ratio within GCs may reach a balance in time. Should such a time come about, it would be interesting to note whether or not black residents, and other non-white residents, feel accepted and comfortable within the GCs. Similarly, white residents' feelings and experiences would be noteworthy if their numbers were matched or surpassed by other racial groups within the GC. This does not imply that all, or any, GC residents hold racist attitudes. However, the choice to live in such a community, a place where particular individuals are excluded due to their class, and therefore, to a large degree their race (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006), does bring into consideration their reasons for doing so.

A further potential relationship between GCs and race involves the perceptions of outside communities that are created and maintained by GCs. When GCs are advertised as offering secure and natural spaces to live (Clover, as cited in Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006) and are described as being private and clean (Tanulku, 2011), the world outside these communities is subsequently constructed as being the opposite (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006). The construction of the world outside directly influences the construction of the people who occupy those spaces, a process of othering (Mathiti, 2006). Therefore, dangerous, crime-ridden, lost and damaged places outside the GC (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006) are occupied by dangerous criminals who cannot be helped. A stark contrast exists between GCs and informal settlements that are based outside of these communities. One resident of a South African GC stated that the neighbouring informal settlement resulted in his expectation of a higher crime rate and the likelihood of him being hijacked once he left the GC and expressed the following: "all the things you're trying to get away from are right outside the door" (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006, p. 248). This speaks to the construction of those outside GCs as dangerous criminals. Thus, as residents of most informal settlements are predominantly black (Barry, Dewar, Whittal, & Muzondo 2007), this implies an understanding that the 'outsiders', the dangerous criminals that GC residents are protecting themselves from, are largely black people. This possibility, however, is not limited to GCs. Barry et al. (2007) relate how residents of suburbs in Cape Town wished to have a high wall erected so as to separate a township from their middle-class suburbs, one motivating factor being that of security and their views that crime would increase if this wall was not erected. This supports the construction of black citizens, specifically those of a lower class, as dangerous criminals who are different from other people, illustrated by a resident's feelings as quoted above (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006). These racial attitudes may not be conscious and the holders of such attitudes perhaps feel justified by having security and the maintenance of property value as their main motivating factors for separation (Ballard, 2004; Barry et al., 2007). However, the current South African context, tied so intimately to the country's past (Foster, 2005), situates such practices in a racial light and the connection of such practices to racist beliefs, however out of awareness these beliefs may be, must be considered.

Without placing a label onto all white, and perhaps even non-white, GC residents, the desire for safety and security is hard to separate from the desire to be excluded from particular groups viewed as posing the danger to them and their families. In addition, as research has illustrated, informal settlement residents who are largely black individuals, are often viewed as posing a danger to residents in more affluent areas (Ballard, 2004; Barry et

al., 2007). Furthermore, should GC residents desire to live with like-minded and affluent neighbours (Grant & Rosen, 2009), the clear economic disparities in South Africa mean that predominantly white people will occupy GCs, which is the case currently (Lemanski et al., 2008). This may be considered an economically based phenomenon; however, a potentially relevant factor is whether or not a person's wealth can be separated from his or her race in a country where one's economic standing is very often associated with race, as explained above. It is possible that a link does indeed exist between these two factors and perhaps the desire by GC residents to be surrounded by people of a similar economic status is related to their desire to live with people of a common race. Such a desire, if it exists, can be understood as being located in South Africa's history, namely apartheid, where black people were barred from many jobs, were forbidden to run businesses in areas assigned to white people and where schools, hospitals, buses, trains, benches, libraries, cemeteries and beaches were segregated, with white individuals gaining the greatest preference and amenities (Hussain, 2013). The enduring effects of this severe and long-lasting segregation of races are evident in everyday life (Foster, 2005) and with regard to GCs, predominantly occupied by white people (Lemanski et al., 2008) who have access to all the facilities within this demarcated area, a similar pattern of segregation seems to exist. It may be argued that this period in South Africa's history is over and thus no longer plays such a major role in the present happenings of the country and its people; however, as Ratele (2006, p. 9) asserts, the present is constantly changing, and rapidly so, "but the past too is not really done yet". This is supported by Hammett (2010) who states that a non-racial citizenry does not exist in South Africa, despite hopes for such a development, and race remains a significant factor in people's lives and their identities. The GC phenomenon in South Africa cannot be dissociated from the past, which has so markedly influenced the present (for example, see Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006; Kiguwa, 2006; Ratele, 2006).

Contrary to the above, it may in fact be the case that GCs foster a SOC between residents of diverse races, representing one place where different racial groups can live together as legislation provides for (Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996), where individuals are desegregated with access to the same resources, unlike spaces outside the GCs. Furthermore, a desire for economic homogeneity may be just that, unrelated to the race of individuals with the means to live in a GC. In addition, choosing to reside in a GC for increased safety (Lemanski et al., 2008) may exist despite the race of those who are believed to pose a danger to one, the aim being merely to protect oneself from criminals in general, not from black or white criminals. These contrasting perspectives may be kept in mind; however,

it seems difficult to isolate current occurrences in South Africa from the country's past, particularly as its past is built principally on a racial divide (Holtman, Louw, Tredoux, & Carney, 2005; Kiguwa, 2006). Choice of lifestyle is related to one's context (Clark, 2012; Low, 2003) and South Africa's context is steeped in both past and present racial segregation (Foster, 2005; Kiguwa, 2006), therefore, attempting to reconcile choosing to live in a GC, separated from the diverse communities beyond the gates, with the South African context is challenging. Focusing on the subject of race, Seekings (2008, p. 2) states that "it would be astonishing if post-apartheid South African society was not shaped profoundly by the experience of apartheid". Following this, the development of GCs and the choice to reside in one is likely to be shaped by the past and, given the salient role that race played in this past, it is probable that in the current day a relationship exists between race and the existence of GCs and the choice to live in one, as certain literature suggests (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006; Lemanski, 2004). With reference to racist relations as well as other forms of discrimination, Ratele (2006, p. 3) asks the question of "how and why people who have to live side by side can manage to hate one another so deeply?"

Racialised identities may be one contributing factor to this. The racial ordering and oppression that occurred under apartheid is evident in the current racialised nature of South Africa, where citizens continue to view themselves in racial categories (Seekings, 2008). Racial identities in post-apartheid South Africa are described as "complex, dynamic and contested" (Hammett, 2010, p. 247). Viewing oneself as being in the category of a "black man" or a "white man" is an indicator of difference and, as discussed above, it is not difference but rather homogeneity, that is desired by some (Geniş, 2007; Grant & Rosen, 2009) and GCs, particularly when they first emerged, offered certain South Africans a way to maintain homogeneity. Therefore, one possible answer to Ratele's (2006) question may be that racialised identities borne out of apartheid, and the 'unknown' that these different identities represented, have filtered through into the present day resulting in a deep hatred between people that live side by side.

To consider a contrary point of view, GCs may in fact blur the lines between racialised identities as diverse racial groups may live and interact together, thereby, lessening the unknown aspect of a different race and creating more common ground rather than difference. Although this may be possible, the social, economic and political roles associated with race and the deep-seated racial distinctions drawn between people (Seekings, 2008) make the erasure of racialised identities an area of uncertainty. A conclusion from this discussion is not automatically that the identities of all GC residents are racialised and that an awareness of

difference exists between the diverse racial groups; however, by being a South African and thus connected to the past and influenced today in some way by its enduring effects, of which there are many (Foster, 2005; Kiguwa, 2006; Ratele, 2006), it would not be surprising if this were the reality.

GCs may also have an influence on racialised identities outside of the gates. The distinct racial segregation maintained by GCs due to economic inequality may reinforce the black and white identities of individuals who live outside the GCs. These two different living experiences may solidify the diverse identities, the "set of social and cultural understandings through which" those within and outside the gates "come to know and experience [themselves]" (Hook, 2004, p. 6-1) and which, it seems, cannot be dissociated from one's race. The development of GCs and the choice to live in one may be associated with a desire to maintain homogeneity and continuity in terms of racialised identities and, in turn, this may contribute to the maintenance of such identities outside of the gates. As mentioned briefly previously, this may not be occurring and boundaries between races and subsequent identities may in fact be fading due to the unique nature of GCs and the potential opportunities that they offer residents, such as communal recreational areas, shared living space and equal access to available resources. Race and space in South Africa has been investigated and considered in different ways (Alexander, 2007; Durrheim, 2005; Finchilescu, Tredoux, Mynhardt, Pillay, & Muianga, 2007; Foster, 2005; Holtman et al., 2005); however, little research appears to have explored race and GCs (for example, see Durington, 2006), particularly in an in-depth manner as that found in existing race and space research. Thus, once again a dilemma surrounds GCs, this time in the form of race and racialised identities of both those within and those outside of GCs.

Privatisation of Public Services and Public Space

Ineffective and unsatisfactory service delivery and municipal functions are a further motivation for GCs worldwide (Geniş, 2007; Lemanski et al., 2008). In South Africa, the effectiveness of government-provided municipal services, such as running water, refuse removal and electricity is cause for concern (Burger, 2009; Vena, 2011) and there is a prominent need for improved service delivery (Bekink, 2006). As stated above, gating allows "private urban governance" (Dupuis & Thorns, 2008, p. 146) which enables the maintenance of private internal bylaws by the community itself (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006). Residents can thus control their area, services and facilities (Dupuis & Thorns, 2008). This allows residents

more choice in terms of services, the assurance that services will be provided to them and "value for money" (Dupuis & Thorns, 2008, p. 146). Many services, including security, are thus privatised (Lemanski et al., 2008).

This need for privatisation of state-provided services is not restricted to South Africa. Private governance was likewise found to be an important factor for residing in a gated residential area in Australia, offering them control, stability and protection (Kenna, 2010). The debate here lies with the inequality and difficulty brought about by this privatisation. In South Africa, effective and efficient service delivery is needed for all groups, including, and especially, for those living in informal settlements (Burger, 2009), not only for those inhabiting GCs. Worldwide, individuals are excluded from receiving effective and adequate services, facilities and infrastructure, based on their "social and economic status" (Geniş, 2007, p. 793). Knowing that one can rely on having refuse removed, water and electricity supplied and streets and parks cleaned is likely important and should be available to all citizens. Residents of GCs are fortunate enough to experience this, whereas many individuals living outside these communities are not. The source of the problem, however, is not necessarily the GCs. If adequate services and facilities were provided to all citizens this particular dilemma would likely be non-existent as there would be no inequality and exclusion regarding basic needs being met, such as water supply and sanitary environments. Removing all GCs would likely not automatically improve municipal service delivery. Many residents may have made the move to a GC precisely because these services were previously inadequate. With dilemmas such as this one, focusing concern away from the GCs and to where the obligation to provide adequate services lies would likely be more effective.

It is not only the privatisation of public services that is cause for concern. An additional contributor towards the exclusion of certain people from GCs is the "privatisation of public space" (Lemanski et al., 2008, p. 137). Public space refers to "streets, sidewalks, parks and plazas that are accessible and open to all people in a particular area" (Lemanski et al., 2008; p. 137). Privatisation of public space occurs when these public spaces become regulated by an institution, such as housing developments (Vesselinov et al., 2007), like GCs. These goods are then possessed by the private space, the GC, and all non-members are excluded. Physical barriers and legal stipulations deny non-residents any access to the space and services within the walls of the private space (Vesselinov et al., 2007). South Africa's constitution "provides freedom of access for all citizens" (Lemanski et al., 2008, p. 135) but the privatisation of space by GCs denies access to many citizens, thereby, restricting human rights (Lemanski et al., 2008). A dilemma of rights thus exists; the right to freedom is being restricted through the

refusal of access to non-residents and, simultaneously, the right to safety is being met for those inside.

GCs are also seen to pose a challenge to local governments (Landman, 2002b). Spatial planning and the management of land use have become cause for concern to them due to GCs (Landman, 2002b). The increasing number of requests for GCs, illegal closures and policy deficits are all contributing to the difficulties that local governments and municipalities are experiencing in regulating development and managing land use (Landman, 2002b). Privatising public space is thus a concern for many parties.

Evaluating the Gated Community Dilemma

From a social standpoint GCs are viewed as extremely negative. As the information above has indicated, it is asserted that they do not allow for integration of citizens and they maintain segregation on the basis of both class and race. They are, however, a "response from citizens to protect themselves from crime" (Landman, 2002b, p. 2). Despite suggestions that crime may be overstated so as to justify separation, there is no doubt that crime in South Africa, and in many other countries, is a problem and for many people GCs do offer safety, security and peace of mind (Grant & Rosen, 2009; Lemanski et al., 2008; Low, 2001). Is does not seem feasible for citizens to place integration and de-segregation above their own safety and GCs do offer people a certain level of security (Lemanski et al., 2008). As much as the human right to freedom might be seen to be negated by the restriction of access to GCs (Lemanski et al., 2008), the human right "to be free from all forms of violence from either public or private sources" (Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996) is similarly not being upheld in South Africa due to the crime.

When debating GCs, issues of unity, equality, racism, exclusion and ethics will surface. As much as these and other issues cannot be denied, GCs do offer some citizens a reprieve from what can be considered to be relevant and rational concerns - crime, poor service delivery and security. Although GCs may not be the answer to problems worldwide, they may offer a temporary solution for some. The negative impact of GCs cannot be refuted (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2002, 2006; Landman, 2002b; Lemanski et al, 2008; Vesselinov et al., 2007); however, neither can the aforementioned crime, poor service delivery, and inadequate security that exists (Abdullah et al., 2012; Burger, 2009; Grant & Rosen, 2009; Lemanski et al., 2008; Low, 2001; Vena, 2011). GCs are possibly the only means by which certain citizens can attempt to keep themselves safe, their environment clean and cared for and

provide themselves and their families with a lifestyle that they consider appropriate. In this way, the existence of GCs may very well be justified until an alternative can be found. In rationalising the existence of GCs, the inequality within the population must, however, never be ignored and a solution perpetually sought. As Roitman (2005, p. 307) states, while there are positive effects of GCs, "the negative impacts of segregation are more evident and dangerous in terms of society as a whole". This highlights the dilemma surrounding GCs; justification exists both for and against them and appears valid. It is, therefore, necessary to take both perspectives into account when deliberating the phenomenon of GCs and possible solutions to the problems that they seem to create.

A discussion on the debate around GCs provides an overview of their meanings and functions from the perspective of both those inside and those outside the gates. An area that has not yet been discussed in-depth concerns the social experiences within GCs. Rather than exploring GCs as architectural designs or spaces that negatively impact society as a whole, focusing on GCs as homes, as places where people live and interact, offers a way to better understand how they are experienced on a day-to-day basis and the types of social relations and community that they create – if any.

A discussion around the social aspects of housing and those within GCs follows in an attempt to provide an integrated overview of this area of study, fundamental to this particular research project. SOC and social cohesion are a focus of this discussion as these concepts are central to this study.

The Interconnection between Place, Attachment and Social Interaction

> Places are repositories and contexts within which interpersonal, community and cultural relationships occur, and it is to those social relationships, not just to place qua place, to which people are attached. (Low & Altman, as cited in Hidalgo & Hernández, 2001, p. 274).

Place attachment is the affective connection between people and particular places and can be understood in terms of social and physical attachment (Hidalgo & Hernández, 2001). Social attachment – the attachment to people living in a certain place, such as a neighbourhood – has been found to exceed attachment to the physical dimensions of a place (Hidalgo & Hernández, 2001). This was the case in various spatial ranges, including a house, neighbourhood and city. Despite this, physical dimensions of a place are important in the development of place attachment and combine with the social dimensions, resulting in an

"affective feeling toward the place of residence" (Hidalgo & Hernández, 2001, p. 279). This appears to be the case within GCs in which both social and physical dimensions play a role. Socially, residents feel that GCs involve less isolation and offer opportunities for contact between neighbours (Blandy & Lister, 2005) and physically; the security measures, natural surroundings and communal facilities are central to GCs (Hidalgo & Hernández, 2001; Lemanski et al., 2008; Li et al., 2012).

Housing is integral to social life, specifically "how and where people are housed" (Stone & Hulse, 2007, p. 1). Different neighbourhood types encompass varied residential experiences and relations between neighbours (Li et al., 2012).

It has been noted that little research has been carried out on the link between certain characteristics of housing, such as housing design, cost and urban form, and social cohesion (Stone & Hulse, 2007). Likewise, although on a larger scale than housing characteristics, research on GCs and their effects on SOC and social cohesion reflected in the experience of residents, appears to be minimal.

The effects of housing cannot be underestimated. A house offers its inhabitants a sense of belonging (Stone & Hulse, 2007). It has been found that certain characteristics of a house, such as the type of housing, are directly related to an individual's social connectedness with others, influencing their interaction with and feelings about others (Stone & Hulse, 2007). Purchasing a house appears to increase neighbourhood interaction, possibly due to the social and financial investment made by the purchasers. In addition, having children and the amount of time lived in the neighbourhood are both related to attachment to the area (Stone & Hulse, 2007). These are factors which need to be taken into account when interpreting the findings of this study, particularly because GCs have been found to be attractive to families with children due to the lifestyle it offers them (Lemanski et al., 2008) and also as a time period is specified in which the residents must have lived in the GC.

Significant in the context of GCs is the finding that "the relative advantage of the area" increases attachment to that area (Stone & Hulse, 2007, p. ix). GCs are said to be advantageous living areas in multiple ways, including the private, safe and clean space they offer (Tanulku, 2011), their recreational facilities (Kenna, 2010) and the exclusivity they provide their residents with (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2002).

Residential security estates, the type of GC that is the focus of this research, have specific characteristics that may directly influence social interaction and community involvement. Indeed, residents of a GC felt that social interaction, or neighbourliness, would be higher in a GC, with its physical boundaries and communal leisure facilities in comparison to a non-GC

(Blandy & Lister, 2005). In addition, increased security results in greater interaction and SOC (Chavis & Wandersman, 1990). Heightened security is one reason provided, if not the most fundamental reason, for residing in a GC (Blandy & Lister, 2005; Lemanski et al., 2008). It follows then that GCs, with their numerous security measures, would likely result in increased interaction and SOC compared to residential areas with less security.

It has been observed that social support, neighbourhood interaction and feeling a sense of belonging to the community are impacted on negatively when relocating from a non-metropolitan area to a metropolitan area (Stone & Hulse, 2007). These findings, however, were not related to GCs, which are different in their design and functioning to that of 'typical' neighbourhoods. For example, in GCs the walls around houses can be foregone (Chase, 2008), recreational facilities such as tennis courts and walkways, are communal (Kenna, 2010), and HOAs may govern the communities internal bylaws (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006). The above findings may, therefore, not ring true for GCs. Residents who have relocated from a non-metropolitan area to a GC in a metropolitan area may not experience decreases in social support, neighbourhood interaction and a sense of belonging due to the particular aspects of the GC.

Gated Communities and Sense of Community

SOC refers to an individual-social relationship (Chavis & Wandersman, 1990). It influences individuals' perceptions of their environments, social relations and perceived control inside the community, and building a SOC promotes healthy development of both the environment and its inhabitants (Chavis & Wandersman, 1990). Interestingly, it is also said to provide protection from illness and assist adjustment (Pretty et al., 2006). Inquiries regarding this concept look for an individual's experiences of inclusion, involvement, belonging, and dedication within a community (Pretty et al., 2006).

It is not only peoples' social environments that influence their SOC (Pretty et al., 2006). The location, including both the "natural and built environments" (Pretty et al., 2006, p. 11), can greatly affect it (Green, as cited in Pretty et al., 2006; Kim & Kaplan, 2004). In relation to the natural environment, many GCs are advertised as ecological estates (Lemanski et al., 2008), making people who are interested in and enjoy nature probable residents. Residents have indeed listed the natural environment as a motivator in choosing to live in these 'eco-estates' (Lemanski et al., 2008). As Pretty et al. (2006) suggest, SOC is related to residents' protection and restoration of the ecology of their place. The focus on ecology within certain GCs may thus be related to the residents' experiences of SOC, assuming they have such

experiences. Similary, the built environment has an effect on community relations within GCs. For certain residents, leisure facilities represent a way to increase their contact with neighbours (Blandy & Lister, 2005). In addition, the size of GCs influences social functions, where those with large numbers of homes are likely to have communal facilities, for example club houses and swimming pools (Grant & Mittelsteadt, 2004), thereby, being more socially orientated. Furthermore, the size affects interaction between residents, and the largest GCs may result in residents almost withdrawing from the outside world as all their needs will be met within the community (Grant & Mittelsteadt, 2004), including the need for interaction with other human beings. Feeling a SOC is likely to encourage interaction with neighbours (Chavis, Hogge, McMillan, & Wandersman, 1986) and in turn positive interaction contributes to the maintenance of a SOC through the emotional connection it promotes (McMillan & Chavis, 1986), illustrating a complementary interaction between SOC and interaction between neighbours.

Feeling safer in one's community likely increases interaction with neighbours and feelings of a SOC (Chavis & Wandersman, 1990). Given that increased security is one explanation for the existence of GCs (Lemanski et al., 2008) and that residents do indeed feel safer after moving into one (Low, 2001), it seems likely that GCs foster interaction and a SOC. Security aspects have been found to increase SOC. Specifically, when security measures are supported by residents of GCs they experience an increased SOC (Lemanski et al., 2008). Likewise, residents and HOAs report that enclosing the neighbourhood increases feelings of community (Landman, 2000a). In contrast, GCs do not always contribute to a SOC. Drives to enclose neighbourhoods have in fact increased conflict (Landman, 2000a). As Landman (2000a, p. 20) states, "a 'sense of community' cannot be created purely by putting up a gate or boom" and in some instances this can hinder a SOC. It is thus evident that SOC is another area of contention around GCs.

Psychological wellbeing has been shown to be positively linked to SOC. Specifically, life satisfaction correlates with SOC (Prezza, Amici, Roberti, & Tedeschi, 2001). From a unique perspective of the human needs theory, Nowell and Boyd (2010, p. 833) describe psychological SOC "as an individual's sense that their community serves as a resource for meeting key physiological and psychological needs such as the need for affiliation, power, and affection". From this perspective, therefore, being in a community that addresses an individual's needs, for example psychological or social needs, would result in a SOC and increased psychological wellbeing (Nowell & Boyd, 2010). Less isolation and increased

neighbourly contact can be considered a social need, and even a psychological need, that was met for residents of a GC in Blandy and Lister's (2005) study, thus representing a SOC.

Neighbourhood relations and social interaction between neighbours are said to be no longer important in modern societies, and in contemporary urban settings only weak social ties are said to exist between neighbours (Ruonavaara & Kouvo, 2009). According to Allan (as cited in Ruonavaara & Kouvo, 2009) this is due to multiple reasons, among which include neighbours having separate social networks and dissimilar leisure interests. This, however, is not necessarily the situation within GCs in which social networks may be shared due to the existence of HOAs, clubs and communal facilities, resulting in interaction between neighbours and possibly more frequent contact compared to neighbourhoods without these elements. Furthermore, residents may very well have similar leisure interests as golf courses, parks and natural surroundings can be found within GCs and are readily accessible to all residents. Thus, following the logic of Allan (as cited in Ruonavaara & Kouvo, 2009) neighbourhood relations may not be insignificant within GCs and social ties may be stronger than in other types of communities.

Interestingly, Blandy and Lister (2005) found that for people living outside GCs, unplanned neighbourhoods represented true communities, which they would rather be a part of. For people interested in residing in one, however, GCs are said to respond to peoples' wish "for community and intimacy" (Low, 2001, p. 48) and residents can form strong relations (Geniş, 2007). Moving into a community is a reason provided by residents for moving into a GC and for certain households it involves less isolation than their previous homes (Blandy & Lister, 2005). Purchasers of houses in GCs were also found to hold expectations for increased contact with their neighbours in comparison to their previous residences (Blandy & Lister, 2005). Existing research illustrates that GC residents have experienced increased social interaction with neighbours in comparison to their previous living environments (Geniş, 2007).

A criticism aimed at GCs concerns the fact that with all the facilities and services available within GCs, residents do not have to leave the community frequently and interaction with the outside world may be affected, thereby, creating social integration difficulties (Grant & Mittelsteadt, 2004). A large volume of research shares this idea, highlighting the promotion of segregation, inequality, social division and separatism in GCs (Blandy & Lister, 2005; Grant & Rosen, 2009; Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006; Lemanski, 2004; Lemanski et al., 2008; Vesselinov et al., 2007). What appears to be given little credit is the integration and equality shown to exist within some GCs. Gating does promote a SOC in

particular communities (Grant & Mittelsteadt, 2004; Landman, 2000b), results in less isolation and more contact for some residents (Blandy & Lister, 2005) and are composed primarily of middle- and upper-income residents (Roitman, 2005) who have equal access to all the amenities and facilities within the gates (Blandy & Lister, 2005). This does not negate the fact that problems arise between 'insiders' and 'outsiders', but it does present a positive aspect of GCs that often seems to be overlooked, whether intentionally or not. Concerns of inequality and segregation within the GCs cannot, however, be ignored.

GCs are said to promote a sense of belonging among residents (Li et al., 2012). For urban planners it is important that the built environment encourages neighbours to interact (Li et al., 2012). This New Urbanism school of thought focuses on particular design principles to produce a SOC (Valle, 2008). Fairly small, well-defined neighbourhoods with distinct boundaries and a community centre emphasising pedestrians are thought to encourage community building (Li et al., 2012). GCs, with their "purposely built public spaces, recreational club houses and commercial centre fit the description of the vision of new urbanism quite well" (Li et al., 2012, p. 7). In this way, GCs may thus be considered a design beneficial to community building. In fact, Li (as cited in Li et al., 2012) argues that in suburban housing estates the common interests of new homeowners as well as their collective actions have brought Tönnies concept of *Gemeinschaft* back. This refers to what is occasionally considered to be a small town in which strong relationships between kin and friends exist (Pretty et al., 2006). From this perspective, GCs greatly facilitate SOC. Conversely, in their study Li et al. (2012) found that gating negatively effects social interaction between neighbours and that physically demarcating the neighbourhood barely contributes to fostering community spirit. This is illustrative of the diverse findings with regard to SOC within GCs.

Additional research similarly illustrates this diversity. Using participant observation and interviews, Low (1997, p. 67) found that residents felt that they were "trading a sense of community for security and other amenities" and they seemed unconcerned with making friends. Lemanski (2004) makes similar observations and Wu (2005, p. 251) states that residents are motivated to live in a GC to "reduce the 'unnecessary' social interaction". Furthermore, Wu (2005) asserts that establishing a community within the gates is fast becoming impossible. SOC has also been found to be higher in non-gated residential communities in comparison to gated residential communities (Sakip et al., 2012). On the other hand, alternative research presents vastly different findings. In a case study of a GC, Geniş (2007) found a desire among residents for social intimacy and an emphasis on

community. Residents commented that “friendship and neighbourliness are really good” and “here everybody knows everybody” (Geniş, 2007, p. 785-786). Likewise, Grant and Mittelsteadt (2004) assert that inhabitants often communicate the SOC they experience.

As illustrated above, much research points to ways in which GCs would likely result in and increase SOC for their residents. Despite this, factors such as an ecological focus, feeling safer and increased interaction between neighbours may not occur in all GCs and if they do, it does not guarantee feelings of a SOC within the GCs, as previous research demonstrates.

SOC is not viewed as being solely positive. It is said to also promote division and negatively impact the mental health of individuals who are excluded from being a member of a particular community and the benefits and resources it offers (Pretty et al., 2006). This echoes the arguments against GCs, which state that they result in segregation (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006) and exclude ‘outsiders’ from superior infrastructure and facilities based on their “social and economic status” (Geniş, 2007, p. 793). For this reason SOC can be used as an analytic tool allowing the realisation of both “the positive and negative aspects of social structuring and power use” (Pretty et al., 2006, p. 18). It thus offers the possibility for rich and critical interpretation within this study. Social cohesion is an additional concept that can enahnce such interpretation due to its multidimensionality. It similarly forms part of the focus of this study and, therefore, requires discussion.

Gated Communities and Social Cohesion

Social cohesion refers to different aspects of social relations, for example, belonging and participation (Novy et al., 2012). It is multidimensional, composed of “socioeconomic, cultural, ecological and political” elements (Novy et al., 2012, p. 1873). In reference to society, Kearns and Forrest (2000, p. 998-999) describe social cohesion as “the harmonious development of society and its constituent groups towards common economic, social and environmental standards”. Such common standards are similarly important in the case of GCs. Regarding the economic aspect, residents from a study conducted by Grant and Rosen (2009) shared that affluent residents are preferable and can become part of the exclusive club that is the GC. In addition, GCs are found predominantly in middle- and upper-income areas (Lemanski et al., 2008), therefore, consisting of residents with similar incomes. Common economic standards can thus be identified within GCs. On a social level people have moved into GCs with the hope of a more open and unified community (Landman, 2000a) and residents have experienced increased interaction with neighbours (Blandy & Lister, 2005;

Geniş, 2007). Furthermore, social standards of privacy, social control and safety are motivating factors for living in a GC (Grant & Rosen, 2009; Landman, 2000a; Lemanski et al., 2008; Low, 2001). Regarding the environmental element; natural surroundings, an ecological focus and a clean environment are a focus within GCs (Lemanski et al., 2008; Tanulku, 2011). Similarly, portrayals of GCs as "rustic" and "rural" are used promotionally, depicting the community as somewhat similar to a game lodge (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2002, p. 201). A statement made by a resident of a GC reflects this: "there's a beautiful river that runs right through Dainfern and it's yours" (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006, p. 250). Surrounding oneself with like-minded people has been found to be important for residents (Landman, 2004) and this is reflected in the economic, social and environmental standards sought after by residents. Social cohesion involves the wish of urban inhabitants for belonging and identification with both a group and place (Novy et al., 2012). In the face of collective goals or goods, shared values and dedication are emphasised (Beumer, 2010).

Stone and Hulse (2007) investigated whether various aspects of housing related to social cohesion's three core dimensions, namely; "social connectedness…inequalities/social exclusion, and cultural norms/values" (Hulse & Stone, 2006, p. 50). It was found that being satisfied with one's neighbourhood is likely to increase interaction and social connectedness (social cohesion) and equally, increased engagement or connectedness results in higher satisfaction. Although the study conducted by Stone and Hulse (2007) was not related specifically to GCs, their findings can be applied to the GC context. Residents of a GC in a study by Lemanski et al. (2008) reported satisfaction with the GC and the lifestyle it offered them. This finding was not, however, linked directly to an increased SOC or social connectedness. A further interesting finding by Stone and Hulse (2007) in relation to aspects of housing, place and social cohesion was that the residents of lower quality housing felt more a part of the community than residents of "higher quality housing" (Stone & Hulse, 2007, p. 33). Housing within the type of GC in this study (residential security parks) is not likely to be of poor quality as it is located in middle- to upper-income areas (Lemanski et al., 2008) and described as "the upper classes' retreat" (Tanulku, 2011, p. 519). It is evident then that factors exist within the GC that may increase social cohesion, such as satisfaction with the community or neighbourhood, as well as factors which may decrease social cohesion, such as the high quality of housing and what this may represent/entail. GCs thus appear to be complex living environments, particularly in terms of social cohesion, belongingness, and SOC. This study intended to offer some clarification on the issue through an exploration of the experience of residing in a GC and how this experience reflects SOC and social cohesion.

The findings and conclusion of the study are not representative of all GCs and all residents' experiences of them, but offer insight into how GCs are experienced from within, the SOC and social cohesion within them and the factors which contribute to this.

Social cohesion is usually presumed to be something good (Kearns & Forrest, 2000); however, it is not necessarily solely positive. For example, it can be about exclusion or a minority experiencing an imposition of values by a majority (Forrest & Kearns, 2001). Social cohesion may be experienced within the GC but their exclusion of those outside the gates has been noted by many authors (Blandy & Lister, 2005; Geniş, 2007; Grant & Rosen, 2009; Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006; Lemanski, 2004).

Findings from international research in relation to social cohesion appears to be significant to the South African context. In particular, it was found in Australia that residents of neighbourhoods who do not have an English-speaking background or who do not speak English at home experience less social cohesion, not feeling part of the community (Stone & Hulse, 2007). This is particularly significant in South Africa given its history and its diverse multicultural society. Under apartheid, acts such as the *Natives Land Act of 1913* and its resulting land dispossession separated 'natives', or non-whites, and white people, laying the foundation of racial segregation (Neves, 2006). Today, social exclusion caused by this land dispossession still exists (Neves, 2006). In South Africa, therefore, people of races other than white, who may very well come from a non-English- or non-Afrikaans speaking background or who do not speak English or Afrikaans at home, experience social exclusion. In GCs, although no racial group is restricted from residing in one, the enduring economic effects of apartheid mean that the majority of residents are white (Lemanski et al., 2008). Being the minority may result in the black residents experiencing social exclusion and feeling as though they are not part of the community.

Stone and Hulse (2007, p. 1) make reference to "non-shelter outcomes", such as "emotional wellbeing, family functioning…and community life". Such non-shelter outcomes are central to this study, specifically SOC and social cohesion. Social cohesion, according to Stone and Hulse (2007), offers a way to conceptually understand and empirically explore these outcomes. Kearns and Forrest's (2000) dimensions of social cohesion, together with those of Novy et al. (2012), were selected to interpret the findings of this study, together with McMillan and Chavis's (1986) SOC theoretical framework.

The Influence of Contextual Factors on Sense of Community and Social Cohesion

Commonalities exist between international and South African features of SOC and social

cohesion within GCs as described above. Firstly, the security offered by GCs is said to contribute to SOC and social cohesion (Blandy & Lister, 2005; Lemanski et al., 2008). Thus, it appears that protection of the self, and in certain instances one's family, is important to individuals who live in diverse contexts and is a basic need for all. Additional common factors internationally and locally that are said to contribute to SOC and social cohesion include the natural surroundings, a clean environment, privacy, social control and residents who have children (Grant & Rosen, 2009; Landman, 2000a; Lemanski et al., 2008; Low, 2001; Stone & Hulse, 2007) . Thus, similar reasons are provided for choosing to live in a GC and likenesses are evident concerning the occurrences within them, specifically with regard to SOC and social cohesion. It therefore appears that worldwide people desire similar conditions from their living space. Underlying these desires and needs, however, are the different contexts in which they occur. Thus, residents of GCs internationally and locally may experience a SOC due to the security or cleanliness it offers them but it is the diverse contexts that engender such desires (Low, 2003). The importance of taking into account the unique context and conditions of South Africa when investigating GCs has been noted by researchers (Durington, 2009; Landman, 2000b).

The South African context reflects pertinent social issues that are related to a person's living style (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006; Lemanski et al., 2008; Mathiti, 2006) and this is certainly the case internationally (Low, 2003). Factors embedded in a country's past are likely to have ripple effects on the present day, one being the living spaces occupied by citizens (e.g., Neves, 2006). This is clearly evident in South Africa, where informal settlements, suburbs and GCs are connected to the apartheid era (Barry et al., 2007; Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006). This is not to say that such living spaces did not exist prior to apartheid, but rather that their continued existence has been impacted significantly by this period in South Africa's history. For example, the racial and closely related class divisions within GCs are attributed to the racial segregation and inequality, and the associated economic disparities, promoted and maintained by apartheid (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006).

The segregation and social division promoted by GCs is a concern internationally and locally. However, despite the prevalent past racial inequality internationally (Farley & Frey, 1994; Johnston, Poulsen, & Forrest, 2005; Oldfield, 2007) it is interesting to note that the topic of racial inequality and its connection to the past is found predominantly in South African research on GCs in comparison to international research. This points to the continuing profound impact that apartheid continues to have in South Africa. In addition, it is predominantly in international research that GCs are associated with increased social

interaction, attachment, increased contact with neighbours, community, sense of belonging, and SOC (Blandy & Lister, 2005; Geniş, 2007; Grant & Mittelsteadt, 2004; Li et al., 2012; Low, 2001). This suggests significant differences between the residents' experiences, as well as their expectations and desires for residing in a GC. This is illustrative of the fusion between GCs and the context in which they exist and the layered meaning that seemingly simple concepts such as SOC and social cohesion possess when contextual factors are considered. Thus, although commonalities exist between international and local research on SOC and social cohesion within GCs, in South Africa these concepts are intricately intertwined with the country's past and are very often interpreted through the lens of apartheid and the racial inequality it endorsed. The potential for South African GCs to be considered a violation of human rights, a possibility in no other country worldwide (Durington, 2009), is contributed to greatly by the historical inhumane inequality and the strong desire to prevent this from being repeated.

When considering international and local research described above, SOC and social cohesion within South African GCs from the residents' perspectives is frequently related to security, open communities, privacy, natural surroundings and living a specific lifestyle (Landman, 2000a; Lemanski et al., 2008). Although it occurs, it does not seem to be often that South African residents express their desire to live in a GC in order to be separated from others and to be part of a homogenous group, unlike international research in which residents appears to express such feelings more freely (Geniş, 2007; Grant & Rosen, 2009). It may be that South African GC residents do not desire this; however, the strong and numerous criticisms aimed at GCs in South Africa for their perpetuation of inequality and segregation and their similarities to apartheid race and class divisions (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006; Lemanski, 2004; Lemanski et al., 2008) make such a possibility questionable. Residents may in fact feel that they cannot express such views for fear of the consequences. Expressing a desire for separation from particular groups, whether they are racial or class groups, in the South African context is likely to be judged negatively and thus residents may feel unable to express such reasons for residing in a GC. It is widely known that unity, multiculturalism and integration are being strived for in South Africa (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006; Myambo, 2010), not homogeneity and segregation, thus, for people that prefer to be with those similar to themselves, making this known would be unwise. It cannot be said that this applies to all GC residents as this would be presumptuous and very likely incorrect. However, there is a possibility that certain residents do feel unable to express their true desires, due mostly to South Africa's history and the extremely negative connotations associated with it.

SOC and social cohesion within South African GCs has been shown by research to exist (Landman, 2000a; Lemanski et al., 2008) and wanting to live in a GC for this reason can be viewed as being equally true as wanting to do so to be separated from certain groups of people. It is beneficial not to paint GC residents with a racist or classist brush as this may very well not be the reality. As discussed previously, certain factors such as increased security, effective public services and ecological environments (Durington, 2009; Lemanski et al, 2008) are reasons for choosing to reside in a GC and they can be perceived as being valid given the South African context. Similarly, a desire for a SOC and social cohesion may be viewed as a logical desire given the prominent division between individuals in South Africa (Foster, 2005). Much research, presented above, points to features of GCs that may foster this SOC and social cohesion and therefore offer unique living spaces.

GCs and the contextual factors surrounding them are complex. The SOC and social cohesion within GCs and the desire for these cannot be separated from the context in which these GCs are embedded, and the South African context makes SOC and social cohesion in GCs, and the potential underlying realities, greatly debatable. This study aimed to determine whether the experiences of residents in GCs reflect SOC and social cohesion and to establish the contributing factors.

Theoretical Framework

To interpret the findings from this study, an appropriate theoretical framework was required. The study aimed to explore the experience of residing in a GC and how this experience reflected the SOC and social cohesion within the GC. The theoretical framework used for interpretation of the findings was McMillan and Chavis's (1986) four-dimensional theoretical framework of SOC and the combined dimensions of social cohesion put forward by Kearns and Forrest (2000) and Novy et al. (2012).

To begin with, a brief discussion on definitions of community is provided. Community is an ambiguous term (James, 2004) and a contentious concept (Grant & Mittelsteadt, 2004). The term 'community' generally describes social organisations that are connected by a geographical location, for example a neighbourhood, or by shared interests, aims or needs (Pretty et al., 2006). Reinforcing this, Pretty et al. (2006, p. 8) state that when assessing SOC, it is necessary to "recognise the level and type of community that is being considered". A distinction exists between "locational (place based), and relational (social interaction based) communities" (Pretty et al., 2006, p. 8). GCs are an example of communities in which aspects of these definitions overlap. Geographically, they are located in particular areas and in a

relational sense residents interact, socialise, and share common interests and goals – as has been presented above. GCs thus encompass various conceptions of community. Likewise, McMillan and Chavis's (1986) theoretical framework of SOC applies to both geographical communities, such as neighbourhoods, and to relational communities.

McMillan (as cited in McMillan & Chavis, 1986, p. 9) proposed the following definition of SOC: "Sense of community is a feeling that members have of belonging, a feeling that members matter to one another and to the group, and a shared faith that members' needs will be met through their commitment to be together". This definition as well as their theory of SOC has four elements, namely: (1) membership (2) influence (3) integration and fulfilment of needs and (4) shared emotional connection. Each element consists of sub-elements working together to form the single component, and they all function collectively to build and maintain SOC (McMillan & Chavis, 1986). First, membership concerns feelings of belonging or of shared personal relatedness. It involves boundaries, with certain people belonging and others being excluded. It is often language, rituals and dress that create these boundaries and these boundaries may be used for protection of people's social connections. Boundaries can be harmful due to the painful rejection experienced by those outside them and the isolation they create. This is a significant factor in the South African context, where those outside GCs are viewed as being intentionally kept out and as potentially having their human rights violated (Durington, 2009; Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006). The boundaries created by GCs in South Africa are predominantly viewed negatively and as maintaining the inequality of the past. Groups within the boundaries are said to "use deviants as scapegoats" to create their solid boundaries (McMillan & Chavis, 1986, p. 9). Once again, this has been identified in South African literature on GCs where those inside GCs construct spaces outside, as well as the outsiders, in a very specific way in order to justify the segregation between the group members and those outside the gates (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006). Interestingly, McMillan and Chavis (1986) assert that just as groups use deviants to create boundaries, so too do deviants use these groups to create their own group boundaries. This is not an area that has been given much attention in research on GCs and it is an interesting idea to consider in the South African context, where individuals who do not reside in GCs separate themselves from GC residents. Thus, the focus is largely on the boundaries created by the GCs and does not often venture to those that people outside the GCs create and maintain.

Moreover, membership encompasses emotional safety, and it is boundaries that defend group intimacy. Having a sense of identification and belonging involves feeling, believing and expecting that one forms part of the group, is accepted and will make sacrifices for the

group. Identification can be represented by statements such as “It is my group” and “I am part of the group” (McMillan & Chavis, 1986, p. 10). Personal investment is an additional attribute that contributes to feelings of membership and SOC and McMillan (as cited in McMillan & Chavis, 1986) states that working for one’s membership leads to a feeling of having earned one’s place and this personal investment increases the value of membership. Home ownership is such an investment and influences emotional connection. In GCs, it may thus be the case that residents who own their house experience a greater SOC than those who do not. This has indeed been illustrated in existing research on housing (Stone & Hulse, 2007). Common symbol systems also contribute to SOC and one way in which this occurs is through the maintenance of group boundaries. Neighbourhood symbols may include the name, logo, landmark and architectural style. Such symbols are evident in GCs, for example, they have their own names (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006), and they have uniquely designed logos and specific architectural styles (Blakely & Snyder, 1999), often prohibiting divergent styles from being built within the gates. These symbol systems would suggest that SOC in GCs is higher than for residents of free standings houses and other residential areas.

The second element is influence and refers to a feeling that one makes a difference to the group, that one matters and that members find the group important. Group members with the greatest influence are said to often be those who acknowledge other’s needs, opinions and values. Members who attempt to dominate others, push their influence and ignore other’s desires and opinions are frequently the least powerful. This is an interesting element to apply to GCs as residents can be part of associations that possess substantial control within the GCs (Landman, 2002a) and their actions and rules set out for the GC will therefore likely have a significant impact on the other residents, whether positive or negative, thereby pointing to their power. McMillan and Chavis (1986) assert the following regarding influence: according to research on group cohesiveness, members are drawn to communities in which they believe they are influential, a positive relationship exists between the influence a community has on its members and cohesiveness, conformity fosters closeness and indicates cohesiveness and lastly, a reciprocal relationship exists between a member’s influence on a community and the community’s influence on a member and it is expected that both would operate concurrently in a cohesive community.

A third element, integration and fulfilment of needs, involves the feeling that the needs of members of a group will be fulfilled by the resources that membership offers them. The maintenance of a group’s intimacy depends on the rewarding nature of the individual-group association for members. Needs are prioritised based on shared values, and when individuals

with shared values meet it is often that their needs, goals and priorities will be similar. This fosters a belief that joining together will enable them to satisfy their needs and receive the reinforcement they want. This may point to the desired homogeneity in GCs (Geniş, 2007; Grant & Rosen, 2009), where residents wish to be surrounded with like-minded people in order that their needs and priorities are met. South African history may play a large role in this regard as the severe racial segregation pointed to differences between people and these differences were used to justify separation (Neves, 2006). The enduring effects of this period are evident in the current South African context and GCs are possible spaces where the past focus on difference and the need to be separated still has an effect. It is possible that this perceived difference is associated with differing values and, therefore, diverse needs and goals. Thus, by living with similar people, whether in terms of race, class, gender, age and other discriminators, GC residents may feel that their values are in line with one another and that their needs, priorities and goals will therefore be met. This may in turn encourage resistance towards diverse residents, perpetuating segregation and discord. Thus, although in South Africa no person is prohibited from living in GC, as determined by legislation (Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996) a desire for homogeneity may make residing in one conflictual for some and prevent any SOC from being experienced.

Last, shared emotional connection refers to "the commitment and belief that members have shared and will share history, common places, time together, and similar experiences" (McMillan & Chavis, 1986, p. 9). The importance of a shared history does not rest on whether or not members participated in this history, they must only identify with it. This is perhaps a questioned element when applied to South Africa as the country's history makes GCs highly contested spaces (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006) and it is interesting to consider whether this history may in fact be a uniting element rather than a dividing one. The intense criticism aimed at GCs suggests that resident's shared histories serve as a uniting factor for individuals of a similar race and class and as a dividing factor for those of differing racial and class groups (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006; Lemanski et al., 2008), thereby promoting a SOC solely between those of the same race and class.

Together with McMillan and Chavis's (1986) theoretical framework, the combined dimensions of social cohesion put forward by Kearns and Forrest (2000) and Novy et al. (2012) form the overall framework of this study. As with SOC, this enabled an exploration of the social cohesion within GCs, viewing it in diverse ways based on its multiple dimensions. The core of social cohesion as explained by Kearns and Forrest (2000, p. 996) is as follows: "A cohesive society 'hangs together'; all the component parts somehow fit in and contribute

to society's collective project and well-being; and conflict between societal goals and groups, and disruptive behaviours, are largely absent or minimal". Within this study, this explanation is considered in relation to GCs. This similarly holds true for the definition supplied by Kearns and Forrest (2000, p. 998-999): "social cohesion…refers to the harmonious development of society and its constituent groups towards common economic, social and environmental standards". Kearns and Forrest's (2000) five dimensions of social cohesion are the following: (1) common values and a civic culture (2) social order and social control (3) social solidarity and reductions in wealth disparities (4) social networks and social capital and (5) territorial belonging and identity. These dimensions are connected to, and have impacts on, one another. Novy et al. (2012) distinguish between the cultural, political, socioeconomic and ecological dimensions of social cohesion. Their focus on social cohesion falls into four areas outlined by four dimensions. They are: (1) socio-economy: solidarity and social exclusion (2) culture: common values and identity (3) ecology: sustainability and ecological justice and (4) politics: citizenship and participation (Novy et al., 2012, p. 1878-1881). These dimensions are used in combination with those of Kearns and Forrest's (2000) in an interpretation of the findings. Certain elements of the two dimension clusters overlap and these will be integrated in the discussion that follows in chapter four.

First, shared common values foster social cohesion as they allow mutual goals and objectives to be identified and supported, as do shared moral principles and behaviour conventions through which members carry out their relations with each other (Kearns & Forrest, 2000). Existing research suggests that residents of GCs in South Africa share common values, such as living a particular lifestyle involving safety, an emphasis on ecology and nature, and cleanliness (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006; Lemanski et al., 2008). Although certain shared values may be perceived as justification for segregation and exclusivity, according to the first dimension by Kearns and Forrest (2000) they may nevertheless promote social cohesion and allow shared goals and objectives to be upheld by the residents. On the other hand, there remains the possibility that these values, as well as numerous others mentioned previously, are in fact justified given the South African context with its high crime rate and periodically non-functioning municipal services (Burger, 2009; Lemanski et al., 2008; Vena, 2011). Whether potential shared common values between GC residents are founded on sound or misleading reasoning, their promotion of social cohesion is central here. However, when considering GCs as part of the South African society as a whole, and not solely their internal cohesion, the foundation of residents' shared values is fundamental in understanding the existence, purpose and impact of GCs.

A cohesive society is said to display backing for political establishments and to be engaged generally with politics, rather than demonstrating indifference towards it. Shared moral codes, including religion, are viewed as being important to social cohesion in societies as is participation in society, acquisition of the necessary skills to participate, the ability to democratically resolve conflict and the maintenance of "tolerance and social harmony" (Kearns & Forrest, 2000, p. 997). Moreover, citizens of cohesive societies are claimed to share views on ways in which to conduct collective matters and to accept the authority of the governing organisation. Furthermore, rights and responsibilities that are collectively agreed upon must be largely met.

Novy et al. (2012, p. 1879) refer to culture: common values and identity as their second dimension, and this concerns identity and shared culture as fundamental elements of "belonging to a social whole". They describe cities as places formed through interaction between people of various ages, lifestyles and backgrounds brought together by commuting, migration and cooperation. Cultural heterogeneity and "hybrid cultures" are said to be created in this way (Novy et al., 2012, p. 1879). The idea of a shared culture in relation to South African GCs is ambiguous; residents may share a common culture based on their values and goals, as discussed above, but the reality of unique and diverse cultures being accepted and integrated within a GC proves to be a grey area. As international research illustrates, for certain residents GCs offer them the social homogeneity they desire (Geniş, 2007; Grant & Rosen, 2009), thus it may be the case that in South African GCs this similarity is also preferred, thereby, negating and perhaps even preventing the cultural heterogeneity described as part of social cohesion by Novy et al. (2012). South Africa's past is shrouded in the suppression of multiculturalism and, just as the consequences of past racial segregation and inequality prevail (Foster, 2005; Ratele, 2006), it is very possible that a retreat from interaction with cultural difference continues to exist, and GCs may provide the boundary that makes this withdrawal socially acceptable. Although no cultural group is excluded from living in a GC in South Africa, African cultures may comprise a minority within them as the economic inequality between black and white people prevents many black individuals from residing in a GC, illustrating the interconnection between race and class divisions (Neves, 2006). It can be postulated that the development of GCs was carried out with this factor in mind; to sustain the cultural homogeneity that was fostered by apartheid and which became the norm for many. Perhaps with the prospect of having to interact with and accommodate people of different cultures when democracy triumphed and multiculturalism began receiving greater attention, GCs offered a way to maintain previous cultural separation. Alternatively,

this function of GCs may have been recognised only after their development to, for example, provide protection from crime. Furthermore, perhaps this is not and has never been a function of GCs; however, the diversity of cultures in South Africa and the close link between culture, race and class makes this possibility debatable.

Novy et al. (2012) refer to Kearns and Forrest's (2000) work in discussing their second dimension, mentioning attachment to a place and the interconnection between one's identity and place as important for social cohesion. These will be elaborated upon below. Interestingly, Novy et al. (2012, p. 1879) explain how "strong ties within a community can be accompanied by discrimination and exclusion of those who do not naturally belong to that community", and they list GCs as an example of this, referring to "host-stranger relationships". This is an argument that has been previously presented in this research and that evokes markedly negative views of GCs. The authors similarly discuss social networks, central to a dimension of Kearns and Forrest (2000), discussed below.

The second dimension, social order and social control, refers to a lack of general conflict and serious challenges to the prevailing "order and system" (Kearns & Forrest, 2000, p. 998). Coercion, repression, the subordination of the opponent through constraints and regulations are not utilised in Western democracies as social control mechanisms, instead more subtle ways exist to achieve social control. This second dimension holds that social cohesion results from routines, exchanges and demands that occur daily. Social order is explained by the reciprocity theory as an outcome of exchanging services, goods, and symbols which creates a network of duties, expectations, obligations and claims between people and, when balanced, these joint dependencies are shared fairly (Kearns & Forrest, 2000). Importantly, individuals and families must feel that they belong and have an investment "in the social system", that interdependence exists and that they are part of the social project that will benefit them all (Kearns & Forrest, 2000, p. 998). If this is not achieved, Turner (as cited in Kearns & Forrest, 2000, p. 998) explains that passive citizenship and division or disagreement by "quasi-members of the society" will be viewed as petty crime or disturbance.

According to Wrong (1995), social order refers to the cooperation between individuals and groups to reach mutual goals, that occurs under certain conditions. Giddens (as cited in Kearns & Forrest, 2000, p. 998) asserts that this involves the complex question of "how diverse groups can cohere or be integrated into the wider social order at the same time as respecting cultural difference". Social cohesion comprises inter-group cooperation, a lack of prejudice and respect of difference, and social order is upheld by groups and individuals tolerating one another, such as diverse ethnic groups (Kearns & Forrest, 2000). Existing

research points to homogeneity in GCs; whether according to social groups, an ecological focus, rules and regulations and more (Geniş, 2007; Lemanski et al., 2008; Roitman, 2005). According to this dimension then, social cohesion may be contributed to by the social order of routine, expectations, duties and social investment. Social cohesion may, however, be jeopardised when group coherence, integration and respect of cultural difference, discussed above, are considered. Inter-group cooperation may take place in GCs, but a lack of prejudice and the presence of tolerance and respect of difference in uncertain, particularly given the view that GCs are in fact perpetuating social divisions of apartheid (Lemanski, 2004). Thus, inter-group cooperation may occur predominantly among those groups of sameness and not those of difference. This research aimed to better understand residents' experiences regarding inter-group relations and, thereby, the social cohesion within the particular South African GCs.

Third is the dimension of social solidarity and reductions in wealth disparities and refers to balanced and agreeable societal development, including the varied groups within society, towards common social, environmental and economic standards. Redistribution of funds and opportunities across groups and areas may enable this. Income inequality is said to result in a collapse of social cohesion due to the stress, family disruptions and frustration that it causes, which subsequently leads to violence and crime (Wilkinson, 1996). From the perspective of this particular dimension, social cohesion implies reduced poverty and inequalities in income, employment, and an increased quality of life among other elements. On an everyday level, and not a state-organised one, social solidarity is demanding as it involves recognising co-citizen's needs, showing interest in their wellbeing and being willing to assist and be engaged in cooperative action from which one-sided benefits are gained (Kearns & Forrest, 2000). Novy et al's. (2012, p. 1878) first dimension of socioeconomy: solidarity and social exclusion is closely related. It refers to the damaging results of social inequality and exclusion from "resources and markets". Fairness and equal opportunities are fostered by solidarity and declines in wealth disparities. Social cohesion is said to involve a society which offers equal opportunities to all members, and this occurs upon a foundation of accepted standards and beliefs and institutions (Dahrendorf, as cited in Novy et al., 2012). Novy et al. (2012) make direct reference to GCs, and state that local cohesion may be positive inside GCs; however, social exclusion between these rich dwellings and poor neighbourhoods may be on the rise and in this way may be jeopardising cohesion in the cities as a whole. In South Africa, this is asserted to be the case as GCs segregate classes and races (Lemanski, 2004) and do not foster fairness and equal opportunities, in fact only certain people may enter GCs and only residents

have access to the resources within, such as leisure facilities and private refuse removal services (Blandy & Lister, 2005; Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006; Lemanski et al., 2008). Thus, social cohesion may be encouraged within the walls but inhibited beyond them. However, the blame for a possible lack of social cohesion in South Africa cannot fall solely on GCs. These communities comprise one factor among many others that can be understood to contribute to a fragmented society. It is perhaps the origins of these numerous factors that likely share a common thread, namely apartheid.

Social networks and social capital comprises the fourth dimension of social cohesion. It is related to the enduring belief that cohesive societies involve high levels of social interaction within the communities and the families. Processes of socialisation and mutual support revolving around family relations maintain social cohesion at a local level, predominantly within neighbourhoods. The importance of social networks for mental health, preventing marginalisation and providing practical, social, instrumental and emotional support has been found; however, questions do exist as to whether strong or weak ties are more significant. Friendships are said to be potentially very important in fostering social cohesion (Pahl & Spencer, as cited in Kearns & Forrest, 2000) and people maintain networks of "friend-like relationships to help them through life effectively and responsibly" (Kearns & Forrest, 2000, p. 1000). These friends are chosen voluntarily, remain important throughout life and are not based on location. In addition, the quality and not the quantity of the relationships is significant (Pahl & Spencer, as cited in Kearns & Forrest, 2000). Societies that are based on trust and mutual benefit may reinforce diversity and simultaneously nurture social relations. Furthermore, collective and cooperative action to solve problems contributes to a cohesive society (Kearns & Forrest, 2000; Pahl & Spencer, as cited in Kearns & Forrest, 2000). Social networks are also important as they both constitute and produce social capital, which allows for a cohesive society, "social capital refers to the norms and networks of civil society that lubricate co-operative action among both citizens and their institutions" (Putnam, as cited in Kearns & Forrest, 2000, p. 1000). In relation to GCs, certain characteristics may contribute to social interaction, such as the physical boundaries, security measures and communal leisure facilities (Blandy & Lister, 2005; Chavis & Wandersman, 1990). According to this dimension, these elements may contribute to cohesiveness within GCs. Issues in South Africa previously discussed make the support of diversity and the nurturance of social relations in GCs questionable and this is explored further as part of this research study.

The fifth dimension of social cohesion outlined by Kearns and Forrest (2000) is place attachment and identity. This dimension concerns ideas of belonging, spatial mobility and

place attachment in cities and neighbourhoods. Strong attachment to place and the interconnecting of individual's identities with places (Massey, as cited in Kearns & Forrest, 2000) is commonly presumed to promote social cohesion by impacting adherence to shared norms and values as well as people's willingness to partake in social networks and develop social capital (Kearns & Forrest, 2000). Place attachment is asserted to serve several purposes, including a connection to those who are important to an individual; a symbolic attachment to others, culture, past experiences and ideas; maintaining individual identity and group identity; the fostering of self-esteem and a sense of security (Altman & Low, as cited in Kearns & Forrest, 2000). One possible drawback concerns the degree to which place attachment and formation of identity takes place:

> People may come to exist in small worlds – close and closed communities – as a result of which they do not share values, understandings and commitments with or to the wider society (and its constituent social groups) of which they are a part (Kearns & Forrest, 2000, p. 1001).

Kearns and Forrest (2000, p. 1001) write that "one place's cohesion may be society's deconstruction". This seems highly applicable to the GC phenomenon as these communities foster segregation and dissociate from the South African goals of integration and equality (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006). Once again, social cohesion within GCs may exist, but this may contribute to minimal cohesiveness in the greater society. A further possible drawback involves the potential for certain disadvantaged groups within society to restrict themselves to places in which opportunity and support mechanisms are minimal, when these groups would thrive with access to and flexibility of movement within a broader urban area (Kearns & Forrest, 2000). Kearns and Forrest (2000) assert that place attachment comprises only one important element and must play a useful and adequate role in society.

The third dimension presented by Novy et al. (2012, p. 1880) is that of ecology: sustainability and ecological justice. This dimension involves the uneven distribution of the "goods and bads" (Novy et al., 2012, p. 1880) of the environment both within and between a city and, therefore, procedures of social exclusion are asserted to be linked to problems of ecological fairness, and this involves sustainability and urban development. Social cohesion is said to require social as well as socio-ecological cohesion and fairness given the continuously re-emerging territory of cities. Within GCs, the 'goods' of the environment are evidently made available to GC residents, and this is advertised openly and proudly, as previously discussed (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006). Similarly, promoters of GCs do not refrain

from constructing the places outside the walls as possessing the 'bads' of the environment; "the harmony of Dainfern...make[s] an instant impact. Palm-lined avenues…classically designed parks, with...fountains and water-features. A far cry from what passes for parks in the city. A place to stroll freely. No litter. No tension" (Dainfern Estate promotional brochure, as cited in Hook & Vroljak, 2002, p. 215). From this perspective, social inclusion and fairness within the GCs may take place but does not occur outside the gates, and the reality of environmental inequality must not be overlooked. The environmental advantage offered by GCs is not often offered to those who reside outside the gates, for example the homeless and residents of informal settlements, and this paints a worrying picture of societal-level social cohesion and equality.

The fourth and final dimension put forward by Novy et al. (2012) is politics: citizenship and participation. This refers to the importance of taking part in public affairs in order to be a local community member. Belonging is linked to political equality, thus, citizens must enjoy equal rights as well as opportunities. A lack of shared norms and establishments that provide for social, political and labour rights is asserted to undermine "social and territorial cohesion", thus, a central focus of new citizenship approaches involves connecting rights with residence rather than an "imagined 'natural' national identity" (Novy et al., 2012, p. 1881). Considering the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (1996), the existence of GCs automatically denies equal opportunities and rights to all citizens and, according to this final dimension, this lack of political equality prevents belonging and thus social cohesion. Therefore, it raises the question of whether cohesion is supported within GCs and if so, whether this contributes to undermining cohesion at a societal level.

Gaps in the Literature

The literature review of existing South African and international research on GCs highlights gaps within the literature. Landman (2000b) affirms the importance of reviewing international literature on GCs as this establishes a base for comparable research in South Africa, among other benefits. A transfer of international advancements must not, however, forego consideration of the unique contextual factors in which South Africa is embedded (Landman, 2000b).

International research has paid significant attention to the residents of GCs, reporting findings in which these territories are associated with increased social interaction, attachment, increased contact with neighbours, community, sense of belonging, and SOC (Blandy & Lister, 2005; Geniş, 2007; Grant & Mittelsteadt, 2004; Li et al., 2012; Low, 2001). Limited

South African research conveys such findings (for example, see Landman, 2004; Lemanski et al., 2008). No assertion is made here that similar results to that of the international studies will emerge within further South African research on GCs; however, such local studies may provide additional information concerning the existence or absence of such relational elements. A current lack of knowledge does appear to exist in relation to internal dynamics within South African GCs, specifically those involving the residents and social and relational processes and interaction between them. In line with this, Durington (2006, p. 152) states that "the main focus of much of the work on gated communities in South Africa and elsewhere tends to focus on the institutional and structural development of these social spaces". He further asserts that while looking at GCs from the outside to investigate their place within the city, their creation and their marketing is necessary so as to locate the history and trends of GCs, the daily life of GC residents and their rationalisations are often lacking. Research that focuses on these latter elements is intended to highlight the voice of the residents and consequently gives "the control of perceptions of social space to inhabitants, a necessary step before critiques or other notions can be developed" (Durington, 2006, p. 152).

While the impact of GCs on wider societal levels is frequently considered in research on GCs (Blakely & Snyder, 1998; Hook & Vrdoljak, 2002; Lemanski, 2004; Low, 2001) an interior-directed focus seems to be less common, particularly of the internal dynamics and the implications thereof for the residents, as well as consequent indications about the GCs, their processes and functions. Existing South African research makes frequent reference to pertinent contextual factors (for example, see Hook & Vrdoljak, 2002; Landman, 2000b). However, residents' perspectives are uncommon within this literature and, moreover, diversity of residents in relation to factors such as race, gender, culture, and ethnicity, which are entrenched in the South African context, are not emphasised. Thus, minimal research appears to direct its lens towards GC residents and their experiences as well as to pay close attention to residents' diversity and the role that it plays both within their subjective experiences and the wider GC. Explorations of the intersection of context with the heterogeneity of the South African inhabitants via first-hand, subjective accounts are scarce, excluding certain, and limited, research (for example, Durington, 2006; Lemanski et al., 2008).

Overall, whether through the use of quantitative or qualitative research approaches, literature on the first-hand accounts of GC residents appears minimal; however, once again more international research was found to employ qualitative methodology with residents, including the use of interviews (Blandy & Lister, 2005; Kenna, 2010; Roitman, 2005). While

certain South African literature provided comprehensive qualitative studies that paid attention to GC residents and their subjective perspectives, utilising interviews for data collection (Durington, 2006; Lemanski et al., 2008), this research was limited. Furthermore, where residents of GCs have participated in research, data extracts presented within the findings are frequently limited. In research where the opposite is true (For example, Blandy & Lister, 2005; Low, 2001; Roitman, 2005) adequate evidence of the researchers' findings are provided and the data extracts highlight the prevalence of the results, such as a theme (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

SOC is discussed and in certain instances explored in literature on GCs (Landman, 2004; Lemanski et al., 2008); however, across the literature this was infrequently carried out in-depth. Where detailed research on SOC in GCs was identified, this was conducted internationally (Blandy & Lister, 2005; Sakip et al., 2012) and not in South Africa. In relation to social cohesion in GCs, neither international nor South African research was found to pay attention to this construct within GCs.

Contextual factors are adequately discussed within existing literature, particularly that of South Africa given their relevance to the existence of GCs (Durington, 2009; Hook & Vrdoljak, 2002; Lemanski, 2004; Lemanski et al., 2008). The use of a theoretical framework with social relations as its foundation is, however, rare across this research. Given the indivisibility of contextual factors from people and their relations within that context, exploring and understanding the GC phenomenon within a frame that talks to social relations appears valuable. In addition, a framework that incorporates, and fosters increased knowledge about, the intersection of social relations and physical space may allow for comprehensive research of GCs. Roitman, Webster, and Landman (2010) convey the need for more cohesive knowledge around the subject of GCs. They outline the institutional, social and spatial analytical approaches utilised, followed by a framework allowing for interdisciplinary analysis, and illustrate the connection between the diverse analytical approaches. Theoretical frameworks allowing for a multi-focus approach, such as that which allows sufficient consideration of both the social and physical aspects of a GC, may thus contribute to a more "cohesive body of knowledge" (Roitman et al., 2010, p. 3).

The abovementioned gaps identified in the reviewed literature highlight the potential value of further research on GCs. The particular focus on GCs within this study may further understanding and increase knowledge of the GC phenomenon via the subject matter under investigation and the methodology applied to carry out this exploration. Specifically, this research considers GCs from an internal perspective through direct contact with GC

residents. Their subjective experiences of residence within these physical spaces are gathered in an attempt to ascertain the influence of this on both social interaction and inter-group relations as well as the existence or lack thereof of both SOC and social cohesion within the gates. Full descriptions of this approach are provided in the subsequent methodology chapter.

Conclusion

This review of literature has examined research and information relevant to the focus of this study, namely a focus on GCs, experiences of residing in a GC, and social relations surrounding these enclaves, specifically with regard to SOC and social cohesion.

Residential security estates were initially defined to provide an understanding of the type of GC under investigation. Many tensions and concerns surround the existence and functions of these enclaves, thus, a thorough discussion of these dilemmas was presented to illustrate the diverse arguments put forward either in favour of or against GCs. The study's emphasis on social relations and social interaction in GCs made pertinent a discussion on the relationship between place, attachment and social interaction. In line with this and central to the topic of this research, SOC and social cohesion in relation to GCs were examined, showing varied results. The role of context and its influence on SOC and social cohesion was considered through a discussion on the similarities and differences between international and local research. A discussion on the theoretical framework presented the multiple dimensions used for an interpretation of the findings, while pertinent South African contextual factors were applied to this international framework. Gaps identified within the literature highlighted a need for further research on GCs.

This chapter has provided a foundation for the remainder of the research report. The subsequent chapter presents the approach taken in this study and the method used to examine and answer the research questions

Chapter Three: Method

Introduction

This chapter initially presents the research questions that guide the study. The remainder of the chapter presents the method carried out to answer these questions and addresses quality, ethical practice and reflexivity. First, framing the research process, a discussion of the research paradigm and qualitative nature of this study is presented. The participants and the sampling procedures conducted are then discussed. The data collection tool used in this research, namely semi-structured interviews, is explained, followed by the procedures taken to collect the data. Thereafter, the process of thematic content analysis that was applied to the data is explained. Steps taken to ensure the quality of the research are then set out, followed by ethical considerations and finally, the position on reflexive practice that was taken in this study is presented.

Research Questions

This study explores the experience of residing in a GC, paying particular attention to SOC and social cohesion. The following research questions directed this study:

1. What are the residents' subjective experiences of living in a GC?

2. How do GCs influence social interaction and inter-group relations?

3. How do the residents' experiences reflect SOC and social cohesion within the GC?

    3.1 What elements of SOC and social cohesion are evident in residents' experiences of living in a GC?
    3.2 What are the factors that enhance or detract from a SOC and social cohesion in GCs?

Research Paradigm

This qualitative research study made use of an interpretive paradigm, which is aimed at explaining "the subjective reasons and meanings" that inform social action (Terre Blanche & Durrheim, 2006, p. 7). It involves understanding the world from subjective experiences

(Ardalan, 2011) and it is subjective experiences of the outside world that are the realities that are studied (Terre Blanche & Durrheim, 2006).

According to the interpretive paradigm, the social world is a process created by people (Ardalan, 2011). Methodologies in which the researcher and participants have a subjective relationship are used, such as an interview, and an analysis of interviews will reveal common themes helping to clarify a phenomenon (Terre Blanche & Durrheim, 2006).

Qualitative research makes possible open-ended and inductive exploration and, in instances of interpretive research, first-hand accounts, rich descriptions, and presentation of findings in language that is engaging and that may at times be evocative (Terre Blanche, Kelly, & Durrheim, 2006). Understandings in context, or empathy, as well as the situation of the researcher as primary instrument in the collection and analysis of information are central to interpretive research (Terre Blanche et al., 2006). This study was concerned with the subjective experiences of residing in a GC and the SOC and social cohesion reflected in these experiences. Interviews were used to collect data from the residents of GCs, thereby gaining subjective experiences, and thematic content analysis was applied to identify themes within the data. These procedures are illustrative of the interpretive nature of this study and, therefore, of the appropriateness of selecting an interpretive paradigm.

Participants

As part of the study's focus is on the experience of residing in a GC, the sample from which the data was gathered consisted of GC residents. Adult members of the households who were available were interviewed and attempts were made to obtain a diverse sample in terms of race, gender and age.

Residential security estates are a specific type of GC that is the focus of this research. For this study, to qualify as a residential security estate the GCs matched closely the description offered by Landman (2000a, p. 3) for what she refers to as security villages, which include residential estates. These security villages refer to:

> Private developments where the entire area is developed by a (private) developer. These areas are physically walled or fenced off and usually have a security gate or controlled access point with/without a security guard. The roads in these developments are private, and in most of the cases, the management and maintenance is done by a private management body.

In addition, as described in another article by Landman (2002a), the security guards request the personal details of people entering the GC to be recorded in a register. Furthermore, larger estates frequently have elaborate entrance gates, and security measures are reinforced with CCTV cameras (Landman, 2002a). Residential security estates were the focus of this study as they provided an appropriate context in which to tap into the issues under investigation.

Sampling

The sampling methods that were used to gather participants included elements of purposive, convenience and snowball sampling. Purposive sampling involves the selection of respondents according to their ability to supply the necessary information (Padgett, 2008). Specific selection criteria are set based on factors such as the primary aims of the research (Ritchie, Lewis, & Elam, 2003) and this study aimed to explore the experience of inhabiting a GC, the impact of GC living on social interaction and inter-group relations as well as how the experiences reflect SOC and social cohesion within the gates. Thus, respondents needed to be adults who live in a residential security estate as defined above. In addition, they needed to have lived in the GC for a time period of one year or more. This time period was specified in order for residents to have had time to settle into the community, make use of the facilities within the GC, attend meetings held for the residents if desired, interact with other residents and to have become accustomed to the procedures and day-to-day routines of the GC.

Convenience sampling involves selecting a sample based on easy access (Lewin, 2005). To identify residents of security estates, I began with individuals who lived in such residences. This method was selected as it made initial access to residents straightforward and did not require a circuitous process to identify the first residents. In addition, this enabled easy access into the GCs as there was not a need to gain permission from alternative sources, such as the HOAs or other governing bodies, due to being granted access as a visitor to the residents' homes. Previous researchers have experienced difficulty with gaining entry into GCs (Low, 2001).

Following this, the method of snowball sampling was utilised. Snowball sampling involves identifying individuals who possess the characteristics of a certain population and subsequently using them as informants to suggest similar individuals who may be able to partake in the study (Lewin, 2005). For this study, residents who had been interviewed were asked to recommend people who fitted the selection criteria. Residents were initially

contacted telephonically to explain the focus and intention of the study and to request their participation in the form of an interview.

Although a diverse sample was preferred, recommendations via snowballing comprised predominantly white and female individuals and finding racially and gender diverse participants proved to be challenging. In total, a sample of 11 participants from seven different residential security estates took part in this study. Table 1 below provides descriptions of the participants and additional relevant information in order to situate the participants in context prior to the presentation and discussion of their subjective experiences in the proceeding chapter.

Table 1

Sample Description and Additional Relevant Information

Participant	*Age*	*Race*	*Gender*	*Children*	*Marital status*	*Previous living area*	*Number of years living in the GC*
1	51	White	Female	Yes	Married	Free-standing house in Johannesburg	12
2	33	White	Female	Yes	Married	Free-standing house in Plettenberg Bay	6
3	39	Black	Female	Yes	Married	Free-standing house in Johannesburg	6
4	39	Black	Female	Yes	Widower	Free-standing house in Johannesburg	7
5	30	White	Male	No	Not married	Complex in Johannesburg	2.5 years
6	41	Black	Female	Yes	Unknown	Tembisa Township	4
7	52	White	Female	Yes	Married	Free-standing	10

						house in Johannesburg	
8	32	Black	Female	Yes	Not married	Free-standing house in Johannesburg	4
9	25	White	Female	No	Not married	Free-standing house in Johannesburg (also lived in apartment-style residence)	5
10	25	White	Male	No	Not married	Free-standing house in Johannesburg	4
11	48	White	Female	Yes	Married	Both free-standing and GC living, Most recently in a GC residence	5 (house was built in the GC 20 years ago)

Data Collection Tool

Interviews allow the researcher to ask questions that are intended to elicit sound responses from the respondents and they offer participants a way to become involved, share their views and discuss their perceptions of a particular situation (Kajornboon, 2005). Inviting people through interviews to talk "about the life and experiences of their community can uncover rich data" (Pretty et al., 2006, p. 8), which made interviews a useful data collection tool for this study as experiences of GCs are its focus. For this study, semi-structured interviews were carried out with residents to elicit their experience of residing in a GC, and attention was paid to experiences around social interaction, feelings of community, friendships, integration, belonging, connection with others, and related experiences.

Semi-structured interviews are non-standardised (Kajornboon, 2005). They fall along a continuum between the control and closed-ended questions of structured interviews, and unstructured interviews during which interviewees may talk freely about anything that may

surface (Zorn, n.d.). An interview guide (Appendix A) was used, that it, "a list of questions, topics, and issues" that I as the researcher went over during the interview (Kajornboon, 2005, para. 12); however, supplementary questions were posed at times, some of which had not been anticipated when the interview started (Kajornboon, 2005). Depending on which direction the interview was going; the question order was occasionally changed (Kajornboon, 2005). Thus the questions guided but did not dictate the path of the interview (Smith & Eatough, 2006). Semi-structured interviews enabled the investigation of the interviewees' particular views, and advantages of using this type of interview included the ability to enquire further into the respondents' situations and for questions to be explained or rephrased if they were unclear (Kajornboon, 2005). As I do not have experience in conducting qualitative interviews, attention was paid to using prompt questions in order that relevant data was gathered as well as to delving deeply enough into certain situations (Kajornboon, 2005). A reflection on my successes and oversights in this regard will be included later.

Procedures of Data Collection

To collect the data for this study, initially participants who I was aware resided in a residential security estate were accessed. Additional participants were found via suggestions provided by colleagues and close acquaintances upon request as well as through the referral of potential participants by those already partaking in the study.

Participants were contacted telephonically to set up appointments and, with their consent, the interviews were conducted at the participants' homes. The interviews were carried out in English as this is the language in which I am most proficient and they were audiotaped using both a laptop and a voice recorder with permission and consent from the residents. The audio recordings have not been destroyed. They are being kept for future use by either the researcher or the supervisor and they have been stored securely on a password protected computer.

Participants were provided with appropriate information about the interview (Appendix B) so as to give their informed consent (Appendix C) (Breakwell, 2006). As explained above, a semi-structured interview guide was followed allowing for redirections and additions with regard to the questions asked. The interviews lasted for approximately 30 minutes to one hour in length. If relevant information was not being gathered probes and prompts were used and providing or requesting unrelated or immaterial information was avoided (Breakwell, 2006). Non-verbal components are also relevant in face-to-face interviews and these were taken into

account and encoded as they can alter the underlying message significantly (Breakwell, 2006). Note-taking was used following the interviews to record any non-verbal elements.

The audio recordings of the interviews were transcribed for the analysis of the gathered data.

Data Analysis

A thematic content analysis of the interviews was conducted. This is a qualitative analytic procedure and presents the data in a descriptive manner (Anderson, 2007). Thematic analysis offered a method to identify, analyse and report themes and enabled the organisation and description of the data set in detail. It allowed for a flexible approach and delivery of a rich, detailed, and multifaceted presentation of the data (Braun & Clarke, 2006). This method of analysis is in no way a passive one, rather the resultant themes were actively searched for (Taylor & Ussher, 2001). Furthermore, the chosen method and theoretical framework utilised in research both align with what the researcher wishes to know and it is important that these decisions are acknowledged and recognised as decisions (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

Braun and Clarke (2006) outline six phases of thematic analysis that broadly guided the process of analysis for this research project. As pointed out by these authors, qualitative analysis is flexible and guidelines, not rules, are provided. In addition, rather than being a linear process, analysis is a recursive one involving movement back and forth between the different phases (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Patton, as cited in Braun & Clarke, 2006). The six phases include: (1) familiarising yourself with your data (2) generating initial codes (3) searching for themes (4) reviewing themes (5) defining and naming themes and (6) producing the report.

The thematic analysis process was carried out as follows. To assist in gaining an in-depth engagement with the data, a specific sequence was conducted with each interview transcript. Initially, the transcripts were read through in order to become accustomed with the data. Following this they were re-read while simultaneously highlighting words, phrases and sentences which appeared to be of interest to the study. Additional brief notes were made on the transcripts as to what the highlighted data may be subsumed under, for example; “danger”, “safety”, “lack of socialising”, “goals”, “freedom” and “nature”. Data items which appeared to hold particular relevance to the study were noted on the transcripts at the bottom of the page for later reference. This practice aligned largely with Braun and Clarke’s (2006) first phase of thematic content analysis.

Once this process had been completed with each transcript, an extensive list of codes was created. For succinctness, similar codes were then collated and combined, resulting in initial themes (Braun & Clarke, 2006). “A theme captures something important about the data in relation to the research question, and represents some level of *patterned* response or meaning within the data set” (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 82).

As the researcher, I judged what represented a theme and more instances of a theme did not necessarily equate to the theme being more crucial (Braun & Clarke, 2006). In choosing themes, their relevance to the research questions was considered; including instances where the theme did not necessarily emerge continuously across the data set but related strongly to the research question(s). Predominantly, however, themes were found via a search across the data set to find recurring patterns of meaning (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Thus, themes included those that appeared consistently across the data set as well as those that occurred infrequently or only in certain data items (Braun & Clarke, 2006). This reflects the flexible nature of thematic analysis as it enables the researcher to determine themes and their prevalence in varied ways, while maintaining the need for consistency in how this is carried out within the analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The transcripts were then re-read and divided into sections defined by the relevancy of the data to each theme. Following this, summaries of each transcript were written up electronically, using the initial theme names as headings and gathering the data relevant to these themes beneath the appropriate heading. Notes and additional comments were included within the summaries. These steps correspond with phase two and three, with variances such as the summaries pointing to the flexibility of this method (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

The themes were then reviewed and refined by reading through the summaries to further organise the data under the relevant themes and creating sub-themes in order to give structure to the larger and more complex themes (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Given the extensive number of themes and sub-themes, further refinement was required to contribute to a concise and clear analysis and discussion. This resulted in the naming and defining of fewer themes, as well as the collapsing of sub-themes. A thematic chart was then created to depict the way in which the data patterns and the connections between them had been conceptualised (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

This process resulted in on-going analysis, allowed for a thorough immersion within the data and enabled a reading of the overt as well as the more covert information, in which inconsistencies and tensions were often found (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Thematic analysis thus enabled the provision of a thorough and nuanced account of the themes (Braun &

Clarke, 2006). These approaches to the analysis were principally directed by phases four and five.

Finally, having developed a set of worked-out themes, the thematic analysis write-up was carried out, in which the extracts from the data set were rooted in an "analytic narrative" serving to describe the data and to "make an argument in relation to [the] research question" (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 93). This final step included relating the analysis back to literature that had been reviewed in chapter two as well as the application of the theoretical framework tenets in relation to the themes.

Establishing Quality

In an attempt to establish and maintain the quality of this study, principles of trustworthiness and rigour were followed. Furthermore, achieving transparency and the generalisability of the findings were considered.

Shenton (2004) presents Guba's (1981) criteria used to determine whether or not a study is trustworthy.

The four criteria include credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability. Credibility refers to the accuracy with which the data has been recorded (Shenton, 2004). In order to ensure the credibility of the research, each interview was voice recorded and transcribed, allowing for no modification of the data. To further enhance credibility, quotes from the interview transcripts were included in the study. This demonstrated the prevalence of the research themes and contributed to transparency of the study (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

Credibility may also be enhanced through triangulation, a process entailing the utilisation of multiple informants (Shenton, 2004). At the outset of the research process, a research team of supervisors as well as peers were engaged in the development and completion of the research proposal, providing diverse viewpoints and suggestions. In addition, continuous engagement with the supervisor took place. In line with this, the rigour of this study was strengthened through the supervisor's consideration and discussion of the coding of themes, thereby, contributing to the construction of a full picture of the data (Shenton, 2004).

Finally, to enhance the credibility of a research project, reporting on previous studies that have addressed comparable issues is invaluable (Shenton, 2004). This was thoroughly executed in the literature review of this study. Despite attempts for accurate representation, a significant tension emerged in this regard and is discussed as part of the reflexive process

later in this chapter. Particularly, objectives of 'truth' associated with credibility (Shenton, 2004) are questioned and critically discussed.

The sampling methods and sample size renders generalisability of the findings of this research limited. Shenton (2004, p. 8) asserts that "ultimately, the results of a qualitative study must be understood within the context of the particular characteristics of the organisation". This suggests that the results of this study must, therefore, be understood within the context of the individual GCs and in relation to the research participants. Although different investigations may offer results inconsistent with this study, it does not necessarily indicate that either one is untrustworthy. They may each simply be reflecting multiple realities (Shenton, 2004).

Dependability is an aspect of trustworthiness that concerns the possibility of a research project being repeated, while not necessarily intending to achieve similar results. To address this aspect, the relevant information and processes of the research were reported in detail (Shenton, 2004), specifically the research aims and questions as well as the sampling, data collection and data analysis methods.

Confirmability is achieved when a researcher demonstrates that his or her findings developed "from the data and not [his/her] own predispositions" (Shenton, 2004, p. 1). Triangulation may decrease investigator bias effects (Shenton, 2004) and reflexive processes can create transparency around the research process (Ortlipp, 2008). Nevertheless, as researcher, I was inseparable from the research process, and thus the development of the findings are interrelated with my own predispositions. For example, themes were actively searched for and this process of data analysis was inevitably influenced by my disclosures, comments and questions, any preconceptions, as well as my theoretical, political and personal orientations (Taylor & Ussher, 2001). The limits of reflexivity, including for establishing confirmability in qualitative research, are considered below.

Ethical Considerations

The nature of qualitative research, such as its in-depth and unstructured qualities, renders ethical considerations particularly significant (Lewis, 2003). Given that this study made use of human participants, ethical considerations were of paramount importance.

Written informed consent was required from the participants prior to the interviews taking place. Each participant was first provided with an information sheet (Appendix C) in order to

alert them to pertinent elements and processes of the data collection procedure as well as subsequent stages of the research process. The basic components of informed consent included a brief outline of the study and the procedures involving the participants, details of how the data will be used, the length of time required from participants, the researcher's identification details for future correspondence, a guarantee that participation in the research is voluntary and the participant may withdraw at any time without consequence, assurance that confidentiality will be maintained, and an expectation of no risks or benefits of participation (Lewis, 2003; Padgett, 2008). In addition, participants were informed that the interviews would be audiotaped, that they could choose not to answer any questions they would prefer not to, and they were provided with information regarding access to and storage of the audio recordings and interview transcripts.

In addition, informed consent to audiotape the interviews was obtained (Appendix D) and participants were informed that they may request to withdraw these recordings from the study (Padgett, 2008). Participants were made aware that direct quotations from the interview would potentially be used. Care was taken not to disclose excess information that may have deterred participants or limited spontaneous views due to extensive explanation regarding objectives, but enough information was provided to adequately prepare participants for the interviews (Lewis, 2003).

A further ethical consideration is that of confidentiality, that is ensuring that the participants' identities are never disclosed or connected to the information they make available (Padgett, 2008). The participants in this study were guaranteed confidentiality, with the exception of situations involving a participant posing a serious risk of harm to him/herself or to others, when information is legally requested to be disclosed (Padgett, 2008) and when a participant shares incriminating information (Eagle, 2012). No identifying information is provided in the study and participants are referred to as 'Participant' followed by a numerical figure so as to distinguish between them and to assist with data analysis and interpretation.

The experience of residing in a GC may not appear to be a sensitive topic with the possibility of uncovering painful experiences for the participants; however, any research topic can elicit sensitive issues (Lewis, 2003). Participants were, therefore, provided with information concerning the issues to be addressed in the study before they were asked to participate (Lewis, 2003).

In order to uphold fairness, the data was not modified in any way in an attempt to meet the needs of the study. In writing up the research, biased language was avoided and the findings were not misrepresented so as to advantage a particular group (Creswell, 2009).

However, limits of noting one's bias as a researcher are considered in the discussion on reflexivity.

Protecting the researcher from harm was also considered. Given that the interviews were conducted at participants' homes certain steps were taken, including using communal rooms and maintaining contact with others after each interview (Lewis, 2003).

Reflexivity

The discussion on reflexivity in this study stands distinct in its nature, as 'typical' understandings of how and why reflexive practice should be carried out are veered away from, with emphasis instead on what Pillow (2003, p. 188) terms "uncomfortable reflexivity". This stance "is not about better methods, or about whether we can represent people better" (p. 193). Both Macbeth (2001) and Pillow (2003) present particularly different viewpoints on reflexivity from that which is frequently utilised in qualitative research.

The reflexive process that is typically carried out is a feature highly distinctive of qualitative research (Tindall, 2001). Qualitative research is a form of interpretative research and it is thus necessary that researchers identify their biases, values and backgrounds that may influence their interpretations (Creswell, 2009). This process involves the researcher examining himself or herself and particularly any biases that may be present and it does not occur only once, but rather continues throughout the length of the research project (Padgett, 2008). Reflexivity is generally considered to be "a deconstructive exercise for locating the intersections of author, other, text, and world, and for penetrating the representational exercise itself" (Macbeth, 2001, p. 35). Achieving complete objectivity and neutrality is not possible; therefore, it is crucial that any bias that may enter the research is reflected upon and potentially relevant beliefs and experiences acknowledged (Snape & Spencer, 2003). Reflexivity is frequently understood to involve continual self-awareness to assist in clarifying the process of knowledge construction with the aim of increased accuracy in analyses of research, and is regularly used to possibly validate research by questioning the research process itself (Pillow, 2003).

Assuming an alternative position to this common standard was not intended at the outset of this research, and the abovementioned reflexive processes were implemented with the use of a reflective journal. The alternative approach evolved from a reading of Macbeth (2001) and Pillow's (2003) assertions and a consequent awareness of their applicability to the processes and experience of my own research. The initial aim of keeping a reflective journal

was to allow for increased methodological soundness and for the research project to reach a comfortable and transcendent conclusion (Pillow, 2003). Instead, the journal and the research processes of reviewing literature as well as gathering, analysing and interpreting the data highlighted the messy nature of the research which lacked clear-cut processes (Ortlipp, 2008) and left me in an uncomfortable reality of carrying out qualitative research (Pillow, 2003).

Furthermore, rather than reflexivity being situated in this research as an intellectual orientation, political perspective or cultural condition which falls within the domain of academic pretension and which is frequently claimed to be a methodological virtue, it is understood as "an unavoidable feature of the way actions (including actions performed, and expressions written, by academic researchers) are performed, made sense of and incorporated into settings (Lynch, 2000, p. 26-27). The perspective on the active reflexive process that was taken in this study may not align exactly with that of Lynch's (2000); however, parallels between them are evident where the process does not automatically equate to improved methodology as well as in relation to the unavoidable nature of reflexivity in the research process, rendering being unreflexive impossible (Lynch, 2000).

Four strategies commonly used in reflexive practice in qualitative research are described by Pillow (2003, p.181), namely "reflexivity as recognition of self; reflexivity as recognition of other; reflexivity as truth; reflexivity as transcendence". She argues that these strategies function together to offer the qualitative researcher a type of self-reflexivity involving confession which often brings about cathartic self-awareness, thereby, providing "a cure for the problem of doing representation" (Pillow, 2003, p. 181). Pillow (2003) conveys the unfamiliarity that comes with qualitative research, and how these strategies are used with a desire to write the research subjects, milieus or issues as familiar, which is in fact considered to contradict the motivations for reflexivity. This, in turn, conceals a dependence in qualitative research on traditional and modernist ideas of truth, validity and essence. This highlights the challenge of a modern to postmodern transition of carrying out qualitative research (Pillow, 2003).

Reflexivity as recognition of self and of other for instance, concerns modernist subjects that are knowable and fixable (Pillow, 2003). The researcher and the researched are such subjects and they are both examined in the reflexive process and, given that they are knowable, the possibility exists that they can be known better through implementation of this process. If a subject is rather understood as postmodern, that is as unknowable, dynamic and multiple, then the intention and practice of research as well as the process of reflexivity are situated very differently (Pillow, 2003). The modernist notion of a knowable subject or

subjects that is conveyed by the research through being reflexive is maintained to result in assertions that both the researcher and the researched are familiar to one another, and therefore the reader. This furthermore positions the researcher as possessing improved and more valid data, which reinforces self-reflexivity as a way to enhance methodology and gather improved data (Pillow, 2003). The reflexive strategy concerning the recognition of other furthermore involves questioning the ability of the subjects to define themselves or their desire to do so. In this way, power differentials are subsumed as part of reflexivity, and being reflexive may actually perpetuate inequality between the researcher and the researched while simultaneously attempting to conceal it (Pillow, 2003).

Reflexivity as truth clearly speaks to validity and Pillow (2003) asserts how reflexivity is often applied as science. Trinh (1991, p. 12) refers to truth as an "instrument of mastery which I exert over areas of the unknown as I gather them within the fold of the known". Pillow (2003) questions this notion of truth and states that reflexive practices that are based on truth gathering make central the researcher's need and wish for 'truth'.

Finally, reflexivity as transcendence involves the researcher being able to transcend his subjectivity and cultural context so as to release him from burden of "(mis)representation" (Pillow, 2003, p. 186). This is similarly modernist, allowing a liberation from the discomfort of representation by means of "transcendent clarity" (Pillow, 2003, p. 186).

Rather than adopting these four reflexive strategies as was initially intended, an alternative approach was taken, one that aligns more closely with Pillow's (2003, p. 187) "reflexivities of discomfort" and considers Patai's question: "does all this self-reflexivity produce better research?" (as cited in Pillow, 2003, p. 176). Although the effects of our positions as researchers are not escaped by constantly talking about them (Patai, as cited in Pillow, 2003), I am drawn to Pillow's (2003) view, in light of this statement, that no longer talking about these positions is not the solution. She does not reject reflexivity, but explores how positions are talked about, that is how reflexivity is practiced and how this impacts, opens up, or limits the potential for critical representation. Thus, my stance on reflexivity does include discussion on my position, especially as it is central to the study; however, it is intended to do so in a way that acknowledges concerns with representation that are typically overlooked in research employing common reflexive strategies, according to certain authors (Macbeth, 2001; Pillow, 2003). My hope was to write critically about my position and aspects of the research process, particularly in relation to the practice of representation, and in doing so, situate the reflexive practice as central to "exposing the difficult and often uncomfortable task of leaving what is unfamiliar, unfamiliar." (Pillow, 2003, p. 177). I

attempted to manage the representational exercise differently by drawing on postmodernism accounts of a lack of one truth and of the existence of more than one reality.

Paradigms are said to often coexist in the social sciences, thus a social constructionist paradigm centring on the ways in which discourse produces particular accounts of the social world may be utilised simultaneously with an interpretive paradigm (Terre Blanche & Durrheim, 2006). These paradigms differ from a positivist approach which involves stable realities and accurate descriptions of these realities. The reflexive process taken in this study incorporated the interpretive and constructionist paradigms, acknowledging the subjective experiences of the participants and the studying of these subjective realities (Terre Blanche & Durrheim, 2006), while also realising the construction of knowledge in this research that I was involved in and the single reality that this represents, with other realities constantly possible and no objective truths inherent in any one of these (Burr, 2003; Gergen, 2009). The interpretive paradigm of this research, according to which the social world is "a process which is created by individuals" (Ardalan, 2011, p. 116), intersected with a social constructionist approach that views knowledge as being constructed between people (Burr, 2003) and their realities determined by the conversations they have (Gergen, 2009).

As the researcher, I was involved in gathering, analysing and interpreting the subjective experiences of the participants and presenting these as findings representative of the social world created by the residents. My subjectivities in the construction of the final reality, presented as themes, meta-themes and discussion, infiltrated the entire research process. I was gathering data about the residents' subjective experiences, yet these very experiences were guided and influenced by me given that I had created the interview guide and was able to direct the process with the use of a semi-structured interview. Each interview transcript represented both the experience and reality of the respective participant as well as that created between myself and each participant. Together we produced particular accounts of the social world (Terre Blanche & Durrheim, 2006) and the knowledge and understandings found within each transcript resulted from the active cooperation and relationships between the participants and I (Gergen, 1985). However, the final conveyed experiences and understandings in the last two chapters of this research study are a reality constructed by me. The findings and discussion in relation to the research questions and aims of this study were put together through processes implemented by myself as researcher, including the extraction of specific quotations from the interview transcripts to relay the themes found, and associated discussion. The research project was my own construction as pointed to in the reflexive preface, which communicates my own motivations for the approach taken in this study. This

form of reflexive consideration involved my awareness and "understanding that writing is a way of framing reality" (Marcus, 1998, p. 392).

This approach did not involve utilisation of reflexivity for methodological power, aimed at improving representations and making them more accurate (Pillow, 2003). The reflexive process adopted here rather concerned acknowledging the lack of an objective truth in what had been presented, recognising that only one reality had been provided by this study. It furthermore involved the recognition and acceptance as the researcher that the participants and their subjective experiences would remain unfamiliar to me. That while I could acknowledge my own biases, values and belief systems and their potential impact on the research process and results, it did not bring me closer to delivering more accurate accounts. I could not claim to know how the participants were defining themselves and their experiences, I could only use their communication and attempt to covey it as they did. However, this process of transmitting their experiences as objectively as possible was framed by my preconceptions as well as my personal, political and theoretical orientations (Taylor & Ussher, 2001). The reflexivity undertaken thus worked towards interrogating "the truthfulness of the tale" (Trinh, 1991, p. 12) and focused on unfamiliar and uncomfortable representations and discussion (Pillow, 2003). The "tale" of this research is not claimed to be a truth, it cannot be. Multiple other understandings are possible and dependent on numerous factors, such as the researcher, the research location, the participants, the motivation behind the research, the language used throughout the study by the individuals involved, the methodology followed, the interaction between researcher and researched, elements of diversity along lines of race, gender, culture, age and position in society, specifically of the researcher and participants, and the context in which the research takes place. As the researcher, I noticed at an early stage the unfamiliarity and discomfort that came with carrying out the research.

It became not about actively applying reflexivity to the research process at each phase, but rather that being reflexive was unavoidable. When analysing and interpreting the data, I was immediately aware of the ways in which I was constructing a particular reality. Sometimes this only became evident to me after the fact. Sometimes, it even seemed extremely difficult to separate my biases from the discussion despite long periods spent attempting this. For example, although I considered my own potential internalised dominance, defined in the next chapter, and how this might have played out during and after the interviews, trying to exclude this and preventing its influence on the research was challenging, especially as sometimes merely identifying whether or not it existed was

difficult. I became a part of the constructed reality and my race and culture influenced the direction of the interviews and, likely, the subsequent data. Participant 4, for example, made statements that pointed to the assumption that because I am white I have a Western culture, and from her perspective, as well as other black and white participants, this prevails, and this has power. This placed me in a position of power as a white and Western woman; however, it also seemed to place me in a positon of oppressor given the inequality experienced by the black participants. Just as the race and culture of the residents and non-residents infiltrated the data, so too did my own race and my "Western" culture. The 'truth' of this research is therefore one that is only possible in the context of this study, myself as researcher and the selected participants. This understanding interrupts ideas of constructing an objective text and reveals its personal construction, and requires that I take responsibility for the production of knowledge (Trinh, 1989).

The interpretation of the findings and the proceeding discussion did at times include an attempt to make sense of what had been said, what the participants' experiences were relaying about GCs but also about broader factors so pertinent in South Africa, such as race, culture, inter-group relations, and the impact of past inequality. As I considered related theory, trying to make this familiar became increasingly difficult. For example, using theory around racialised identities, internalised dominance, collectivist versus individualistic cultures, diverse past experiences of white versus black people (Lemanski, 2004; Myers, 2008; Pheterson, as cited in Tappan, 2006; Seekings, 2008; Triandis, 2001) and much more, highlighted how unfamiliar the participants' experiences were to me, and that being aware of myself and my biases while collecting the data, collating it into themes, discussing it, and applying theory did not make me more familiar with it. In fact, I became increasingly uncomfortable during my engagement with this research.

My removal from the literature I was reading stood out, my naturally assumed Western identity had been pointed out to me blatantly during the data collection, the experiences of clear discrimination, sense of exclusion, preference for sameness, and inequality were apparent despite my expectations that this would not be the case. The hope for narratives of inclusion, unity, movement away from race based discrimination, a SOC and social cohesion was not met, leading me to face this reality conveyed to me, and in an in-depth manner at that. I sat across from white participants telling me about the advantage of GC living, about the procedures benefitting them, while seeming to be unaware of the way in which they were complicit in the oppression of others, such as domestic workers. I sat across from black participants who relayed experiences of discrimination and exclusion within the gates,

centring on race and culture, but who also often seemed unaware of the disparities between GC and non-GC residents. I engaged in a process of data analysis involving recurrent thought around racial inequality, cultural divides, and a lack of integration, a wish for separateness and a blindness, or perhaps a denial, of prejudice occurring within the GCs. This led me to consider my own possible blindness and denial, my own guilt induced by black residents pointing out my race and culture. If white residents possessed greater power and influence within the gates as conveyed by certain black residents, how was I being viewed by these participants during the interviews, and how was my race influencing the direction that they were taking? I questioned the likelihood of my own internalised dominance, asking myself why I felt so strongly in support of the black residents and angry at certain white residents. Was I experiencing aspects of the internalised dominance I applied to some of the white participants? I attempted to place myself in the position of a participant and consider whether or not I would have spoken openly about race. The unfamiliarity and discomfort was powerful here; I was trying to relay their experiences but my subjectivity entered this process at each turn. I could not transcend my subjectivity and cultural context nor the "burden of (mis)representation" (Pillow, 2003, p. 186), and knowing that my representations were a reality that I constructed rather than fully accurate accounts direct from the participants did indeed feel like a weight to carry.

White privilege, whiteness, westernisation, female, young and university student were all prominent elements that I had to contemplate and that appeared to impact the research early on. As much as I would have liked to believe that these did not matter, that I was not associated with the inequality they represented, my interaction with the participants showed otherwise and I was no longer protected by the theoretical distance of these concepts. This is in line with authors who adopt varying and alternative practices, as reviewed by Pillow (2003) and described by her as uncomfortable reflexivity, and judge knowing themselves and their subjects as difficult and uncontainable, seeking to know while simultaneously recognising the fragile nature of this knowing. Furthermore, being aware of power relations and confronting power plays that exist in the methods of interpretation is included in another alternative take on reflexivity (Visweswaran, as cited in Pillow, 2003). Thus, awareness of my position of power as researcher was necessary, including in the process of applying the theoretical framework for interpretation. This application yielded answers to the research questions that were reached given my position of power to begin the research, gather the data and choose a framework in which to interpret this data.

My initial intentions to follow a reflexive process that is typically applied to qualitative research (Tindall, 2001) and the associated use of a reflective journal did allow me to locate the intersections of the researcher, other, the text and the world and also to penetrate the exercise of representation (Macbeth, 2001). However, in doing this, rather than better methods or improved representation (Pillow, 2003), I constantly seemed to reach dead-ends, uncertainty and uneasiness. Another author's experience as relayed by Pillow (2003, p. 189) resonates with my own research process:

> Chaudhry does not, indeed cannot, pretend to "know" herself or her subjects, as each attempt at knowing spins her into "compulsive questioning." Nor does Chaudhry seek truth or transcendence in her writing – there is no easy story here to tell, nor for the reader to hear, but a whirling of voices, figures, and histories. Chaudhry asks: How far back in time and space should I go when talking about the hybridization of meaning systems and identities?

A social constructionist perspective holds that the 'truth' is not important, but rather the realities that are created through talk and the outcomes or function of these realities (Riley, Rodham, & Gavin, 2009). This corresponds in particular ways with Pillow (2003) who advocates for continual critique of research attempts and realising that many researchers do engage in studies where real work has to be done despite the impossibilities of the task. This involves using reflexivity to challenge representations while also recognising "the political need to represent and find meaning" (p. 192). I view this latter point as extremely important because, while I have questioned my representations and the processes of data collection and analysis to reach these, I am in agreement with researchers who maintain that further research involving GCs will be valuable (Durington, 2006), particularly as existing literature points to strained inter-group relations and racism in South Africa (Lemanski, 2004; Ratele, 2006) and the role that GCs play in this regard (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006). There is necessity and value in carrying out qualitative research around relations in South Africa, but recognising the uncomfortable and unclear nature of this research and its representations is important (Pillow, 2003).

I have provided a research report with particular representations, as well as a brief account of the difficulty in conducting research in which central elements included race, culture, inequality, discrimination, exclusion, social conflict and segregation. My influence at all stages of the research process yielded a final research project that is my own construction, one way of framing reality, and which remains surrounded by questions such as, "can we truly represent another? Should this even be a goal of research? Whose story is it – the

researcher or the researched? How do I do representation knowing that I can never quite get it right?" (Pillow, 2003, p. 176).

Conclusion

This chapter described the procedures carried out to execute the study. The guiding research questions were presented, followed by a discussion on the interpretive paradigm and qualitative approach utilised in this study given their applicability to the aims of this research. The participants and the sampling procedures were presented, followed by explanations of the research tool and the procedures that were used to collect the data. The process of thematic content analysis carried out was outlined, followed by the steps taken to ensure the quality of the research. Ethical practice and reflexivity were then discussed. The chapter that follows presents the analysis of the data collected in this study and a discussion of these findings in relation to the literature that was reviewd in chapter two. In addition, the data is interpreted through the application of the theoretical framework tenets.

Chapter Four: Findings and Discussion

Introduction

In this chapter, the findings gathered through a thematic content analysis of the data set are presented and discussed. Five primary themes are identified, described and illustrated in this chapter. A clear and recurrent emergence from the data was the primary advantage of safety offered by the various GCs. Safety was mentioned by participants as beneficial in relation to various factors; highlighting it as central to living in a GC from the residents' perspectives. Given its broad applicability across the data, safety is discussed within the various themes rather than comprising a theme on its own.

Underscoring most of the issues found in the data are four elements that are positioned as the meta-themes in this research: homogeneity, exclusion, discrimination and inequality. Where pertinent, these meta-themes are discussed within each theme. The findings are studied within an interpretive paradigm, thereby, centring on the residents' subjective experiences of living in a GC. A discussion of the findings is thus intended to illustrate the experience of residing in a GC as well as the significance of these particular residences in the South African context. This discussion includes the positioning and explanation of the findings within existing literature.

An integration of the theoretical framework tenets is included within the discussion. Particular dimension combinations from the theoretical framework are used for each theme in order to interpret the data. In addition, critical commentary allows for my own voice to be present within the discussion.

Inter-Group Relations

The broad topic of inter-group relations forms a pivotal element of this research, fundamental to the focus of its investigation. At the inter-group level, the processes of, and relations between, groups are central (Foster, 2006; Kiguwa, 2006). Many processes and relations between groups which are significant to this research have been presented in the review of existing literature, both locally and internationally.

The theme of inter-group relations encompasses multiple sub-themes, representative of the extensive nature of these relations that surfaced from the data. Inter-group relations reveals sensitive and controversial aspects of society, particularly within South Africa (Campbell, 2006; Neves, 2006; Ratele, 2006), and an analysis of the data pointed to similar

findings. The five theoretical dimensions considered most applicable for interpretation of the data within this theme included membership, integration and fulfilment of needs, shared emotional connection, social networks and social capital, and place attachment and identity (Kearns & Forrest, 2000; McMillan & Chavis, 1986).

Social Interaction

Interaction with other residents on a seemingly superficial level emerged among many of the participants. A common thread ran through many of their experiences, where brief and customary forms of interaction commonly occurred:

> In terms of us, it is just, you know, greeting and, "how are you" and that is it (Participant 3).

When asked if she interacts with other residents, one participant stated:

> I do but I wouldn't say it's on a like, it's neighbourly, not a…friendship basis. It's mainly 'how you doing' not 'can I come have tea' (Participant 8).

Participant 6's response below to the difference in interaction within the GC and her previous residence highlights the surface-level interaction that appears to take place within the GC and the contrast thereof in her previous home:

> Actually if truth be told, most people they use their house in the gated communities as bed and breakfasts. Most of them they are in Tembisa right now…they're there. That's where it's happening, that's where people understand them (Participant 6).

This distinction appears to go beyond mere friendly and enjoyable social interaction, having an impact on a sense of feeling understood within the particular community.

An evident racial distinction is highlighted by this remark. Across the findings within the data, such an occurrence was never stated by a white resident, rather it appeared that the white residents were predominantly satisfied within their GCs and a sense of being misunderstood was absent from their narratives. An additional racial dissimilarity appeared across the data in relation to the superficial social interaction that seems to take place within the gates, namely a racial distinction around the need for greater, more meaningful interaction within the GCs. Most black participants appeared to desire such interaction, whereas most white residents did not express such a need, conveying an apparent satisfaction with the level of interaction present within the gates. While discussing living in the GC, participant 3, a black female, went on to state the following:

> The only thing though, what I expected in terms of…the community and the neighbours, that you would…have the interactions and a relationship but that has not happened (Participant 3).

Participant 7, a white female, similarly expressed a decrease in social interaction within the gates; however, without a desire for such interaction that certain black participants communicated. A congruence with these black residents that was evident, however, was the connection between sameness and greater interaction, pointing to a relationship between homogeneity and increased social interaction:

> In fact when we were living in the other house we did a lot more with the neighbours there for some reason. But they were more or less our same age and had same interests (Participant 7).

It appeared that a sense of belonging for some residents was related to a physical sense of being a part of the community. Simply residing within the community automatically translated into belonging to the community. Often, a relational aspect was absent from stated experiences of having a sense of belonging, suggesting a possible absence of social interaction at a level which fosters a sense of belonging within the gates. Participants answered diversely about experiencing a sense of belonging:

> Belonging in what way, like I feel that, yes, this is my complex…I can…walk, I can go to gym…I go to the meetings of the…homeowner's associations…but there is no really, like social activity as neighbours and as a community, just, each one is just living their own (Participant 3).

> Yes…I like the surroundings…I think it is peaceful (Participant 5).

> Let's see...I don't play golf. I don't use the club house. We rarely swim…I've been here probably about one year after they opened so I've been here kind of since the beginning so I feel that I do belong here (Participant 9).

> No, not really. You know, I'm attached to my home (Participant 11).

Participant 9's sense of belonging is related to her being a part of the GC since its establishment and her response points to the possibility that if a resident chooses to be a part of a club, or perhaps a committee or association within the gates, a greater sense of belonging may be achieved.

Sense of belonging due to physical proximity and mere association with someone as another GC resident is apparent within the following two responses:

> Here…I call them my family, because they're very close. If my house has to burn down now, they'll be the first people to see it, so that makes a difference. If anything has to happen, people will be able to hear, because we are very close (Participant 4).

> If he screams I am going to run across the road and assist him, just because I know who he is, not necessarily a person, on a personal level, but I know of him (Participant 10).

Whether or not this is sense of belonging, specifically of a relational, personal, unified and integrated kind, is questionable. From certain participant responses, such as the above two, it appears that their understandings and experiences of sense of belonging may be different, perhaps based on more logistical and tangible factors. This is in line with international assertions and findings, which relay that it is due to the practical existence of security measures that residents assume anyone inside the gates belongs there; "it is not so much that neighbors know one another. It is more that they expect anyone that they come in contact with to be 'one of them.'" (Blakely & Snyder, 1998, p. 68). As found in this research, belonging comes about purely from residing within the gates, and residents are considered trustworthy merely due to their living within the GC. A significant difference emerges, however, between the findings of this study and that of Blakely and Snyder's (1998) international findings. These authors describe that the perception of GC residents is one of a group of people with the same socioeconomic status as well as similar interests and values, and one major GC developer relayed the central issue as residents wanting a SOC, a place where friendships with those from similar backgrounds can be formed. Rather than a SOC and the forming of friendships, safety emerged more so as a central reason for residence within the GCs in this study. Furthermore, for participants who desire and expected a SOC and the formation of friendships with other residents, this did not occur and contributed to negative experiences for these residents, specifically most of the black participants. As illustrated in this chapter, across the findings similar interests and values do emerge, such as that of safety and environmental aesthetics; however, interests and values in relation to relationships with other residents, SOC and friendships were found to be noticeably different between participants, divided primarily along the line of race. South Africa's distinct contextual factors (Durington, 2009; Landman, 2000b, Lemanski et al., 2008) likely feature strongly in these divergent understandings and occurrences within these South African GCs, particularly the racial disparities evident within the primary desired functions of these locations.

There were, however, divergences from this trend of belonging merely due to practical factors and a lack of connection between residents:

> We can voice our feelings…we really do because we are kept informed at all times…because as neighbours we need to actually work together to prevent crime too… so you have to feel like you belong to some kind of community that works together for their benefit and your own (Participant 7).

Thus, participant responses around experiences of a sense of belonging within their respective GCs varied, with individually held values influencing their experiences, such as the importance placed on interaction within the community and safety.

The surface-level, habitual interaction as well as the lack of social interaction and relationships described by the participants diverges from that which is theoretically said to promote SOC and social cohesion. Contributors to cohesion include high levels of social interaction and friendships (Kearns & Forrest, 2000) and the above descriptions provided by the participants of relations with other residents, or a lack thereof, do not appear to align with these. Many participants described friendships with people outside their GCs rather than with other residents. This corresponds with theory around friendships and social cohesion, where friends can be chosen voluntarily and are not based on location (Pahl & Spencer, as cited in Kearns & Forrest, 2000). Experiences of social cohesion may thus exist for the participants; however, for the majority this is seemingly not due to friendships formed with other GC residents. This is likely not limited to GC neighbours. Ruonavaara and Kouvo (2009) maintain that neighbourhood relations and social interaction between neighbours are no longer important in modern societies and, from their own consideration of existing literature, weak social ties between neighbours in "modern urban settings" (para. 12) can be attributed in part to neighbours having separate social networks and dissimilar interests (Allan, as cited in Ruonavaara and Kouvo, 2009). Despite both black and white residents mentioning having separate social networks from their GC neighbours, it was only black residents who relayed a desire for and importance of social connection and interaction with their GC neighbours, and a concern that these did not exist within the gates. Thus, international findings such as those of Ruonavaara and Kouvo (2009) match those of this study to a certain extent; however, depart from them when racial diversity is considered. In contrast to the white participants, most black participants in this study conveyed a desire for stronger social ties within their GCs.

Furthermore, feelings of belonging are questionable in relation to membership, as well as place attachment and identity. Superficial interaction, feeling misunderstood within the GC and the minimal interaction relayed by the participants makes forming part of the group and being accepted uncertain and unlikely. In addition, responses around sense of belonging did not refer to personal relatedness and relations (McMillan & Chavis, 1986) with other residents but instead to physical elements of environment, proximity to neighbours and time span within the gates. Although membership to the gym or to the HOA was mentioned as a

form of belonging by participant 3, this was made distinct from a sense of belonging on a social and community level. A lack of SOC in specific relation to elements of membership thus appears to exist.

In contrast, safety appears to be a uniting factor between residents and may foster a certain sense of belonging given that it promotes the participants' awareness of others' safety. Safety emerged overwhelmingly as the one uniting factor among the participants. The necessity and benefit of safety is an element that has emerged frequently across research conducted on South African GCs (for example, Durington, 2009; Landman, 2000a; 2000c; 2004; Lemanski et al., 2008). Safety was described by participant 7 as a reason to belong to the community in order to work together to prevent crime and benefit oneself and others. Furthermore, safety appears to be a shared value among the residents, thus suggesting similar needs and priorities in this regard which is claimed to foster a belief that joining together will enable them to satisfy their needs (McMillan & Chavis, 1986). Safety and security may therefore promote aspects of membership as well as promote integration and fulfilment of needs, and consequently SOC. This positive influence of safety on SOC has similarly been found by research carried out in GCs across three South African cities, where residents expressed feeling safer within the gates due to the security measures as well as a greater SOC among those in support of the initiatives (Lemanski et al., 2008). It is important to note here, however, that few participants mentioned a joining together (McMillan & Chavis, 1986) or direct interaction with other residents around safety and security. Instead it appears that by simply residing within the GCs, many participants feel that this need is shared and met. The integration element of this SOC dimension thus appears to be lacking as well as a relational component. These findings stand in contrast to Chavis and Wandersman's (1990) assertion that feeling safer likely increases interaction with neighbours.

In addition, the function of safety and security is debatable as has been previously mentioned. Boundaries are a significant element of membership, where certain people belong and others are excluded, and groups within the boundaries are said to "use deviants as scapegoats" to create their solid boundaries (McMillan & Chavis, 1986, p. 9). Those within the gates may therefore construct individuals beyond the GCs in such a way as to reinforce the dangers they are said to pose, thereby, justifying the segregation (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006). Possible alternative reasons for the segregation, and not purely safety, may be closely linked to race and culture, which are discussed later.

Sense of belonging with regard to the dimension of place attachment and identity appears weak. Place attachment serves purposes of connections to those important to an individual as

well as a symbolic attachment to others, culture, past experiences and ideas, among others (Kearns & Forrest, 2000). Describing the GC as a bed and breakfast in contrast to Tembisa where residents, specifically black residents, feel understood suggests greater place attachment for participant 6 to her previous living area of Tembisa. This indicates important connections with others in Tembisa as well as a symbolic attachment to them and the culture, particularly given the construction of Tembisa as more of a home where relations with the residents appear more meaningful and satisfactory, despite choosing to reside within the GC. Similar ideas were reported by other black participants, thus greater social cohesion may exist outside the gates for these black residents. Conversely, the white participants appeared to relay a greater place attachment to their respective GCs; however, not on a relational and social level but on a practical one of mere residence within the GC, length of residence, environmental surroundings and proximity to other residents. Unlike certain black participants, no white participants expressed a need for increased or more meaningful interaction with other residents. When considering the primary relational aspect of place attachment and identity, these findings point to minimal social cohesion. Physical dimensions are held to be important for place attachment (Hidalgo & Hernández, 2001), and all participants in this study relayed some attachment to the physical dimensions of the GCs, including the environmental settings, aesthetical value, recreational facilities and security measures. Social attachment has, however, been found to exceed attachment to physical dimensions of a place; across the spatial ranges of houses, neighbourhoods and cities (Hidalgo & Hernández, 2001). A distinct absence of relationships on a community and cultural level is apparent, which appears to be concerning only for certain black residents.

In their research, Blandy and Lister (2005) found that residents believed GCs to involve less isolation and offer opportunities for contact between neighbours. Plainly opposite findings were relayed by most black residents in this study who, in comparison to their previous living environments, experience isolation within the gates and minimal contact with their neighbours, as is further described in this chapter.

Noticeable variations emerged in participants' responses regarding the quality of life within the GC. A pattern appeared whereby white residents' responses were primarily positive and described the benefits of residing within the gates, whereas, most black residents either relayed benefits initially but went on to describe negative aspects of their quality of life, or immediately described these negative aspects, typically connected to social relations with other residents:

> There is no…social interaction in terms of…the neighbourhood and…you are sort of sceptical in terms of even your kind, there is not that sense of community (Participant 3).

> The first two weeks I wanted to slit my wrists…people don't greet, everyone for himself. Everyone keeps to themselves…eventually I almost went for counselling. The cultures were so different from where I came from because where I come from the neighbours kids…they sommer have breakfast in your house without being invited. It's normal, and there…I think the first neighbour actually moved without me knowing her first name, and literally it's like we're sharing the same roof because she's just next door to you, you don't know each other's names (Participant 6).

For participant 6, her experience in the GC differed greatly to her previous living environment, Tembisa Township:

> Everyone knows everyone…and you don't make an appointment to my house, you just show up and it's okay (Participant 6).

Culture broadly describes the shared values and rules of a group as well as the practices that are collectively supported by the group (Van der Walt & Bowman, 2007). Cultural differences, particularly the dichotomy between collectivist and individualist cultures, can be viewed as significant when considering these explanations on quality of life offered by participants 3 and 6. Their experiences appear to point to collectivist cultural practices, where relationships with others, reliance on one another and working together to achieve the group's goals are priority (Myers, 2008; Triandis, 2001). Interdependence within their groups occurs for persons within collectivist cultures and their behaviour is predominantly shaped by the group's norms (Mills & Clark, in Triandis, 2001). An absence of these seems to create distress and mistrust for these participants.

Responses from white residents point to more individualistic cultural values, with greater focus on themselves and their own goals (Myers, 2008). People within individualist cultures are autonomous and personal goals receive priority over those of the in-group (Triandis, 2001). An element that appears to be lacking for certain participants, such as 3 and 6 above, is the increased sense of belonging that interdependence creates, and when uprooted from those with whom they are interdependent, such as family and friends, these social connections that contribute to defining who they are, may be lost (Myers, 2008). Although moving into the GCs was voluntary, the impact may not have been anticipated by these residents given their responses. Within collectivist cultures "the goal of social life is not so much to enhance one's individual self as to harmonize with and support one's communities" (Myers, 2008, p. 42). A lack of harmony and support appears to be a severe deficiency within the gates for certain participants, particularly those who seem to be part of cultures that may be considered more collectivist than individualistic.

A noteworthy idea is relayed by Participant 6, one that appears to bear significance when framed in the South African context, both past and present:

> It is a closed community but the fact that everyone keeps to themselves, it makes you feel unsafe because you don't know if you can trust your neighbour...there's that element of not trusting each other because we really don't interact with each other (Participant 6).

The experience of residents keeping to themselves is what made her feel unsafe because trust became questionable. Thus, despite the intense security measures of the GC, it was the lack of interaction that resulted in a sense of danger, of being unsafe within the gates, a phenomenon that was distinctly different from the experience of participant 6 in her previous living areas. A similar response was not provided by any white participants and instead, according to the data, an enjoyment of privacy, distance from other residents and limited interaction was a more common response revealed by some white residents, these experiences in fact fostering a sense of safety for them. A deviation from this was put forward by participant 10, a white male resident:

> I think there is sometimes a false sense of security because you never know who you are living next to… you don't know who your neighbour is (Participant 10).

The possibility thus exists that one's neighbours may not be trustworthy. This presents a possible grey area in relation to the construction of non-GCs and their occupants as more dangerous, a finding that emerged frequently in the data. Uncertainty around one's safety may therefore also exist when inside the GC given the minimal interaction that seems to take place between neighbours. Existing South African research portrays conflicting evidence as to whether GCs do indeed decrease crime, and for professional criminals the gates may not act as a deterrent (Landman, 2000a).

In contrast, for some participants safety within the GCs was also attributed to other residents and not solely to the physical security measures:

> I don't think I would survive living in…a freestanding house…because you don't know who's waiting for you, your security basically…when you're in a complex environment you know your neighbours, should anything happen, you can always hoot and your neighbour will come out and you know that you're protected (Participant 8).

> Two of the ladies over here thought they were being stalked by someone…but all of us were kind of aware of it and we were checking…everybody then spoke to each other (Participant 9).

For these participants a sense of fellowship and dependability between residents does appear to exist and a common goal of safety may increase interaction, as found in existing research

(Lemanski et al., 2008). However, despite all the participants in this study sharing the goal and enjoyment of safety, a minority expressed increased connections or relations with other residents because of it.

Adjustments to the changed interaction as well as positive and more meaningful experiences of social interaction did emerge among both black and white residents. Participant 6, for example, was able to adjust to some extent to the changed social interaction:

> The fact that someone cannot just come there at will it's also kind of a relief…because you have your time; you have the space (Participant 6).

Furthermore, participant 2, a white female resident, expressed having meaningful relations with other residents and participant 8, a black female resident, expressed an enjoyment of the decreased social interaction in comparison to her previous living environment:

> I think I'm a lot more open to people you see. I tend to meet anybody and talk and build up friendships (Participant 2).

> I think I have adapted quite well due to the fact that I also like that. It was overwhelming with my parents because we always have people, uninvited people and that would irritate me…where I live you can't just come and go as you please, you have to make an appointment and for me to be at home…so it's me and myself and I…where we lived…was more of a…family orientated community whereas where I live it's more…young people, modern life people, they're more concerned with making money than family life (Participant 8).

Advantages of more controlled social interaction enabled through GC living as described by participants above aligns with research on gating carried out by Wu (2005, p. 251), stating that residents are motivated to live in a GC to "reduce the 'unnecessary' social interaction". Findings such as these, common across both international and local research, suggest one potential impact that GCs are having on social interaction and inter-group relations, moving them away from spontaneous and unrestricted relations to those that are regulated and occur due to choice. Research highlighting the negative influence of GCs on social relations between those within and those outside the gates is extensive (for example, Blandy & Lister, 2005; Geniş, 2007; Kenna, 2010; Lemanski, 2004; Lemanski et al., 2008).

While bearing these divergences in mind, the above participant responses point largely to a lack of the components that comprise the social cohesion dimension of social networks and social capital (Kearns & Forrest, 2000). High levels of social interaction and friendships are clearly deficient within the gates. This deficiency emerged as a common factor for most participants, save for certain exceptions; however, it was described as a negative occurrence only by black participants, such as by participant 3 and 6 above. Once again a social and

relational element is largely absent, with greater focus on individualistic, practical factors. This distinction appears to work in favour of certain residents and not others.

The importance and impact of relations with other residents can similarly be interpreted within the SOC dimension of membership (McMillan & Chavis, 1986). The element of identification and belonging appears hampered for some residents by the lack of interaction. Feeling a part of the group, feeling accepted by the group and identifying with the group as a member may be impeded by the lack of social interaction and relational connections with other residents communicated by the participants. Similarly, barring the element of safety, the individual-group association appears to offer few rewards for participants, suggesting a limit in the SOC dimension of integration and fulfilment of needs (McMillan & Chavis, 1986).

Cultural distinctions in needs and values must, however, be considered here. Given emergences from the data, individualistic goals of personal and immediate family safety may be met within the gates, whereas collectivist goals of relationships and interdependence may not. Thus, the levels of integration and fulfilment of needs may be met satisfactorily for certain participants, specifically those orientated towards individualistic cultural patterns. As shown above in excerpts from the data, and reiterated throughout the thematic analysis, this is not the case for some residents. As this particular dimension comprises part of the theoretical framework, individual-group association is central to an interpretation of the data and thus, although certain residents may not desire association with the group other than for goals of safety, according to the framework SOC is deficient within the gates from the perspective of integration and fulfilment of needs.

Variations in the type and amount of social interaction appeared within certain groups of people within the GCs. Participant 8 belongs to a different generational group to that of the other black female participants. Being a part of this younger generation may contribute to the differences expressed in desire for interaction within the GCs. Culture and tradition, which can be understood to play a significant role across generations in varying ways (Van der Walt & Bowman, 2007), may hold diverse meanings for the different generational groups, thereby impacting the significance and type of interaction.

Generation and race appear to be interlinked, where social interaction and connection within the gates was desired much more strongly by the older black female participants in comparison to the older white female participants.

In line with generation distinctions, the relevancy of race surfaced among the interaction of younger generations, specifically the children within the gates. When discussing racial discrepancies within GCs, participant 6 stated the following:

> I find that the young ones are okay, it's normal for them, they see human beings (Participant 6).

Participant 4 communicated her concern about the interaction among the racially diverse children:

> Our kids go into different environments and when we do that, we get exposed to other things…because they go there to other friends, they adopt their lifestyle, they want to bring it here. It becomes a problem for me (Participant 4).

From the perspective of the participants it appears that social interaction within the GCs is more common among the children. Many participants mentioned higher levels of social interaction between the children in the GCs as well as the existence of friendships between them. Social cohesion may therefore be greater among children in these GCs according to the dimension of social networks and social capital (Kearns & Forrest, 2000). In addition, racially and culturally diverse children are reported by participants to socialise and integrate with one another, unlike the participants themselves. This speaks to the unique conditions of the South African context (Landman, 2000b, Lemanski et al., 2008; Ratele, 2006), particularly in that the past racial segregation has created divergent experiences of interaction and integration between different generation cohorts, as well as diverse views and feelings towards this.

The concept of a shared emotional connection (McMillan & Chavis, 1986) may be used to better understand the resistance towards integration with diverse groups evinced by certain participants. In this dimension, shared history, time together, experiences and common places are primary contributors to SOC. The participants who display the greatest struggle with integration and multiculturalism have lived as children and as adults through the apartheid regime. Despite their subjective experiences of this time remaining largely unexplored by this research project, common knowledge concerning this period includes the rigorous and sustained segregation of diverse racial groups (Foster, 2005; Hussain, 2013). It may thus be reasoned that the lack of social interaction and integration between the participants and other residents is impacted on by the SOC they experience and have experienced with people who have shared their history, time together, their experiences and common places, namely those people of similar racial and cultural groups. Identification with a shared history is considered to bear equal importance to that of active participation in it (McMillan & Chavis, 1986). Participants may therefore experience a stronger shared emotional connection with those they identify as sharing their history, specifically individuals of a similar race and culture. As

depicted within the data, white participants appear largely satisfied with their lives within the gates and this may be contributed to by their shared emotional connection with other white residents, with whom they may believe they have and will share a history with. Given the responses offered by most black participants, there are few other GC residents of the same or similar race and culture, and for some participants a personal experience of racial and cultural discrimination. A lack of shared emotional connection thus appears to exist within the GCs for most black participants, and consequently minimal SOC. This supports the greater place attachment and identity to living spaces outside the GCs that certain black participants reported. It would seem that it is within those spaces that these residents believe they have shared and will continue to share history, time, experiences and places with the people residing there, people of a similar race and culture to their own.

Additional variation appeared within other groups. A difference was noted in the interaction of domestic workers, who were viewed as interacting with other residents more often than the participants themselves:

> Our domestic know the kids next door and knows actually the neighbour…the rest of the neighbours, I do not even know…I do not know who they are (Participant 3).

Participant 3 described the interaction displayed by the domestic worker next door, who would openly greet her from the neighbour's house given the close proximity and minimal privacy between the houses. This was unlike participant 3's own interaction with the neighbours, who she would actively avoid such interaction with to maintain her privacy. This need to maintain privacy was similarly explained by participant 10:

> It is knowing your…boundaries. I think in a community…you live really quite close to somebody; you don't want them inside your house (Participant 10).

A desire for privacy emerged frequently among participants, and a GC may be viewed as a place to maintain one's privacy. A tension within the responses of certain black participants surfaces here, however, as they relay a desire for privacy as well as a desire for increased interaction and belonging with other residents. An incongruity around social interaction with others in the GCs thus emerged, with a longing for greater interaction like that within previous residences apparent, as well as a need for privacy and an enjoyment of the increased seclusion offered by the GC.

Within the data there is evidence of positive social interaction and connection between residents:

> I tend to socialise a lot more with more residents purely on a work basis more than anything else. We've got quite a few friends that we've met in [Name of GC] that we've built relationships with… (Participant 2).

> I'm happy here. And I know my children will always be content and happy here because even the security, they made friends with my children (Participant 2)

> I think it does, it forces you to reach out more, definitely, and I saw it especially then when we had the crime, people did come together, they do come together because we want to make a plan to benefit the whole community… and the kids are on the street together (Participant 7).

Children are once again referred to in relation to greater interaction within the gates. It may therefore be that there is promise for future inter-group relations within GCs. Currently, however, from participant responses there would seem to be a lack of meaningful and deeper levels of engagement with other residents. The development of friendships within the gates such as that described by participant 2 emerged as rare across the data and most participants referred to the existence of friendships with people outside of the GCs. Furthermore, participant 2 mentioned greater interaction and friendships given that she works within the GC.

Further indicating the social interaction taking place within the GCs as well as between those within and those outside is the construction of the world beyond the gates:

> For me it's safety…that's more important than…living in a huge house somewhere where you've got to worry 24/7 about break-ins for a little bit more privacy… You've got the freedom to go walking at night…who goes walking in the streets at night…and the more you try and teach your children to be aware of strangers…if somebody's friendly with them, they're friendly back and I think in here you feel a little better because a lot of them that are friendly are grandparents or parents…so it's much nicer (participant 2).

Participant 2 makes a distinction between strangers within the GC and those outside. A particular type of person is viewed as residing within the gates, seemingly these are people that can be trusted, thus making it safer for children to talk to strangers inside the GC. Spaces and people beyond the gates are constructed as dangerous and untrustworthy and a clear attempt to distance themselves from this threat is evidenced by the participants across the data:

> If you live in a normal suburban area…you're not quite safe because you can walk, you can actually walk into an ambush. People waiting for you, hiding somewhere…I'm very comfortable where I am…I mean, yes in time we might have invasions (Participant 8).

Non-GC residences and their occupants are constructed by participant 8 as extremely vulnerable and easy victims of criminal activity. Although no specific group of people are mentioned, her use of the words "ambush" and "invasions" suggests a risk of serious

violation by these individuals. The lack of a specified subject in addition serves to locate all spaces and people outside the gates as a potential invader, thus the need to separate oneself from them to reduce the risk of attack, or ambush. The 'us' of the GC residents barricade themselves from the 'them' of the non-GC population. A homogenous group of people is sought after and believed to reside within the GCs, such as the trustworthy grandparents or the reliable, upright neighbour. Lemanski (2004, p. 109) explains in her research that the spatial exclusion of social groups emphasises the "other", a social construct, as dangerous, thereby, offering further justification for exclusion as well as increased fear. This appears to be evident in the findings of this research, where residence within the GCs positions the occupants as separate from other social groups outside the gates, thereby, excluding these other groups. As shown in this study's findings these excluded groups are constructed as dangerous by the residents, in this way justifying the separation and seeming to increase the fear of the residents, to the extent where certain residents view all non-GC spaces as unsafe.

In line with participant 8's assertions, participant 10 and 11 express similar views on safety:

> There is security but it depends how vigilant you are with your security. If you sleep on ground floor and you leave your sliding door wide open at night time, we do live in Africa…you can't expect…somebody not to walk in because the sliding is open (Participant 10).
>
> If I'm driving around or stopping at somebody's house, I feel vulnerable...if we live in South Africa we will only live in a security estate…I feel vulnerable when I'm driving at night, but then I think all girls feel that way… it's part of what happens in South Africa (Participant 11).

These participants relay an expectation of South Africa as a whole as dangerous. They convey an understanding of danger as the norm and of making arrangements and living in a particular way to survive that reality. South Africa and Africa are constructed as danger zones, and GCs as spaces of protection. An 'otherness' of the spaces and people beyond the GCs was common across the data. Similar findings emerged from residents of South African GCs included in a study conducted by Lemanski et al. (2008). The researchers found that feelings of safety inside the GCs ironically promoted increased anxiety outside the gates given the comparison of internal safety versus external danger. They describe how this is representative of the way in which "physical space can influence social space or mental constructions of reality" as well as indicative of how GCs exacerbate the tension between those inside and those outside, particularly in relation to the city of Johannesburg which has a very high crime (Lemanski et al., 2008, p. 148).

> You can sleep at night…unlike the old house where you were too scared; we were very close to Alex [Alexandra Township]. So it wasn't a very nice place to be (Participant 4).

The racial demographics within informal settlements in South Africa are disparate, with black individuals comprising the majority of residents given the racial segregation of the apartheid-era (Hart, as cited in Neves, 2006; Neves, 2006). Alexandra Township, if void of any human beings, would more than likely not be considered a dangerous space. It is thus the people that occupy the area and its informal settlements, predominantly black people, who are viewed as dangerous and who evoke fear in others, as evidenced in the above statement. Safety, demonstrated here, is interwoven with race. It is noted that participant 4 is a black female, which points to an intra-racial and not inter-racial focus in this instance. In reference to a different informal settlement, participant 7 expressed the following:

> It does sometimes worry me, you know there are times at night that we can hear gunshots coming from Diepsloot. I have never been a Dainfern fan because of that, if you know what I mean? (Participant 7).

These residents' feelings about informal settlements and the danger that they pose is illustrated in their assertions above. Such views of spaces outside the gates as dangerous and fear-evoking cannot be separated from the people who occupy these spaces and although the participants refer to the spaces; it is the occupants who incite fear, are threatening and who the residents wish to secure themselves from. Previous research conducted in South Africa has shown how informal settlement residents, who are largely black individuals, are often viewed as posing a danger to residents in more affluent areas (Ballard, 2004; Barry et al., 2007).

Perhaps it is valuable to acknowledge at this point that this discussion is not serving to portray the informal settlements, or any other location mentioned by the participants, as idyllic, safe, crime-free areas that are merely constructed as dangerous by GC residents. The existence of crime in these places may very well be a reality, and crime in South Africa in varied spaces has been recorded (South African Police Services, 2014). What appears to emerge from the data, however, is a generalisation of the places and people beyond the gates as dangerous without a critical and fair appraisal of the situation outside the GCs. Illustrative of this is the concentration of crime in deprived "black social groups and spaces" due to the socio-spatial legacy of apartheid (Lemanski, 2004, p. 104) and not in middle- to upper-income areas. This contributes to the questions posed around crime as a justification for gating, which appears to construct a significantly altered picture of the crime concern in South Africa.

The social cohesion dimension of place attachment and identity speaks to the creation of an out-group and the intentional exclusion of this group as discussed above. Participants displayed an attachment to place in their frequent communication about the security provided by the gates and thus the benefit of living within them. Once again, this attachment did not seem to involve a social or relational aspect, but rather an attachment to the physical factors of the GCs and the fulfilment of individual and family needs of feeling secure. As described by Kearns and Forrest (2000, p. 1001) a possible negative effect of place attachment and identity is that "people may come to exist in small worlds – close and closed communities – as a result of which they do not share values, understandings and commitments with or to the wider society (and its constituent social groups) of which they are a part". This is relevant to the construction by participants of a dangerous group beyond the gates from which they need to be protected, a protection offered to them by the GCs. This likely serves to reinforce the group within the gates and their social identity (Foster, 2006). What appears to be taking place within the GCs though is maintenance of individual identity and not group identity (Kearns & Forrest, 2000). Although safety is relayed as a common goal and need by participants, the desire for safety centres on the individual and his or her family, and not the wider community. A distinct aspiration and maintenance of safety for oneself and those closest to the individual emerged across the data. A certain level of social cohesion may still be promoted given their attachment to place, to which safety appears as a large contributor, as well as the interconnecting of their individual identities and place (Massey, as cited in Kearns & Forrest, 2000). It is an absence of inter-group connection and group identity that surfaces from the data, and in this regard a lack of social cohesion seems apparent.

Kearns and Forrest's (2000, p. 1001) statement that "one place's cohesion may be society's deconstruction" seems applicable to the categorisation of spaces and people outside the gates as crime ridden and threatening respectively. Yet as discussed above, the data points to limited cohesion within the GCs with regard to safety, as well as other factors. In this way, it paints a bleak picture of the influence of GCs on inter-group relations not only between those within and those outside the gates but especially between those within the gates. The deconstruction of society by GCs appears evident in multiple ways, as was presented in a review of literature (Durington, 2006; Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006; Lemanski, 2004; Roitman, 2005). The data from this research project suggests a deconstruction of the wider society by portraying it as lost to crime and danger and in this way likely hindering connection with the broader society (Kearns & Forrest, 2000) and fostering segregation. In addition, inter-group relations appear strained within the gates with minimal social cohesion existing, according to

the theoretical dimensions utilised for interpretation. A compounded negative influence of GCs thus surfaces, where inter-group relations are affected between those within and those beyond the gates, as much literature indicates (Durington, 2009; Geniş, 2007; Kenna, 2010; Lemanski, 2004; Lemanski et al., 2008; Wu, 2005), as well as between those who live inside the GCs. It appears then that closed communities exist within the GCs themselves, and thus segregation is taking place within these spaces that promote societal-level segregation. GCs thus seem to exist as structures of multi-level segregation.

Integration

Integration presents as a central element of the discussion on inter-group relations. Social interaction within the GCs proved to be different among participants, with some having experienced greater interaction and relationships with neighbours at their previous residences, such as in freestanding properties. Participants' descriptions of these differences suggest decreased integration within their GCs. Further occurrences between residents within the gates point to a lack of integration, and in certain instances, a direct resistance to integration. Meta-themes of homogeneity and exclusion permeate strongly within the experiences relayed by the participants and, within the realm of integration, the factor of race is blatant.

> Maybe it is a Jo'burg thing because…people are coming from different backgrounds and all of that, whereas in the Eastern Cape we are all like the same, we all…Xhosas, it is the same ethnic group…so, we do everything the same, like we talk the same language (Participant 3).

For participant 3, significant to her experiences of minimal interaction seem to be broader elements of geographical location, ethnicity and language, as well as the change from what appears to be a fairly homogenous group to a heterogeneous one. Common language has similarly been found to be important in neighbourhoods internationally where residents of neighbourhoods, although not specifically GCs, who did not have an English-speaking background or who did not speak English at home experienced less social cohesion, not feeling part of the community (Stone & Hulse, 2007). For participant 3, her non-English background emerged as significant to her experience of living within the GC, setting her apart from other residents, unlike her previous home in the Eastern Cape. A sense of inclusion and community is relayed in her accounts of her previous home, unlike her experiences within her current home.

"Language, time and place" are central to culture (Triandis, in Triandis, 2001, p. 907) given the transmission of culture via language and the advantage of having the same

geography and historical period to transmit culture efficiently (Triandis, 2001).Thus, participant 3's tendency towards similar people to herself may be contributed to by the connection with others that the homogeneity signifies. The same may apply to all the participants, black and white, who conveyed a preference for sameness between themselves and others. It is contextual factors that appear to be relevant here, specifically the underlying reasons for the distinct separation between heterogeneous groups, such as racial and cultural groups, and the foundation on which preferences towards those similar to oneself have been built upon. The historical institution and maintenance of physical division and separation of racially diverse groups (Foster, 2006; Neves, 2006) likely contributes to the evident inclination by participants towards racially and culturally similar people to themselves.

Resistance to heterogeneity within the gates is emphasised by participant 6:

> If you are observing a holiday…like…Heritage Day, make sure that you…don't do only koeksisters and the voortrekker dresses…lets accommodate everyone, Sotho, Xhosa …and even try a little bit to add Ziyabonga…just a little bit that says 'I belong' and recognise they can see me…their culture is normal and it's things that they can do (Participant 6).

It may not only be integration within the gates that is impacted, but a lack of integration with those outside the gates may similarly be occurring, given the nature of certain GCs, such as that described by participant 1:

> You never actually have to leave [Name of GC] because you've got somebody in here who does nails and massages and hair and we've got a nursery school in here and you've got a doctor in here...you've got everything in here (Participant 1).

Having amenities and resources, including schools, medical and shopping centres and restaurants within the GCs seems to offer residents greater convenience. This supports the research of Grant and Mittelsteadt (2004) who explain that larger GCs may result in residents withdrawing from the outside world given that their needs are met within the gates. A distinction is made between the separate findings, however, when considering the authors' assertion that GCs with many homes and communal facilities are more socially orientated (Grant & Mittelsteadt, 2004). The data gathered from the participants of this study points to minimal social orientation within the GCs, despite the communal facilities.

Such convenient access within the gates as that described by participant 1, does appear to offer residents the choice to move outside of the gates as infrequently as is preferred. In a country where de-segregation and multiculturalism are strived for, the option to isolate oneself within the gates and thereby limit the possibility of exposure and interaction in the

wider communities, may pose a barrier to integration within the country. Such a concern has been raised in international research, which highlights the creation of social integration difficulties given that residents do not have to leave the community frequently with the facilities and services available to them within the GCs, which subsequently affects their interaction with the outside world and its people (Grant & Mittelsteadt, 2004). Much research, both that conducted locally and internationally, points to the promotion of segregation, inequality, social division and separatism by GCs (Blandy & Lister, 2005; Grant & Rosen, 2009; Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006; Lemanski, 2004; Vesselinov et al., 2007). Such incidences carry particular meanings and consequence in the context of South Africa as communicated by Lemanski et al. (2008, p. 135), who state that "although representative of worldwide gated community literature, in South Africa, concerns regarding these exclusionary territories are exacerbated by fears that they effectively recreate the apartheid city and thwart post-apartheid goals of urban integration and inclusion". Lemanski et al. (2008) found that social control and SOC within the GCs can be taken too far, with certain residents conveying complete separation from the city and its occupants. The authors describe how the GC thereby begins to function "as a self-contained island" (p. 149).

Within this research project, no participants acknowledged such complete separation from the city outside their gates, in fact, they all communicated having relations with non-GC residents as well as diverse active engagement in the wider city. Variations did, however, emerge between participants, where some expressed fear of the wider city when outside the gates, others expressed frequent interaction beyond the perimeters and still others conveyed a preference for spaces within the non-gated city. The latter finding emerged only from the data of most black participants. Participants thus felt diversely about the self-containment provided by their respective GCs, and a clear racial divergence emerged, with more black than white participants overtly stating a desire for interaction and integration within the spaces beyond the GC. The reasons for this are discussed throughout this chapter. A further difference to the findings of those by Lemanski et al. (2008) is the lack of SOC expressed by the participants of this study, perhaps explaining the need for continued interaction with others outside the GCs. Thus, as well as strained integration between residents, integration between those inside and those outside similarly appear to be influenced negatively. The unlikelihood of integration with outside communities is reinforced by the way in which those communities are constructed, that is, as places and people to be avoided.

The impact of limited integration on trust between residents emerged, with race playing an integral part in this interaction:

> There's no trust…once we can move from the environment of saying, you're pink, I'm purple, you're brown, you're grey, that will change a whole lot of mind-set and the future going forward…one of the things that I feel, there's a lot of discrimination here, is that apparently when black people go to the swimming pool, the white people get out of the pool (Participant 4).

> Black people always the same way, white people always go the same way. Because there's that element of we don't trust each other yet. We're not there yet as a nation (Participant 6).

The historicity of inter-group relations in South Africa permeates bitterly in such occurrences, with the ripple effect of the forced separation of races evident in the latter statement.

Linked to the historicity of inter-group relations are generational differences that appear to influence integration within the GCs. As discussed above inter-racial differences are evident; however, the potentially less anticipated incidence of intra-racial factors is significant, similarly playing a role in changing interaction and integration within the same groups:

> My parents they come from a background whereby you welcomed people regardless of plans, you actually work your plans around people who, you know, just rocked up. Whilst for me and my generation, you rock up I can tell you 'look I was actually on my way out so it's either you join me where I'm going or come and see me some other time… we're not a welcoming generation…we're not being rude but in an African custom that's being rude… (Participant 8).

Further racial distinctions surfaced. Experiences of discrimination and a lack of integration with other residents were expressed by most black participants, whereas, significantly divergent views were relayed by white residents:

> No, that actually has never been a problem here, discrimination. I think…because there is a lot of young people here…we are all moving on and we know that the people that live here are sort of high of stature and I think they are more racially like aggressive towards their own culture of a lower class than what we are to them…(Participant 10).

It appears significant to note, however, that participant 10 is a young white male, thus more than likely possessing vastly diverse past experiences to that of many other participants, potentially impacting his views and experiences of discrimination within the GC. With this in mind it seems important not to negate these diverse experiences, and while never underestimating the long-term influence of the country's history, a sense of moving forward and progressing beyond entrenched barriers may be welcomed with less hesitation. Although racial discrimination may be less rife for this participant, class inequalities appear to be

significant, reinforcing the enmeshed nature of class and race in South Africa (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006).

The connection between class and integration, between class and connection with other residents, was described by participant 4:

> People must understand that today money can buy anything if you can afford, you live anywhere you want… money's there to buy, but money's not there to give you love and respect, that's the difference (Participant 4).

Similar statements were made by other black participants. Although the overt meaning of such statements was not explored, they suggested that existing residents within the GCs, for example the "*people [that] must understand*", wished to keep particular others out and this was previously possible due to the high cost of living within the gates. Changing economic circumstances, however, has made living within a GC possible for more people, in this case specifically black individuals. According to the black participants, residing within the gates does not necessarily promote connection, interaction and integration among residents.

Interestingly, integration within the gates may be experienced differently given the background of the resident:

> I've always been advantaged. My life has always been one of the best. I was always exposed to this white lifestyle and with other people, they will still say there's a lot of apartheid or discrimination or most white people…haven't realised that the black people have arrived. So, with me it's a whole different concept, I don't believe in that, because ever since my life… I went to a private school…I spent my time with white people (Participant 4).

The meta-theme of exclusion appears significant here. Although this particular resident may feel included and part of the community it seems that others with different past experiences are excluded, although not physically, due to a desire within the gates for racial homogeneity, specifically white homogeneity. Furthermore, this resident proceeded to explain her own experiences of cultural exclusion and discrimination, discussed in greater detail under a subsequent theme. This tension speaks once again to the highly complex nature of GC living.

Heterogeneity surfaces frequently as a barrier to integration within the gates:

> I think as a country in as much as we are free…you're not really fully integrated hey, we're not fully integrated…we're completely different and we cannot pretend but must try to forge relationships you know, to forge to understand each other (Participant 6).

It is difference that appears to be avoided and, as stated by this resident, differences cannot be denied.

Emerging from the data, and relevant to this subtheme of integration, is the apparent desire for increased acceptance and integration within the GCs among many black participants. This is seemingly due to their experiences of exclusion within the gates. Conversely, white participants did not express such a desire and, although this was not discussed in great detail with them, their own experiences of discrimination appear limited within the gates and thus it may be that they do not wish or have a need for increased tolerance and acceptance. Their homogeneity with other GC residents that emerged from the data, with race situated as an overarching element to this similarity, appears to provide them with satisfactory social connections and group intimacy (McMillan & Chavis, 1986), unlike the black residents who appear to experience clear exclusion of the groups to which they belong, primarily racial and cultural groups. A lack of integration is thus apparent and appears to be forged along lines of race and its interwoven partner, culture.

A further complexity is highlighted here. White participants do not express a need for increased connection, acceptance and integration in the GCs; however, the data from these participants simultaneously suggests a lack of these among the white residents. This may be contributed to by various factors including the influence of an individualistic culture mentioned previously, and their contentment with focus on and integration within their immediate family and friendship groups. Alternatively, their social relatedness and connection may be met with those beyond the gates or, as their clear reluctance to engage in discussion around race may suggest, they may wish not to integrate with the diverse groups in the GC, preferring to remain part of homogenous groups. The black participants were distinctly more open in their communication about from where, with whom and why they connect with certain groups and not with others. Numerous distinctions are therefore apparent between the racial groups in the GCs; nevertheless many of these differences appear to be framed by a prevailing orientation towards homogeneity. It is this partiality for similarity that most black and white participants share and which appears to contribute significantly to the apparent lack of integration and strained inter-group relations within the GCs as well as between those within the gates and those outside. Certain exceptions to desired homogeneity have emerged from the data, some of which have been discussed previously and others which will be elaborated upon below.

The data related to integration reflects minimal SOC and social cohesion within the GCs when interpreted through the lens of the dimensional framework. First, a deficiency of membership (McMillan & Chavis, 1986) appears evident. Feelings of belonging and personal relatedness with other residents are lacking and this emerged specifically from the data of the

black participants, as illustrated above. Participant 6 in fact reports a desire for change within the GC that will provide her with a sense of belonging and of being acknowledged. Participants further pointed to the way in which racial discriminators maintain distance and mistrust between residents, suggesting that shared personal relatedness is left wanting between residents. Once again, it was from the black participants that issues of race and exclusion emerged. This is potentially illustrative of past discrimination either personally endured or identified with by these participants and the remnants of which appear to be having an effect within the GCs. This is in contrast to the white participants whose histories have likely played out differently and who therefore have different experiences within the GCs.

The boundary element of membership similarly plays a prominent role in issues of integration. Certain people belong and others are excluded from boundaries, and this is used to protect social connections (McMillan & Chavis, 1986). For many of the black participants, boundaries present within the gates function negatively, as McMillan and Chavis (1986) warn they may do by being harmful due to the painful rejection experienced by those outside of them and the isolation they create. These boundaries appear to be primarily located around race and culture and the myriad related aspects such as language, ethnicity, traditions and customs. What appears to be fairly apparent from the data is the way in which the boundaries work in favour of the white participants given their reported satisfaction with the functioning of the GC environment in comparison to many black participants, who conversely report ways in which the GC environment contributes to their lack of integration within it. The lifestyle within the gates with regard to social relations and connection with others appears to be satisfactory for the white participants. The boundaries that represent the black participants' group intimacy and protection of their social connections seem to be located outside the GCs, therefore, seeming to contribute to a low sense of membership and belonging within the gates.

A noteworthy exception does arise from the data and suggests potential integration for younger generations within the GCs. As shown above, participant 8, a younger black female resident, relayed changing customs and traditions from that of her parents and her previous living environment due to residing within the GC. This may point to her own integration within the GC, as she remains connected to her family and her culture yet appears to be simultaneously incorporating different ways of living and interacting with others. For children within the gates, integration may be easier and more likely with younger generations given their different histories to that of older generations and the different contexts to which

they are exposed and environments they are brought up in. Membership among younger generations within the gates thus appears to exist to a greater extent than for the older participants. Many research participants in this project can be considered then to form part of the older generation groups and, as has been shown thus far, SOC and social cohesion within the gates appears to be limited for them. A probable argument for this concerns the past apartheid system and its lasting impact. Carrying out this research project with younger participants may therefore have yielded vastly different data and interpretations, pointing to the complexity of the past and present South African context and its effect on inter-group relations.

As with membership, the data appears racially disparate in relation to the dimension of integration and fulfilment of needs (McMillan & Chavis, 1986). Excluding safety from this discussion, values and needs appear not to be met for most black participants, particularly from a social and relational perspective. The opposite seems to be true for the white participants who either relay satisfaction with relations within the gates or do not report any difficulties or needs in this regard. Furthermore, racial differences in experiences of shared emotional connection (McMillan & Chavis, 1986) have been discussed under the sub-theme of social interaction as well the connection of this to the apparent limited integration within the GCs. Taking into account the few exceptions stated above, overall an interpretation of the data in the sub-theme of integration indicates minimal SOC within the GCs. Race and the interlinked elements of culture, tradition and generation are highly influential in this regard, aligned closely with factors of homogeneity and exclusion.

Dimensions of social networks and social capital together with place attachment and identity signifies restricted social cohesion within the GCs (Kearns & Forrest, 2000). Limited social interaction, mutual support and friendships are evident as well as decreased trust given the diversity within the gates.

Interestingly, integration on a physical level is occurring as the diverse participants live together in the GC space, but it is limited socially and relationally. Also, as certain residents allude to, greater class equality in South Africa has allowed physical integration but an absence of integration on other levels. It would thus seem that rather than promoting integration, the GC space contributes to experiences of discrimination and exclusion for some residents and an increase in desires for homogeneity. Generational aspects may be important to bear in mind here, as participant 8's communication as well as the descriptions of interaction between the children living in GCs suggests.

Social Exclusion

Social exclusion is linked closely to integration with factors of diversity, particularly race, playing a central role. Generally, it seems that lack of involvement within the community is a choice made by residents. This may be viewed as more overt disengagement from communal activities and interaction with other residents. More subtle yet powerful forms of exclusion, such as those framed by race and class discussed above, may be viewed as a choice only for some, specifically for those in positions of power.

Evident from the data is the occurrence of exclusion across different groups of people associated in some way with the GCs; including builders, domestic workers, non-board members and residents. Race and class discrimination are disturbingly apparent in the participants' experiences:

> You know what I love, is if we have builders here…they all had to have IDs, they were like marked in literally, and then they had to leave by a certain time also, so that was wonderful because you always had the sense of you know there's builders and where there's builders you can expect things to disappear off your property. They phoned me to say 'has your domestic left, do you know for sure the domestic has left because she hasn't gone out by the gate'. And then if we've got anything that we give her, like she's got children so when my kids outgrow their stuff I give it to her or her bike or their toys or whatever. The gate will phone you and say 'your domestic is trying to leave with XYZ, is it okay?' (Participant 2).

It is concerning that participant 2 conveyed such procedures with pride and agreement, without a sense of the violation taking place for the builders and domestic workers. Such statements made and the meaning that they hold suggests processes of internalised dominance (Tappan, 2006) and serves to reinforce apartheid-like practices of the degradation and disrespect of diverse racial groups.

Learned of or personal experiences of being excluded by ways other than choice were not expressed by white participants; however, most black participants communicated experiences or knowledge of exclusion:

> Show me and tell me any one that's being run by a black person. None. So if there is going to be…I don't want to say cycling, but a white sport because the clubhouses need the tenants and do not put the notice under my door…it's not a black sport… because they know exactly who lives where so automatically I am being excluded (Participant 6).

When asked about her thoughts on the reason for a lack of black managers of GCs, participant 6's responded that:

> Besides the crime, the original, that is now my personal view, that the original idea of a gated community, because everyone thinks or assumes crime is committed by black people, was to say let's move away from the normal residence and exclude ourselves…forgetting that you are now allowed to live everywhere and

> everyone's got money, some black people have actually more money than white people so it was short minded just short sightedness from their side that…although I know this was about the residents I think as a country I think.... just to try and accommodate not even cultures but…each other just as human beings (Participant 6).

Social exclusion within the gates thus appears to be closely tied to race, class and culture. Specifically, the heterogeneity of these factors within the gates appears to be actively avoided, thereby hindering integration. The greater the similarity between groups, the less exclusion and discrimination carried out. This suggests more homogeneity overall between the white residents given the absence of personal experiences of exclusion and discrimination. This may assist in understanding the discriminatory practices carried out within GCs such as those described above by the participants, where both black staff and residents are excluded in different ways, and the white residents' influence and power is maintained. Maintaining homogeneity within the gates, such as through strict control of the staff, having primarily white board members as well as the numerous examples discussed previously does appear to work in favour of the white participants. Severe and rigorous processes to maintain homogeneity have also been found in GCs internationally (Geniş, 2007). The apparent desire for sameness and the racially-based experiences expressed by participants seem to coincide with the claim that residents of South African GCs, the majority of whom are white given the enduring economic effects of apartheid (Lemanski et al., 2008), have a "racist fear of difference" (Lemanski, 2004, p. 101).

The social exclusion that appears to exist does not align with the dimensions relevant to the theme of inter-group relations, and points to a deficiency in SOC and social cohesion within the GCs. This lack is especially evident from a racial perspective as exclusionary practices and discrimination appear to be aimed primarily towards black residents and staff.

Trust

Trust can be viewed as linked to inter-group relations, closely tied to social interaction and integration. Despite the security measures carried out by the GCs, trust appeared tenuous across the data. This points to the probable influence of matters in South Africa that existing literature suggests is masked by the pretext of safety within GCs, such as the desire for and maintenance of division of race and class (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006). Some participants held that increased interaction will promote trust between residents, and the structure and boundaries created within the gates was also mentioned as fostering trust. The prevention of

trust due to heterogeneity and particularly that of racial difference was evident in a statement made by participant 7, a white female resident:

> I just find this complex has got a lot of, I don't want to sound racist or anything but a lot of Asian people have moved in, a lot of black people and it is not a problem they sort of tow the line, but you know you often hear of complexes where they look like they are all okay but in the meantime they are robbing people left right and centre and living amongst you. You sort of feel like you wonder, but nothing has ever happened to give us the excuse to use that you know (Participant 7).

This comment seems to be indicative of broader concerns within the country. Participant 7's use of the word "excuse" is worrying, seemingly suggestive of being primed to find fault with the diverse racial groups. Once again, Lemanski's (2004, p. 101) "racist fear of difference", masked by an expressed fear of crime, is supported by these findings. Furthermore, responses such as these maintain continuity of historically imposed racialised identities (Kiguwa, 2006) and for all participants, separate groups occupied the GCs in terms of racial categories, such as 'black', 'white', 'Indian', and 'Asian'.

Further relations between race and safety emerged from the data. For participant 6, the possibility of greater integration within the GC was linked to a lowered crime rate in the future, and this was associated with race:

> I think as well when the crime rate has gone down there will be that little…element of trust...that element of trust will soon come back, and was it Tokyo…one of the politicians…they were asking him; 'and if your wife is walking in the morning….if he sees a black man approaching will he not cross over to the other side of the road?' and he said 'yes'. 'And if he sees a white male approaching?' he says 'no we continue walking because it feels safe. So until we change that mindset… (Participant 6).

This stated connection, where increased safety should lead to increased trust and integration, thus appears to be intersected with race. Specifically, from this participant's perspective, black individuals are viewed as the perpetrators of criminal activity by some, using a black South African politician to illustrate this. Her discussion suggests a current lack of trust of black people which is preventing integration both within and outside the gates, and this barrier to trust, this mind set of a mistrust of black people, needs to change according to her.

Many of the participants' responses around safety cannot be disconnected from race and certain participants acknowledged this to some extent, whereas others made no reference to race, whether intentionally or not.

> You know what, there's that element of not trusting each other because we really don't interact with each other. Say for instance they arrange something at the clubhouse it will be something that black people can't participate on…that takes away the opportunity for us to integrate and if we integrate more we learn about each other more (Participant 6).

Participant 6's response above points to minimal integration, a sense of mistrust, a desire for separation from other residents and potential racism. This statement was echoed by other black participants in various ways. In stark contrast, all white participants relayed very different occurrences and experiences within the gates, in some cases seemingly an active attempt to justify the GC and present a problem-free utopia:

> Do you feel that everyone is accepted, all social groups, racial, gender and religion? (Interviewer)
>
> Yes absolutely (Participant 7).

With the exception of participant 5, who views the boundaries set up within the GC as contributing to trust, a sense of mistrust was conveyed by other participants. This finding stands in contrast to the dimensions reported to contribute to SOC and social cohesion. SOC (McMillan & Chavis, 1986) appears hindered as emotional safety and group intimacy appear unstable given the lack of trust, and certain participants' needs seem to remain unmet. Once again, racial heterogeneity is situated as a barrier to greater interaction and connection and this deviates from the elements subsumed under the social cohesion dimension of social networks and social capital (Kearns & Forrest, 2000). Similarly, within this dimension societies that are based on trust and mutual benefit may reinforce diversity and simultaneously nurture social relations. Across the data, the GC societies appear to be based on mistrust of others, represented by the actions taken towards staff within the gates as well as between residents. Thus, social cohesion appears to be significantly low when considering issues of trust.

Culture and Values

Values of safety, peace and quiet, family orientation and maintaining a certain quality of life ran throughout much of the data. Often these values were considered by the participants as shared with the other residents based solely on their residence within the gates and on observations made. A noticeable difference of values, specifically those which related to culture, surfaced between black and white participants and these divergences appear to serve to create conflict and reinforce homogeneity, exclusion and discrimination within the gates.

The two social cohesion dimensions used for interpretation of the data within this theme include common values and a civic culture and culture: common values and identity (Kearns & Forrest, 2000; Novy et al., 2012). An interpretation of the findings will thus speak predominantly to social cohesion within the GCs.

> If you have children and if you have the same sort of lifestyle I think we share values…generally people that live in here…are family orientated people…our concerns are all over our children (Participant 2).

> It is young families…I mean they are family orientated (Participant 3).

> You know I think everybody's goal here is to keep crime away and to have a lovely family lifestyle, let your children grow up the way I grew up (Participant 7).

> It's the same…when we hosted feasts and family gatherings we would tell our neighbours…well firstly you invite them…when I went to a complex, fortunately the people that were there they also believe in that. We wanted to live together, we are tolerant of each other and we need to respect (Participant 8).

> I think you do have a sense that the people are all looking for a safe place for their kids and you have this idea that they are all very like-minded to you (Participant 11).

The benefit and value of safety emerged clearly across the data and family orientation and privacy were similarly expressed frequently. The shared value of safety seemed to be automatically considered a common aim by virtue of residing in the GC. Safety was similarly found to be a shared goal and this commonality appeared to be assumed by the participants, not known by them due to interaction with other residents. Safety thus appears to be an aspect of residing in a GC that residents may perceive as unifying, as being desired by all other residents and a key motivating factor to live there.

A false sense of security and the existence of crime within the GCs, although typically relayed with the qualification of its less severe nature, were raised at times. This suggests an uncertainty, a break in the firmly held views of safety as an absolute within the GCs. It was often the case, however, that the perceived less serious nature of the criminal activity within the GCs seemed to create an acceptance of this crime amongst the participants:

> I think even though they can get in and steal your stuff…they're still pretty safe…I think they're less likely to physically attack you if you're in a complex (Participant 2).

> People die, people get raped in a stand-alone house, so it's a lot…there's more risk than in an estate. In an estate they do everything quickly, then off they go. You have few break-ins here and they'll steal from downstairs…but to go upstairs, it becomes a bit dangerous, they would never do that (Participant 4).

> You would think there won't be any break-ins, but there are more break-ins in an estate than in an actual stand-alone house. The reason being, we have contractors here and…gardeners (Participant 4).

Following Kearns and Forrest's (2000) dimensional framework, the consistencies between participants shown above point to shared common values between the residents and this in turn allows for their goals of a safe, family-oriented and private residence to be met. Having children is related to attachment to an area (Stone & Hulse, 2007) and family orientation has

emerged in prior research conducted with GC residents, where families with children find GCs appealing due to the lifestyle it offers them (Lemanski et al., 2008). In this way, social cohesion appears to exist within the GCs in this study. However, further interpretation utilising the additional relevant social cohesion elements reveals ambiguities and divergences in this regard.

Beyond safety, mutual goals between residents appear questionable and similarly point to the recurring contentious issue of homogeneity:

> Would you think that you share goals with the other residents? (Interviewer)
>
> I don't know hey, I don't know that you don't share goals but... I think each family's different (Participant 2).
>
> No, I don't think so, because we differ. And the other thing is we don't sit down around the same table and discuss things, so I wouldn't know that we share the same goals (Participant 4).
>
> I do, I personally share goals with the other residents. I think for me to be, to have lived in that area for that long it shows that I feel comfortable and I like how everything has been structured (Participant 8).

Participants 2 and 4 refer to a realistic and common occurrence of individuality between people, and differences in goals can be considered natural among groups of people (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). As illustrated, certain values and goals are shared by residents such as safety; however, values which appear fundamental for certain participants are lacking and this may impact their social cohesion within the gates. For participant 4, a black female, meaningful interaction with the other residents would provide a sense of having shared goals or not. Given the additional data such as that presented in theme one, this type of meaningful interaction within the GCs seems to be deficient for most black participants, and a value which is not commonly shared within the gates. Consequently, social cohesion appears to exist to different extents for racially diverse residents. Furthermore, intra-racial differences arise, where elements of social cohesion (Kearns & Forrest, 2000) differ across varied age groups of the same race. For example, participant 8 in stark contrast to the other black participants referred to shared values, goals, respect and tolerance within her GC. Interestingly, she also relayed the similarity between these elements within the GC to those within her previous living environment.

Personal experiences of cultural discrimination and exclusion emerged palpably in the data. This emergence surfaced only from certain black participants:

> Other cultures are left behind. Other things are left behind. It's just your Western culture, which it's still there. So, that's all I can say to it (Participant 4).

> Let me tell you where my problem is, when my husband passed away, we've got a certain culture…once someone passes on, they need to slaughter…and in an estate environment, that's where we're different. They don't allow slaughtering in there. So, I had…fights with my neighbour…I tried to explain. She was telling me why should I take my kids to a private school if I can't maintain it, which culture and private school are two different things…each and every person has a culture, so if we can respect that. And she said, no you can do it, go to Alexander and do it and I just felt she's being a bit insensitive. I've lost a husband. It's not my call. I do what they tell me to do…it's not something just to have. It was culture. That's one of my problems… I was very much upset, especially from my neighbour. If it was someone from another street, I wouldn't mind, but from my neighbour… and my funeral and your funerals are different. Again, we have a feast and you guys go to a chapel and it becomes a finger lunch. Here it's…huge (Participant 4).

An apparent cultural divide emerges here, where one culture is discriminated against. Cultural identity is an integral element of an individual and his or her life (Myers, 2008; Triandis, 1989). For participant 4, her cultural practices which are central to who she is and what is expected of her, were hindered. The cultural discrimination relayed by residents' points to a lack of adjustment to diverse cultures within the gates. It thus appears that certain cultures are negated and others accommodated within the gates and this cultural incompatibility fosters conflict between residents. Cultural discrimination, intersected with racial discrimination, was described by one resident:

> That Indian holiday where they do the fire…crackers in the evening…fortunately I don't keep pets…but New Year's Eves when…there's only black people left and they have to do fire crackers then I will tell you there will be complaints from Timbuktu to Kimberley (Participant 6).

When asked about the sense of belonging in GCs, Participant 6, a friend of participant 4, responded as follows:

> It is a false sense of belonging I'll tell you why. When [participant 4's] husband passed away here they couldn't understand the culture that everyone comes to pay their last respects from day one. I mean he died 6 months ago, today is the day [participant 4] is supposed to literally take off the black clothes. People will be coming here and I promise you by Monday ... letter from the complex manager to say that too many guests...we've never had a private funeral in the black communities…in that sense I feel that she doesn't belong. She couldn't slaughter a goat…they had to actually hide the goat...as long as I cannot accommodate your culture then we don't belong with each other (Participant 6).

In reference to a sense of belonging within her own GC, participant 6 stated:

> No, if I die I have to go home to Tembisa…the neighbours would understand, they don't even have to understand they know that's just the way of life…us as black people we have a lot of things that we're so care free…with the black community you don't have to know someone that much…to go to their funeral…it's different cultures mainly (Participant 6).

This statement suggests that home is where this resident's culture is accepted, not within the GC. Constructions of her neighbours in Tembisa are positive in comparison to those within the GC. Sameness is once again shown to be preferred over diversity, there is an indication of

'us' versus 'them' and although these participants are within the gates they construct themselves as outsiders given the cultural inequality experienced. In line with the cultural barriers experienced by certain black participants, a thread running throughout the data and across all themes is a pervasive racial distinction. The GC environment, the rules, standards and procedures appear to cater specifically for certain groups and in doing so a division within the GCs is created; namely a white utopia and a black compromise.

When considering social cohesion, the cultural and racial distinctions described above appear incompatible with many elements of the selected social cohesion dimensions. Both SOC and social cohesion are intended to be considered and understood reasonably within this research project. This involves the awareness that they cannot be fully met within the GCs and that deviations, conflicts and hindrances are expected. In relation to social cohesion for example, as described above by participants, diverse life goals and values are anticipated. A concern arises, however, when contemplating the imbalance in social cohesion in relation to different racial groups that appears to exist within the GCs. This occurrence may still be considered natural given diversity between individuals and groups and the assumption that some will thus experience greater social cohesion than others in virtually any context. However, the unease lies primarily in the fact that the differences in the extent to which the elements of social cohesion are matched or remain unmet for different races is very closely linked to practices of discrimination and exclusion of the black participants.

Novy et al. (2012, p. 1879) explain how "strong ties within a community can be accompanied by discrimination and exclusion of those who do not naturally belong to that community". Participant 4 and 6 point to strong ties within their GCs between homogenous cultures and races, which results in their own experiences of discrimination towards, and exclusion of, their own cultures, the strong ties of which seem to lie beyond the gates in other residences. Thus on the one hand, these residents describe negative experiences within the gates and a lack of community and social interaction, while on the other hand they convey safety and, later, lifestyle factors as benefits of GC living. This can perhaps be related to the findings of Low (1997, p. 67) who found that residents felt that they were "trading a sense of community for security and other amenities". Unlike Low's (1997) results, however, these participants did not appear unconcerned with making friends. The descriptions provided by these participants as well as others, both black and white, correspond with international findings of a higher SOC in non-GCs in comparison to GCs (Sakip et al., 2012).

Certain participants' cultural values and identities (Novy et al., 2012) are thwarted within the gates. Given that identity and shared culture are fundamental elements of

"belonging to a social whole" (Novy et al., 2012, p. 1879) a lacking sense of belonging and social connection that emerged from the data for these participants is understandable. Their culture does not appear to be widely shared within the GCs, unlike within their previous living environments. These findings are in direct opposition to the stated elements of social cohesion. Nurturing social cohesion is the ability to democratically resolve conflict as well as the maintenance of "tolerance and social harmony" (Kearns & Forrest, 2000, p. 997). The need for participant 4 to conceal her cultural practices which created conflict with her neighbours cannot be considered democratic, and the relayed experiences centring on race and culture do not speak of social harmony and tolerance within the gates. Finally, in discussing social cohesion, Novy et al. (2012) describe cities as places formed through interaction between people of various ages, lifestyles and backgrounds brought together by commuting, migration and cooperation. Cultural heterogeneity and "hybrid cultures" (p. 1879) are said to be created in this way. In the context of the GCs the initial barrier to cultural heterogeneity according to this description is interaction. As discussed in theme one, meaningful interaction appears lacking within the GCs, thereby contributing to cultural distance and discrimination. A resistance towards cultural heterogeneity seems to exist, rendering GCs more socially cohesive for groups to which the functioning of the GCs work in their favour. The opposition towards difference within the GCs that emerged from the data resonates with previous South African research which has found that surrounding oneself with like-minded people is important for residents (Landman, 2004). This speaks to the detrimental effects of social cohesion, such as exclusion and a minority experiencing an imposition of values by a majority (Forrest & Kearns, 2001). An inclination towards like-mindedness within the GCs appears to result in some residents experiencing an imposition of values by others, such as cultural practices. Social cohesion may therefore exist to a greater degree for the majority, in this instance, residents' whose cultural values and practices are tolerated within the gates. The data suggests that alternative majority groups also exist in the GCs, such as the board of trustees and HOAs, which are discussed in the subsequent theme. Clear racial distinctions thus surface as an interpretation of the data of white participants portrays a significantly different picture of social cohesion within the GCs in relation to culture and values. When considering GCs as constituting one system, however, an overall deficit of social cohesion is apparent.

There were, however, racial and cultural exceptions and participant 8 relayed a vastly different experience with cultural diversity in her GC. Generational differences may once again play a primary role in these differences:

> It is quite nice because you find that we're actually not so different from each other…in African custom, although we don't use a table as a sort of meeting area, but we like proper food…and we sit around the mat and discuss things that happened and that's how we interact…so you end up there thinking 'oh we're not so different after all'…you start interacting, you start engaging and you find that actually there's nothing to be scared of. To be honest with you I find Afrikaans men more attractive than previous because they take time, they respect a woman…I wonder why was that segregation? So I must say I'm quite privileged to be in such an environment because all my life I think I've been introduced to the English way of doing things, but okay now, with an Afrikaans way of doing things I'm like 'actually we're not so different'. I think segregation comes when people haven't…related with different cultures (Participant 8).

Participant 8 is a younger black female in comparison to the other black female participants in this study. Thus, generational differences may once again be significant. Her statement "I wonder why was that segregation?" is suggestive of her past experiences against those of the older black females, for whom the reality of segregation and the causes thereof seem clear given their personal experiences. Participant 8's statement similarly points to the groundless institution of the apartheid practice which gave one power over another, fostered a fear of difference and a domination of some. Unlike the older black female participants, participant 8 relays experiences within the GC that move away from racism, from the white man as perpetrator, which is perhaps indicative of her relative distance from apartheid in contrast to the other women. Her responses point to social cohesion within the GC given the stated shared values and goals, participation, tolerance and harmony, a sense of belonging to the social whole, interaction, and cultural heterogeneity (Kearns & Forrest, 2000; Novy et al., 2012). Participant 8 similarly made references such as these to interaction with those beyond the gates, throwing hopeful light on inter-group relations within and outside the GC.

Just as racially diverse children interact within the gates, so too do culturally diverse children:

> It is more for my kids that we are losing, I mean….the area is mixed racial, mixed cultures and they are not necessarily experiencing what I have experienced where I grew up in the same culture…but in terms of family life I am happy (Participant 3).

> Everyone's got a different culture, but besides … the kids get along very well. For the kids it's the best place to be. They enjoy each other's space, company (Participant 4).

It seems that greater cultural integration occurs among the children within the GCs. For participant 3, however, this may not be desired as her children do not experience the same cultural homogeneity that she did growing up. This alludes to a resistance to cultural integration. These participants' seem to yearn for their own cultural backgrounds to be repeated for both themselves and their children.

For the participants with children, the need for a secure environment for their children was met, and for the white parents this was often considered positive as it provided their children with a similar childhood to their own:

> My kids are very lucky and they literally have all the freedom they want here where I don't believe that if we lived outside of a complex that they'd have the same sort of lifestyle… growing up as a child we were in the streets most of the time on our bikes. And for them, they can do the same thing…They're safe, I know that nothing's going to happen (Participant 2).

> The pros have been for the kids having a safe…probably the type of lifestyle that kids had in the older days… they have that freedom (Participant 11).

A yearning to re-create for their children the lifestyles and childhoods that they had experienced emerged for these participants. The perceived safety of the GCs provides the children with freedom within the gates. Freedom fostered by an increased sense of safety has been found in existing research (Low, 2001). A racial divergence exists in relation to re-creating past lifestyles, where many white participants desire the safety offered to them in the past, whereas many black participants wish for the SOC and belonging experienced in their histories. The GCs may therefore meet certain values and lifestyles for some residents, but not others. Specifically, white residents relayed a satisfaction with the lifestyle offered within the gates, whereas, it appears that for most of the black residents interaction, connection, fellowship and togetherness are lacking in comparison to their own cultural values and practices.

Power and Control

Participants' responses varied when asked as to the influence they felt they had within the community, often appearing to be limited among most participants, although in certain instances this was viewed by residents as being a matter of choice. However, along with choice, the influence within the GCs was constantly placed with another party, an 'other' group typically. Racial differences emerged with regard to the groups possessing the greatest power and control within the gates, with the white participants focusing on intra-racial and the black participants on inter-racial power differentials. Relatedly, processes of exclusion, discrimination, inequality and maintaining homogeneity filtered throughout much of the data.

The three theoretical dimensions utilised for an interpretation of these findings include the SOC dimension of influence (McMillan & Chavis, 1986) together with the social cohesion

dimensions of social order and social control and politics: citizenship and participation (Kearns & Forrest, 2000; Novy et al., 2012).

Influence within the Gated Community

A lack of influence within the GCs was evident among the participants. Certain groups were frequently said to have greater authority than others, including home owners, board members and committee members. A distinction between 'them' and 'us' was evident and choosing not to be a part of these groups appeared to be associated with an acceptance of having little influence within the gates.

> Do you feel that you have any influence in [Name of GC]? (Interviewer)
>
> No. I don't interfere with anybody…I don't go to the meetings which is also not a good thing, but I don't. They can carry on, I'm happy quietly living on my own (Participant 1).
>
> No not at all…it's very clique-y and I think the clique is what sets the rules here and that's it. You've got min say here, very min say here. It's not a bad thing…it is what it is (Participant 2).
>
> Not really, I must be honest as well…we have not been like involved…people just mind their own business. If there is a meeting…home owners would go, sometimes (Participant 3).
>
> Not at all…I'm not part of any clubs. I'm not part of the board that makes the decisions. I have nothing to do with that (Participant 9).

A contrast of experiences was highlighted by Participant 10 who is a member of the board of trustees for his designated precinct of the GC:

> You have just got to know how to influence the people…you need to show them what the general living rules are…here are the rules, don't forget them… if you are part of a Trustee, if you really want to make yourself heard, you can make yourself heard (Participant 10).

Participant 10 expressed a level of influence within the GC that the other participants were not able to given their absence from authoritative groups. His membership locates him in a position of power and influence.

A prescribed way of living dictated by residence within the GCs was conveyed by all participants and a lack of control over this was common within their discussion. Furthermore, an acceptance of this and an expectation of restriction were common and appeared to be viewed as an implicit aspect of living in the GCs.

> I've got freedom within my four corners (Participant 4).
>
> You can be individual…in your own space…you can't be individual on the outside of the walls (Participant 10).

Restrictions of individuality and freedom were expressed by certain participants, such as by participant 4. There were very few exceptions and almost all participants felt restricted in some way. These restrictions point to a resistance to heterogeneity and an encouragement of sameness, however surface-level this may be, such as the exterior décor of the houses within the gates.

Participant responses portray an unspoken arrangement within the GCs that individuality and difference may be expressed within the four walls of one's home but may not go beyond this boundary. The implication of this appears to be that sameness is good and difference is unwelcome and attempts are made through power and control to foster sameness. Superficial homogeneity among most participants seems evident from the data, such as housing type or preferred landscapes. It is, however, the deep-seated heterogeneity of culture, race and diverse worldviews that impacts much of the GC living, to be discussed further.

In relating her experienced lack of influence, participant 2 commented that:

> You see…for me…you pay a huge amount to live here and then you can't do what you want to your house (Participant 2).

Participant 2's quote above points to a relationship that emerged within the data, that of residents equating wealth with entitled power and influence. This suggests an understanding that having money, which residence within the gates automatically implies, entitles one to have influence within the GCs. Thus, it seems that it is not due to the simple fact of having a home that should allow residents to dictate what happens to that home, but rather to the financial wealth that the residents possess.

The overarching pervasive link across the data, that of race, surfaced clearly when discussing residents' influence, where having minimal or no influence as a resident was attributed to race:

> I don't have, because the board of directors are white people and my worry is how would they learn other cultures? There's the Indian culture. We do have Indians here; we've got Chinese guys here, the Black people… (Participant 4).

> The majority of the residents are white so when it comes to voting in new members we are always outnumbered hence our voices can't be heard (Participant 6).

There were exceptions, where certain participants did feel that they held some level of control in their GC:

> I think so…they do ask for opinions…they do give you the opportunity to give your views…and I think what the general public feel definitely influences the decisions they make, the homeowners, definitely (Participant 7).

> I do because if there's something that's bothering me they do make moves to make sure that it doesn't happen again (Participant 8).

The SOC dimension of influence encompasses a feeling that one makes a difference to the group, that one matters and that members find the group important (McMillan & Chavis, 1986). With the exception of participants 7, 8 and 10, the above findings appear to largely tend away from this aspect of influence. The choice to remain uninvolved in meetings and clubs and to keep to oneself stands in contrast to feelings of making a difference, mattering to other group members and finding the group important. Instead, an individual focus seems to predominate towards oneself and one's family and little attention appears to be given to forming a part of the wider group, to the importance of the group and to concern around membership to the group. Furthermore, some black participants conveyed having a lack of influence due to their race, with experiences of the white residents possessing greater control. White participants similarly expressed minimal influence within the GCs; however, this was never attributed to, or associated with race. These diverse experiences speak to inequality and discrimination, and they are reminiscent of past power differentials based on race, where white people were dominant and controlled the actions of all other racial groups. Thus, both black and white residents appear to experience little influence according to the theoretical elements (McMillan & Chavis, 1986); however, particular reasons for their subjective experiences are vastly different.

An 'other' group typically seems to yield greater influence within the gates, such as board members or those forming part of the HOAs. Choosing not to be a part of such groups is associated with having minimal influence and, thereby, merely conforming to the rules and regulations set out by these groups. Conformity is positioned as fostering closeness and indicating cohesiveness (McMillan & Chavis, 1986) and in this way, SOC may be encouraged. Conformity thus appears to be positive for certain participants as, although they may not experience personal influence, it allows mutual goals of safety, family orientation and aesthetic aspects to be met.

Social order, a component of social cohesion, refers to the cooperation between individuals and groups to reach mutual goals, which occurs under certain conditions (Wrong, 1995), and this appears to be taking place in some ways within the GCs. In addition, the prescribed way of living, the regulations and restrictions and the uniformity that emerged

from the data appears to set in place routines, exchanges and demands that occur daily which are stated to result in social cohesion (Kearns & Forrest, 2000). In these ways social cohesion may be contributed to.

Given the participants' limited involvement with boards, committees, clubs and HOAs, it is difficult to discern whether or not group members with the greatest influence are those who acknowledge others' needs, opinions and values (McMillan & Chavis, 1986). What is known, however, is that freedom and individuality is restricted within the GCs and deviations from the norm are said to result in penalties. Safety recurs as a need which is met within the gates; however, other potential needs, opinions and values may be unnoticed and suppressed for most residents, thereby, excluding some, as conveyed by the participants. It is a certain few who appear to hold the most influence within the gates and who are said to dictate many processes and procedures. A racial imbalance also appears to exist, with black participants expressing experiences of minimal influence, acceptance and integration (Kearns & Forrest, 2000; McMillan & Chavis, 1986) as a GC resident given the greater number of white residents and the white dominated boards and committees. For these participants SOC and social cohesion appear deficient.

Novy's et al. (2012) dimension of politics: citizenship and participation includes the importance of taking part in public affairs in order to be a local community member. A large number of participants expressed voluntary non-participation, seeming to prefer not to become involved in the public affairs of their GCs. Three residents conversely expressed participation and varying levels of influence within the GCs, one of these residents being a home owner and the other a member of the board of trustees. This points to the impact of participation on membership and social cohesion. Overall, if a resident does not form part of the HOA, board of trustees or a committee it appears that social cohesion may be hampered for these individuals. Given that most participants are not members of such groups, an overarching lack of social cohesion as well as SOC is suggested.

Influence by the Gated Community

Experiences of being influenced by the GCs, rather than having an influence within them, was communicated about diversely among participants. This included the building restrictions and approval needed before making any changes to one's home as well as noise level restrictions. Prohibition from contributing to the surroundings outside their houses was common among residents' experiences, but this even extended to personal garden decoration within one GC.

> You know it's a normal braai that goes through the night and it's not supposed to be a party but it ends up being a bit of a party that causes trouble (Participant 1).
>
> It would be very difficult to get permission [to make changes to the outside of the house] because they don't want to change the face. Say that one person does something then they are going to have to let everybody else so they are very strict on that side of it (Participant 9).

This rigidity was conveyed by many participants and more leniencies in various aspects were desired by most. Participant 9's response relays the control executed within the GCs and in this particular instance, homogeneity is maintained by controlling the exterior elements of the GC to which individual preferences cannot be added.

Positive experiences of being influenced by the GCs extended beyond practical considerations and were viewed as beneficial:

> I think maybe it's given me a different outlook on life…I've calmed down a lot with my children…because I feel safer in here (Participant 2).
>
> Yes, I suppose they do. Again, with the security; I'm more aware of my surroundings, especially when I go out (Participant 9).

Central to both experiences is the element of safety provided by the GCs. A particular construction of the world outside the gates is portrayed by participant 9. The sense of security inside the GC appears to create for her an antithetical world beyond, where constant awareness of surroundings and vigilance is required.

> Do you feel the community influences you? (Interviewer)
>
> Yes it does…the area I live in is predominantly Afrikaans speaking people so my son goes to an Afrikaans school…so my son speaks fluent Afrikaans and English and Sotho also. So he engages with everybody and that forces me to go into an environment that I'm not used to, it's a matter of, I start to engage with Afrikaans speaking people and they teach me certain things. How to cook potjiekos…their way of living and in return I'll do the same…it's a mutual interaction (Participant 8).

Participant 8's response to being influenced by the GC varies significantly from other participants responses, including those of other races, ages and genders. Her response points to possible integration, multiculturalism and the accommodation of culture that is absent from the experiences of many other participants. Age and thus generational differences may once more be meaningful here.

Rules, a significant element of GCs, were exposed as central to power and control within the gates. Certain residents expressed satisfaction with the rules while others felt restricted. As with experiences among participants of having minimal influence, a lack of choice and control over rules was relayed:

> If those rules aren't in place people tend to let a lot of things slide and it just becomes unmanageable (Participant 5).
>
> Either you conform to the rules or you get fined…if you want to live like an Aborigine then you are going to have a problem (Participant 10).
>
> I suppose if you are going to live in a community like this, you have to be mindful of the rules and regulations and you go into knowing there are certain restrictions…and you've just got to abide by them. But I think people are happy to pay that price for the security thing (Participant 11).

Opposition to difference is once again highlighted here. Conformity is desired and any movement away from this is problematic and unaccepted. These findings are comparable with those of Roitman (2005), who found that the rules, regulations and the cost of housing make GCs homogenous places when compared to the diversity of the wider society (Roitman, 2005).

This discussion of these findings is not intended to negate the need or value of rules but it is the type, extent and aims of particular rules within the GCs which raise concerns. The homogeneity which certain rules appear to work towards and maintain speaks strongly to processes of exclusion and inequality. Once more, race and culture are indivisible from these processes.

A racially varied response emerged across the data in relation to the GCs rules. White participants predominantly listed rules that they felt were perhaps too stringent, but overall felt that the rules kept them safe and were there for a reason. There were stark differences in the responses of certain black participants:

> There are rules. That's why I mentioned earlier that it would be better if the board of trustees would be a mixture [of cultures]. Someone from England would be one of the board members and they've got a different culture from what I have or what you have and that we are able to learn from one another, so if we can do that and accommodate certain needs…everybody will be very happy (Participant 4).

When asked about her thoughts as to the white dominated board, participant 4 responded as follows:

> I don't know. Maybe Black people are too scared or…maybe they're not given an opportunity…you feel left out, out of 10 White people (Participant 4).
>
> They [the estate manager] need a little bit of education as far as accommodating other people…you can't have more than 30 people and I swear if someone dies in your family I'm sure you'll have more than 30 people for the funeral, you'll have more than 30 at once to bring you tribute…and already you can see that these rules are already excluding me. I pay the rates, I live here, I look after my house but these rules are already saying that I can't live here so there will always be conflict. There isn't a way of saying how do we accommodate the other cultures…the rules are definitely meant to keep me out…maybe it's a means of…having their own kind of people living there…I don't know (Participant 6).

Elements of the data encompassed within this sub-theme of 'influence by the GC' points to both SOC and social cohesion within the GCs, while other findings suggests a dearth of these upon interpretation. Safety emerged as a uniting factor among the participants and appeared to serve as an assuaging element against the rigidity of the numerous rules set out. Thus, according to the dimension of influence (McMillan & Chavis, 1986), when the benefit of safety is considered, a positive relationship exists between the influence a community has on its members and cohesiveness. All the participants regarded the security offered by the GCs as desired and valuable and the influence which this has in their daily lives was evident. Furthermore, conformity is stated to foster closeness and indicates cohesiveness and all the participants communicated their conformity within the gates to certain rules and processes. For some residents, including participants 7 and 8, a reciprocal relationship does appear to exist between their influence on the community and the community's influence on them, with both operating concurrently. These residents felt that their voices were heard within the GCs and that they contributed to decisions and actions made within the gates, while simultaneously being influenced by the GC with regard to their lifestyles, behaviour and interaction. These findings thus align with elements of the dimension of influence, indicating SOC within the GCs.

Social cohesion is similarly indicated within the GCs. Despite displeasure and disagreement with certain rules within the GCs, participants predominantly appear to abide by these and as a result carry out routines, exchanges and demands that occur daily and which are said to foster social cohesion (Kearns & Forrest, 2000). With specific reference to safety and a family oriented lifestyle which emerged strongly throughout the data, individuals and families appear to feel that they belong and have an investment "in the social system" and that they are part of the social project that will benefit them all (Kearns & Forrest, 2000, p. 998). These mutual goals of a safe, family-focused living environment seem to be reached through the cooperation of the participants, and residents in general, and a lack of general conflict and challenge to the prevailing system appears to exist (Kearns & Forrest, 2000). In these ways, the influence held over the participants by the GC indicates social cohesion.

Conversely, further interpretation of the data points to significant constraints on SOC and social cohesion within the GCs. These limitations arise primarily from the responses of black participants such as those illustrated above, who convey the influence of their GCs as resulting in experiences of exclusion and inequality. The rules are viewed as biased towards certain groups, working in the favour of some but not others. Specifically, the rules and procedures of the GCs appear to negate fundamental elements of diverse cultures, traditions

and lifestyles which, if pursued by the participants, are admonished. The apparent imbalance of power and control within GCs emerges here, where certain groups yield greater power over others resulting in the repression of some. This inequality appears closely tied to likeness according to the data, where particular racially and culturally homogenous groups possess greater influence within the gates, thereby, negatively impacting those of different races and cultures. Participant 4 and 6 relay this clearly, describing the lack of accommodation of their cultures and associated experiences of exclusion. This echoes the findings in theme two of 'culture and values', in which processes of exclusion, discrimination, inequality and desired homogeneity emerged. No data from the white participants included experiences of a repressed culture, resulting in feelings of exclusion. Although desires for greater leniency were expressed by some white participants with regard to certain rules such as noise levels or aesthetic aspects this was not associated with being unaccommodated or experiencing a decreased sense of belonging within the GCs. It appears that their lifestyles, cultures, traditions and worldviews are largely accommodated within their GCs. These findings stand in contrast to elements of SOC and social cohesion dimensions. In relation to influence, it does not seem to be the case that the group members with the greatest influence are those who acknowledge other's needs, opinions and values (McMillan & Chavis, 1986). Instead, those with the greatest influence, such as board members and committee members, appear to set in place overarching rules and regulations which accommodate specific groups and, rather than making provision for diversity, actively exclude others and their values and needs. Thus, SOC may exist for certain groups but not for others.

Social cohesion similarly appears to be hindered as conflict arises when participants attempt to carry out their cultural practices and lifestyles which challenges the prevailing "order and system" (Kearns & Forrest, 2000, p. 998). This was also indicated in theme two. Social order is reported to involve the issue of diverse groups cohering or integrating into the "wider social order" while cultural difference is simultaneously respected (Giddens, as cited in Kearns & Forrest, 2000, p. 998). Social cohesion thus seems to be lacking as integration and respect of difference are largely challenged and resisted within the gates. Finally, the existence of social cohesion is questioned as a lack of shared norms and establishments that provide for social, political and labour rights is asserted to undermine "social and territorial cohesion" (Novy et al., 2012, p. 1881). A lack of shared norms is evident from the data of most black participants, such as norms around cultural practices and traditions. It may be said that their social rights are being undermined within the GCs which in turn detracts from

social cohesion. Furthermore, a lack of territorial cohesion appears evident as a greater connection to previous living environments is relayed given the acceptance and tolerance there of the participants' cultures and values.

Monitoring

Monitoring forms a central part of the GC process and environment. From gaining access into the gates as a non-resident to ensuring the compliance with rules by residents, the GC system calls for supervision at multiple levels. Embedded in this control are processes of exclusion, discrimination, inequality and attempts at fostering homogeneity. Race once more forms a pivot around which this power and control operates, however unknown this appears to be to certain participants.

> You have to register, if you've got staff members working for you; be it from a home office or a domestic worker, you have to register them at the gate and they will only be allowed in by metric access on the days that you've listed them for…I think it is very good…because they pretty much always know who is in and who is not (Participant 5).
>
> How do you think the staff would feel about that…being so closely monitored? (Interviewer)
>
> I wonder... I don't know actually. I suppose, in a way, it gives them also a sense of security, knowing that they're...I don't know whether it gives them a sense of mistrust, on the resident's part, but I suppose they could understand it (Participant 5).

Participant 5 ineffectually attempts to provide justification for the close monitoring of staff and instead reinforces the motive of benefitting the self that seems to be common among many of the participants within the GCs. An indication of internalised dominance seems evident, particularly "the incorporation and acceptance by individuals within a dominant group of prejudices against others. Internalized domination is likely to consist of feelings of superiority, normalcy, and self righteousness...internalized domination perpetuates oppression of others" (Pheterson, as cited in Tappan, 2006, p. 2120).

> I think as a homeowner I can organise for them [contractors], I have to put all the names and the people's IDs and their ID book has to be checked and copied and then those people will get a card of sorts so that they can get access when they want but there is a limit…my gardener and domestic worker have got a fingerprint… but when they first introduced it they would sort of limit that to six months because you know gardeners come and go and sometimes you find that they are stealing and we don't want that in our estate…(Participant 7).

'Outsiders', non-residents, are constructed by participant 7 as potentially concerning and dangerous, as possible criminals. Thus supervision in the form of IDs and fingerprints is necessary to keep track of these individuals and to exclude them if needed. These control

procedures are worryingly similar to those carried out during the apartheid era, when black citizens had to carry passes, sign registers, and receive permission to access an area (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006).

Potential damaging effects of the monitoring processes within the GCs are illustrated by these findings; however, for the residents they may in fact encourage and maintain SOC and social cohesion. Many participants expressed approval of the monitoring processes around gaining access into the GCs as this provided them with choice over having guests or not. Similarly, monitoring of the security within the gates was accepted and desired. These processes speak to the social cohesion dimension of social order and social control (Kearns & Forrest, 2000). These systems are not challenged by the participants, but are instead accepted, and they appear to create routines, exchanges and demands on a daily basis, such as entry in the GCs and confirmation of visitors' identities. As shown above, in line with the social identity theory (SIT) (Foster, 2006), the construction of an out-group comprised of criminals barred from entering and potential criminals who may enter but who are monitored closely, including domestic workers, gardeners and contractors, may have a unifying effect within the GCs given the consequent construction of the in-group of which the residents form a part. Feelings of belonging, having an investment "in the social system" and believing themselves to be a part of the social project that will benefit them all seems apparent as a result of these processes, thereby, contributing to social cohesion within the GCs (Kearns & Forrest, 2000, p. 998). In relation to certain monitoring procedures such as those mentioned above, inter-group cooperation appears to exist, reported to be an important component of social cohesion (Kearns & Forrest, 2000).

Elements of the SOC dimension are similarly apparent. Group cohesiveness involves feeling influential as a member of a community (McMillan & Chavis, 1986), and as was conveyed by numerous participants, including 5 and 7 above, certain monitoring processes carried out within the GC in which they are involved appeared to provide them with a sense of having an impact within the gates. Certain GC processes involving the residents thus point to a reciprocal relationship between a members' influence on the community and community's influence on the members that operates concurrently, indicating group cohesiveness and SOC (McMillan & Chavis, 1986).

Close monitoring and control appears to take place for residents as well, not only 'outsiders' of the GCs:

> Tenants need to be screened before they come and rent the place out…you don't want drug dealers to be

> roaming around and you don't want people that would bring bad vibes or a bad apple into the community…we want to bring up our kids with certain morals (Participant 8).
>
> The estate agents…know the youngsters…they sort of interview you and say what type of area would you like to be in…the estate agents sort of place you…they look at…the type of person that you are, and they sort of say 'we suggest you go to this precinct or we suggest you go to that precinct, because it has XYZ for your type of needs (Participant 10).

Exclusion and discrimination are bitterly apparent here. Close monitoring of individuals prior to residence within the gates occurs and based on this judgement, made by a certain few authoritative members of the GCs, these potential residents are either allowed to live within the gates or are excluded. This discrimination between preferred residents' points to the creation of a very specific living environment, one where homogeneity prevails and difference is rejected. A particular world is created, or attempts are made to do so, through these processes of exclusion and discrimination. A separate reality appears to be encouraged, where people are excluded not only because they cannot afford to live there but because they do not fit the profile of the desired, ideal GC resident. This illustrates an active, unashamed avoidance of heterogeneity and difference within the gates. This parallels the findings of research on a GC in Istanbul, conducted by Geniş (2007) which illustrates how social heterogeneity outside of the community is avoided. Homogeneity is clear within the GC in relation to cultural values, socioeconomic status and demographic characteristics. Western lifestyle, value systems, culture and ideology dominate within the GC. Similarly, the exclusionary and discriminatory processes found by this local study were found by Geniş (2007, p. 784), where prospective residents are required to undergo a rigorous application process that examines "their occupational and educational background and their cultural and social capital in addition to their income level" and references are often required to assess a family's credibility. Astonishingly, one family was denied residence given their religious orientation and lifestyle. Residents were found to desire other residents with similar social backgrounds and this, together with cultural homogeneity, was found to enable neighbourliness and community, with residents expressing friendships with their neighbours and the positive factors of all residents knowing one another and of sharing relationships with each other. Thus, desire for and attempts at homogeneity are apparent in both research findings. A distinct divergence can, however, be seen in this study's findings. Specifically, the same level of homogeneity does not appear to exist in these South African GCs and even amongst homogenous groups, community and neighbourliness appear to be very minimal. One potential understanding for such differences may be that one's socioeconomic standings gains a person access into these GCs, thereby, enabling diverse people to live in them,

although with certain GCs following more stringent entry procedures. This Istanbul GC contrastingly permits residence not only to those of a certain socioeconomic status, but also of particular occupation and education factors, cultural values, ideology and world view, and lifestyle. This rigorously maintained homogeneity was found to increase interaction and integration away from the "socially and culturally decaying city life" (Geniş, 2007, p. 784). This is unlike the findings of this research, where although the outer city life was similarly constructed negatively by participants, positive relations and friendships among residents were not found. The heterogeneity within the GCs of this research may offer one explanation for this difference.

These aspects of monitoring and control uncomfortably echo the practices of the apartheid state. Based on certain characteristics a person may be excluded from living there. Participant 10's elaboration on this screening of potential residents reinforces this:

> We have got the one [precinct] with the kids…the party group…we have actually noticed that there is…a culturally diverse group actually right next door here…that is where the most cultural differences are in the whole estate…we agreed Pebble Beach had the most culturally diverse…in one block, there is Indian, Chinese, Afrikaans, there is Black…and they are in one group… (Participant 10).

Within his GC, grouping of residents is highly monitored with those people considered similar being placed in a particular precinct, such as younger people believed to be suited to the "party group". Cultural segregation within the gates emerges clearly, with one area within the GC being culturally diverse while the others are to a greater extent culturally homogenous. The decided grouping of culturally diverse individuals in one area results in a maintenance of homogeneity, and difference or 'otherness' is kept apart and confined, reminiscent of the apartheid era (Foster, 2006; Lemanski, 2004; Neves, 2006). This unnatural grouping of people and prescribed living arrangement indicates a lack of integration within the gates, or perhaps more accurately, a devised system to promote segregation within the GCs. This is once again reminiscent of international research which found GCs to encourage socio-spatial segregation and division of culture (Geniş, 2007). The manufactured nature of GCs has been previously expressed, such as by Blakely and Snyder (1998, p. 69) who referred to these spaces as "artificial creations" and "faux communities designed to meet people's dreams…contrived rather than organic community in every respect, yet they do seem to meet their inhabitants' needs". As indicated by the findings of this research, these contrived communities seem to meet the needs of only particular groups, while others experience inequality, exclusion and discrimination.

Intensive monitoring is depicted in these findings and goals of homogeneous spaces seem to exist. The description of the procedures carried out by the GC of participant 10 suggests potential social cohesion among the separate groups who have mutual goals and cooperate with one another (Kearns & Forrest, 2000). Conformity is reported to foster closeness and cohesiveness (Mcmillan & Chavis, 1986), thus a SOC may exist between the discrete groups within the GC. However, from the perspective of GCs as a system, as a whole, evidence of social cohesion and SOC is unpromising in relation to the processes of power and control, tied closely to inter-group relations within the gates.

In place of tolerance and fairness (Kearns & Forrest, 2000) seems to be the purposeful construction of spaces of sameness, such as the grouping of young individuals or racially diverse individuals. Thus, it appears that not only are the GCs segregated from outside spaces, but segregation is taking place within the gates, suggesting a notion of segregation within segregation.

Illustrative of the interconnection across themes and sub-themes, sense of belonging appeared to be impacted on by the control implemented within the gates:

> There's too many red tapes…us as black people we have a lot of things that we're so care free...to me it's limited in a way. Without sounding racist I think that type of living is not meant for black people. Yes we can afford, we are free we can live there but it's too much red tape. I want to throw a party I want to go there and say 'Hey Mr. Jones I'm throwing a party or 21st birthday ... not write a letter and your committee to review… (Participant 6).

It may be that previous living experiences contribute to views such as this, where participant 6 described a vastly different lifestyle in Tembisa Township, where "red tape" as described appeared minimal.

Deficient SOC and social cohesion are indicated here. A lack of belonging, importance of the group, influence, conformity and reciprocity between participant and community is apparent upon application of elements of SOC (McMillan & Chavis, 1986). The GC space seems to create feelings of exclusion and to provide a way of life considered foreign, suggestive of limited coherence and integration and thus social cohesion (Giddens, as cited in Kearns & Forrest, 2000).

Wealth, Status, Class and Exclusivity

A prestige was commonly associated with living in a GC by the participants, ranging from the status accompanying housing exteriors to the exclusivity of being part of a higher class category. Money emerged strongly as an entry card into the GC and once more race was

interconnected in various ways. The meta-themes of exclusion, inequality and homogeneity frame much of the data within this theme and South Africa's history plays a pertinent role in its contextualisation. An interpretation of the findings is carried out using the social cohesion dimensions of social solidarity and reductions in wealth disparities (Kearns & Forrest, 2000) and socioeconomy: solidarity and social exclusion (Novy et al., 2012).

Some participants described how those outside the gates may perceive residence within the gates as representative of status and privilege, but that they themselves did not. Living in the GC appeared to concern choosing a home not status. All the participants expressed an attachment to their homes in the GCs, including those who described negative experiences, as discussed in previous themes. One potential reason for this attachment may be the finding that the advantage of an area increases attachment to that area (Stone & Hulse, 2007, p. ix). The advantage of safety has been considered, and additional factors such as the natural environment and facilities that the GCs offer, and which are available only to those with money, may similarly encourage the residents' attachment to their homes. This is suggestive of the complex nature of a GC and the multifarious factors that play a role in the subjective experiences of the residents, especially when considering that certain residents remain in the GC despite experiences of exclusion and discrimination.

Wealth and race were shown to be interconnected from the participants' perspectives:

> Driving in – most of the people I see coming through the gate are white residents…I was wondering whether it was to do still with I suppose economic luck. I suppose white people still have economic freedom, compared to black people…you've got to have money to live here really (Participant 5).
>
> It is majority white but we have noticed quite an increase in Asians especially this part, our part, every second house about is Asian and a couple of black families in between too but predominantly white. It is quite expensive to live here and obviously those black people and Asian people that live here, you can see they are well off, they can afford it (Participant 7).
>
> I seem to find more black people than…I did 2 years ago. So it is more accepting…BEE…they make more money. (Participant 9).

Participant 5 highlights a reality in South Africa where many white citizens were advantaged in the past with the consequences of this clear in the wealth discrepancies between races (Lemanski, 2004). These participants explain that money is needed to reside within the GCs and thus the estate is open only to those who can afford the high fees involved. The construction of the GC and the resources required to live there therefore exclude certain people, particularly those with less money. Although participant 9 reports greater acceptance of diverse racial groups within the gates it would appear that according to her statement, greater wealth among these groups allows them access into the gates, not increased tolerance

or acceptance. The discrimination, exclusion and inequality within the GCs that is described across the data supports this. Wealth may therefore be a surface-level homogenous factor that is over-powered by resistance to deeper heterogeneous characteristics of race and culture.

> It's a club and you pay a premium to live here so any house here, if it was built somewhere else, would cost a whole lot less but because it is here it costs more. So I suppose people, white people maybe are more prepared to pay that premium (Participant 5).

> Even the scummiest looking house…they cost a fortune…you have to earn a fair amount of money to live here…I think everybody is more of less on the same socioeconomic level (Participant 7).

By nature of being built within the GC the houses are more expensive and thus exclusive, thereby, preventing certain people from living there. Rather than white people being "more prepared" to pay the premiums, perhaps they are in fact able to, given the advantage gained by white people during the apartheid era. A circumnavigation of the reality appears to surface here, where participant 5 implies that all races can afford to live within the GC but choose not to. A denial of reality in line with internalised dominance appears evident here (Pheterson, as cited in Tappan, 2006), however unintentional this may be. The GC is constructed as a place which welcomes everyone; however, it does not given that only people of a certain socio-economic status can reside there. These localities therefore appear to be created in such a way that many people are excluded and only economically homogenous groups exist within them.

Financial homogeneity and related exclusivity have been found in GCs worldwide. Residents from a study conducted by Grant and Rosen (2009) shared that affluent residents are preferable and can become part of the exclusive club that is the GC, and one development representative participating in the same study said of a GC that "the fact that there are gates at the entrance to this project almost automatically tells you that there is something inside that is special" (p. 580). In South Africa, the indivisible connection between wealth, race and culture brings into consideration the function of GCs. An active choice is made by residents to live in an enclosed area that is only accessible to individuals with enough money, and although changes in wealth have and continue to occur for racial groups in the country, white people possess greater wealth (Nattrass & Seekings, as cited in Meyer & Finchilescu, 2006).

As has been illustrated in former themes, conflict exists between the diverse racial and cultural groups within the gates, and in discussions around these tensions it was mentioned by most black participants at some point that changes have occurred and more black people are now able to afford GC living. Increasing economic equality seemed to be used by these black participants to justify black peoples' residence within the gates and also to highlight the need

for acceptance and tolerance of all race and cultural groups since they can no longer be excluded on an affordability basis.

Racial divergences in views on the status and exclusivity of the GCs emerged:

> Do you think that by living in a residential estate there's a certain exclusivity and status? (Interviewer)
>
> Yes, it shows that you're made in life. Not everyone is fortunate to have their own space. It gives you that certain sense and status that you've made it in life and you're comfortable… to other people it might look different because you're not with your same race…I think…race now doesn't matter it's about people and people you share the same values with…to your peers, to the people that you grew up with, they're like 'wow she's made it in life and she's able to afford a bond and she doesn't have to share space…it's a privilege (Participant 8).
>
> Do you feel…there is elitism with living here? (Interviewer)
>
> No (Participant 9).
>
> Do you think…that there's a certain status that comes with it? (Interviewer)
>
> Probably yes and no. You can have those people that are down to earth and will see it as just a home, others will say, 'Oh my God, it's a golf estate how can you afford to live there?' (Participant 9).

Participant 8 and 9, both females, are not far apart in age yet their responses differ significantly. Participant 8 demonstrated no hesitancy in answering in the affirmative when questioned around the exclusivity and status that comes with living in a GC for her. It appears to represent a great accomplishment in life and having her own space and not having to share it with anyone is very significant, whereas for participant 9 a comparable response is absent. This potentially points to the racial disparities of the past where many white people have been advantaged and have experienced vastly different lives to those of many black people. Participant 9's response suggests her possible entitlement to such living conditions, an expectation of no less given her privileged living conditions from birth. A lesser appreciation of the space is portrayed due to different, perhaps less comfortable residences, having never been experienced by participant 9. The pride which comes with living in the GC for participant 8 is suggestive of previous dissimilar circumstances, for example her current ability to afford a bond and not having to share space with others.

Class emerged as significant within the gates and the prestige and status surrounding GCs was highlighted through comparison with lower class outside spaces. The clear exclusion of certain classes surfaced:

> If [Name of GC] looked like a how can I say, informal settlement, where there is clothes, dirty water, things like that, quality of life would be different, therefore you adjust your personal belongings to that because if you have a, say for example, you live in a five star golf estate, you will have naturally the best of the best. If you live in an informal settlement, you will have okay things because you don't want to be

> seen as better than somebody else (Participant 10).
>
> It is the same with white people. If we see a white hobo we wouldn't want to see him around here. I know we are going to push him out…the classes are quite defined (Participant 10).

Matters of class are found globally in research on GCs. The above findings match closely those presented by Geniş (2007), who conveyed that the wealthy GC residents are believed to intentionally isolate themselves from lower income groups.

Aspects of wealth, status, class and exclusivity presented above can be viewed as unifying factors among the participants and potentially GC residents as a whole. Across the data set there is consistency in relation to the affluence required to live within the GCs, the class distinctions between those within the gates and those beyond and the sense of exclusivity that comes with GC residence, including the ability to live there and the accompanying resources and facilities that this provides. In this way, unlike much of the findings within other themes, participants are homogeneous.

The internal GC space and the consistency relayed by the participants point to social cohesion according to the applied dimensions. Kearns and Forrest's (2000) dimension of social solidarity and reductions in wealth disparities involves varied groups within society, and in this instance the GC societies, developing towards common social, environmental and economic standards. The cost of living within the GCs, the maintenance of a specific class within the gates and the importance of image that was conveyed by participants suggests common standards and thus social cohesion. Class may be encompassed under social standards; however, if social standards are also to include social relations, socialising, connection and integration, as has been discussed in previous themes, social standards may not be common among the participants and residents. In addition, this dimension holds that social cohesion implies reduced poverty and inequalities in income, employment, and an increased quality of life among other elements. In relation to wealth, equality can be considered present given the need to have enough money to reside in the GC, and this is expressed by most participants.

This aligns closely with the dimension of socioeconomy: solidarity and social exclusion, which Novy et al. (2012) maintain involves fairness and equal opportunities being fostered by solidarity and declines in wealth disparities. As presented in the data, declines in wealth disparities have enabled more non-white individuals to make the choice to live in a GC, thereby contributing to social cohesion within the gates. However, as has been briefly discussed, the financial capacity and the decision to live in a GC does not seem to equate with

solidarity, fairness and equal opportunities beyond the level that fostered by similar wealth. This applies specifically to the experiences relayed by black participants who, despite their ability to afford residence within a GC, do not feel accommodated, experience exclusion and a lack of connection with other residents. Equal wealth thus appears to be limited in its impact on social cohesion. If this theme is considered in isolation, the wealth, status, class and exclusivity of the GCs as conveyed by the participants would seem to foster social cohesion. Nevertheless, the themes and their associated findings are interconnected and, thus, taken as a whole the social cohesion encouraged by wealth and exclusivity appears to be outweighed by the factors that draw away from social cohesion. The homogeneity of wealth, status, class and exclusivity seems to be overpowered by the heterogeneous factors of race and culture. Wealth allows for physical integration into the GCs but barriers remain which impede social integration, multiculturalism and productive inter-group relations.

Wealth, status, class and exclusivity may be said to have a greater impact on inter-group relations between the GC space and those outside of it. Novy et al. (2012) state that local cohesion may be positive inside GCs; however, social exclusion between these rich dwellings and poor neighbourhoods may be on the rise and in this way may be jeopardising cohesion in the cities as a whole. In South Africa, outside neighbourhoods may not only be those that are poor but also those that remain segregated from GCs. In addition, income inequality is reported to be detrimental to social cohesion (Kearns & Forrest, 2000) and the discrepancies in income between people that can live in a GC and those that cannot are immense. Social cohesion is said to involve a society which offers equal opportunities to all members (Dahrendorf, as cited in Novy et al., 2012). The exclusion of groups who cannot afford GC living and the segregation of classes and races by GCs (Lemanski, 2004) stand in direct contrast to this. Therefore, on a societal level, the wealth and exclusivity surrounding GCs appears damaging to social cohesion and inter-group relations.

Lifestyle

Lifestyle factors were frequently mentioned as advantages of living in the GCs. The aesthetics of the GCs, the outdoor and environmental focus, recreational facilities, convenience and reliable services were raised as favourable elements of GC living. The dimension of ecology: sustainability and ecological justice (Novy et al., 2012) is used for an interpretation of the findings.

> It's a beautiful community…we go for walks and there's a pond…there's jungle gyms so it's really lovely for the children… This estate especially is a beautiful estate to live in (Participant 1).

> We have got a little wildlife nature reserve …we have freedom (Participant 7).
>
> You can see the whole of the Magaliesberg mountains over the top there… you see a sunset…a normal open house…doesn't have that type of feel to it and the warmth (Participant 10).

The participants convey a comfort and accessibility within the GCs and an idyllic lifestyle is portrayed. These benefits of residing within the GCs align closely with that of the exclusivity connected to these spaces that was discussed under the fourth theme. Similarly, as has emerged repeatedly throughout the data, the communication of these advantages sets the GCs apart from other living areas and seems to serve to construct the GCs in a positive light and as different from outside spaces. Previous research has similarly found residents of South African GCs to list the natural environment as a motivating factor in choosing to live in the 'eco-estates' and to report satisfaction with the lifestyle offered to them within the gates (Lemanski et al., 2008).

The above findings were common among all the participants and point to enhanced social cohesion within the GCs. The relevant dimension involves the uneven distribution of the "goods and bads" of the environment both within and between a city (Novy et al., 2012, p. 1880), thus, in the context of the GCs all residents receive the goods of the environment and in this regard exclusion does not emerge. Social cohesion is said to require social as well as socio-ecological cohesion and fairness given the continuously re-emerging territory of cities (Novy et al., 2012). There is evidence of socio-ecological cohesion and fairness within the GCs. For example, participant 6 expresses a good quality of life in relation to the services provided within her GC, but in earlier themes this is not so from a social and relational perspective. Social cohesion may therefore be fostered by certain lifestyle elements, such as the ecological focus, aesthetical value and environmental benefits but restricted by the social aspects of life within the GCs. These findings stand in contrast to research that maintains that the recreational facilities that are available to all residents encourage community building (Li et al., 2012). Likewise, GC residents in further international research felt that social interaction, or neighbourliness, would be higher in a GC, with its physical boundaries and communal leisure facilities in comparison to a non-GC (Blandy & Lister, 2005). This is unlike the experiences found among the participants of this research, which largely involved little interaction with other residents and, in certain instances, much less social interaction and neighbourliness than in previous living areas with no physical boundaries and communal leisure facilities.

When asked to describe the quality of life within the GCs, safety was frequently provided by the residents as evidence of the good quality of life. Security was described by every participant at some point during the interviews as an advantage of living in the GC. Interesting variations in experienced quality of life within the gates did, however, emerge:

> How would you describe the quality of life here? (Interviewer)
>
> Wonderful, absolutely wonderful. It's safe, completely safe (Participant 1).

When this same question was posed to participant 6, her first response was as follows:

> If I have to compare it with the township it's a good quality of life, the services they run like whites you know… (Participant 6)

The diverse responses to this question point to an interesting distinction between the experiences of different racial groups within South Africa. It appears that well-run services were seldom associated with the quality of life for the white residents as this was perhaps not distinctly different from their experiences in other residential areas. This finding is suggestive of the disparate lived experiences of different racial groups in the country, where housing and service delivery have often been, and continue to be, unequally provided to these separate groups given their area of residence and socio-economic status (Neves, 2006). Representations of quality of life for the racially diverse residents varied, often seeming to be based on past experiences in different living areas, as well as current views on the world outside the gates, whether in terms of safety or service delivery. The varied responses are similarly suggestive of the participants' motives for moving into the GC, once again tied closely to previous experiences. In her communication around safety within the GC participant 11 illustrates this, and the contrast in her response to that of certain black participants is evident:

> That is the big draw card [safety], not the sense of community. The sense of community wasn't the reason I would have come here. In fact I actually didn't want to come for that reason (Participant 11).

This response, which echoes that of most white participants of this study, is unlike the results of existing South African research, where GC residents have moved into these spaces with the hope of a more open and unified community (Landman, 2000a). Rather, for these residents a more private and removed living area is desired. The response from participant 11 is clearly different from that of most black participants, who conveyed a desire for increased SOC within their GCs and, for some, the lack of community and social relations was in fact

found to foster feelings of mistrust and of being unsafe within the gates. Thus, across the data, increased security did not appear to result in greater interaction and SOC as maintained by Chavis and Wandersman (1990) and as has been found in international GCs (Blandy & Lister, 2005; Geniş, 2007). Contextual factors are likely relevant in this regard, where safety is not merely just that, but is rather linked to elements of race, culture and preferences for homogeneity. South African GCs are situated in a unique context which, as has emerged from the data of this study, involves the intersection of, and multi-directional influence between numerous elements. For example, the elements of safety, race, culture, and sameness described above. Furthermore, these elements are dynamic and continuously impacted on by other elements. The importance of taking into account the trends of the context surrounding GCs is thus clear (Landman, 2000b; Lemanski et al., 2008).

Furthermore, on a societal level social cohesion appears to be significantly strained according to the elements of the dimension (Novy et al., 2012). The environmental advantage offered by GCs is not often offered to those who reside outside the gates, for example the homeless (Mathiti, 2006) and residents of informal settlements (Lemanski, 2004). Uneven distribution of the bad and good elements of the environment is thus clear and social exclusion linked to problems of ecological fairness involving sustainability and urban development are similarly apparent when poverty-stricken areas and under-developed residences are considered.

Conclusion

This chapter presented the findings gathered through a thematic content analysis. Five themes were identified, with four meta-themes framing much of the data within them. In line with the interpretive paradigm of this study, this chapter centred on the residents' subjective experiences. The discussion included the use of existing literature and knowledge in relation to the findings, as well as the application of the theoretical framework tenets to allow for an interpretation of the findings. Multiple and diverse findings emerged, a synopsis of which is provided in the subsequent chapter, paying attention to the research questions guiding this study.

Chapter Five: Conclusion

Introduction

This chapter serves to provide a summary of this research study. First, a synopsis and discussion of the findings presented in chapter four in specific relation to the research questions posed, is presented. This is intended to offer a concise understanding of the experience of living in a GC with particular focus on the relational element of GC living, specifically SOC and social cohesion within these spaces. In addition, the overall influence of GCs on social interaction and inter-group relations is considered. The discussion includes relevant literature, and the significance of South African contextual issues is similarly incorporated. The strengths of the study are then discussed, including its significance and contributions to knowledge. Thereafter, limitations and directions for future research are discussed, followed by a final comment.

Overview of the Findings

The analysis conducted in chapter four included the presentation and discussion of the participants' subjective experiences of residing within a GC. The division of these experiences into multiple themes highlighted the multifaceted nature of GC living. Commonalities as well as divergences of experience among the participants emerged, with tensions and ambiguities surfacing across the data. The theoretical framework of this study allowed for an interpretation of the findings, which focused on the SOC and social cohesion reflected in the residents' experiences. This included an application of the framework dimensions and their respective elements to determine the existence or absence of SOC and social cohesion within the GCs, as well as factors that either enhance or detract from SOC and social cohesion. This interpretation spoke to the interaction of social relations and physical space. Underscoring much of the data within each theme were dynamics of discrimination, exclusion, homogeneity and inequality and thus they were set as meta-themes within the study. Furthermore, these dynamics placed as meta-themes were frequently linked to the factor of race, thereby, situating race as an overarching element within the data and as central to its interpretation. The uniqueness of the South African context in which the GCs and their residents are situated was significant within the analysis and interpretation conducted. The distinct conditions and characteristics of South Africa (Durington, 2009; Landman, 2000b) are important to bear in mind and undoubtedly influenced the subjective experiences relayed by the residents.

The seven residential security estates situated as the spaces of focus within this study encompass functions and characteristics from each of the three GC categories comprising Blakely and Snyder's (1999) typology, representative of the multiple functions which one GC may fulfill (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006). The leisure activities highlight the social statement made by lifestyle communities, aesthetics such as their impressive entrances speak to the status and exclusivity surrounding prestige communities, and finally security measures implemented within the GCs to ward off crime and decrease traffic portray their further function as security zone communities. The overlap between all the participants' experiences centred primarily on the satisfaction with the security provided within the GCs and the sense of safety this offered them. Similarly, commonalities emerged frequently in relation to the environments provided within the GCs, experiences of minimal influence as a resident, and the importance of a family orientated community was also expressed by many of the participants. As shown, particular experiences corresponded between many white residents, while black residents communicated similar experiences at times. These divergences between the black and white residents emerged particularly in relation to social interaction and inter-group relations as well as culture and values, many of which are presented and discussed in themes one and two.

Every participant relayed a subjective experience encompassing both advantages and disadvantages of living in a GC, each experience seeming to be guided in part by multiple factors including race, culture, age, gender, level of influence within the GCs, past experiences and ideas and beliefs about the places beyond the gates. These factors were often framed by dynamics of exclusion, discrimination, inequality and homogeneity, which at times emerged as benefitting some residents and not others. The subjective experiences of GC living included interactions with non-GC residents, both within and outside the GCs, to which the overarching dynamics described above were similarly applicable, and which were approached in a manner favouring the residents. This points to the negative influence of GCs on social interaction and inter-group relations between residents as well as between residents and non-residents. Context was regularly discussed in relation to the participants' experiences, given the importance of South African contextual factors when considering the existence of GCs in the country (Landman, 2000b; Lemanski et al., 2008) as well as the relevance of these factors to the participants' descriptions.

Taking into account the nuances of each subjective account, generally it was evident that the white participants experienced living in a GC as more positive and satisfactory in comparison to most black participants, excluding participant 8 whose experience aligned

more closely to that of the white residents. The other black participants did express satisfaction with, and enjoyment of, certain GC characteristics; however, unlike the white participants they also described negative experiences within the GCs involving discrimination, exclusion and inequality. Furthermore, two black participants expressed continued and strong place attachment to their previous living areas in comparison to the GC. In contrast, the findings suggested satisfactory place attachment for the white participants. It is important to bear in mind, however, that many elements likely combine to construct each individual experience and tensions and ambiguities emerged from the accounts provided by the participants. In particular, the division between the experiences of the racially diverse participants, discussed here briefly and presented in chapter four, was not always clear-cut. The complexity of the GCs is highlighted here, where diverse people occupy a space together, both of which are influenced in certain ways by contextual factors.

An overall absence of SOC and social cohesion emerged through an analysis of the findings and strained inter-group relations within the GCs were clear. This analysis revealed multiple and often interconnected factors that detracted from SOC and social cohesion and this complexity seems to be representative of the intricacies of the South African context, including racial identities, history, culture and local governance (Durington, 2009). GCs have been erected within this convoluted context and therefore it is not surprising that they evoke such layered meaning, as that which emerged from the data.

Some residents' experiences do suggest SOC and social cohesion and elements of the dimensions are present, such as working together for a safe and peaceful environment, reliance on neighbours, reciprocal influence within the gates, abiding by the set rules and procedures and a similar socio-economic status with other residents. Factors that appeared to enhance SOC and social cohesion included safety, having children and a desire for a family orientated community, a preference for sameness among residents and wanting an aesthetically and environmentally pleasing setting. However, what stands out from the findings despite descriptions of social interaction and working together for mutual goals and needs, is an absence of social relations with other residents and a focus limited primarily to oneself and to the family within the house. The participants were divided, with some expressing a desire for social relations, increased social interaction and SOC, while more participants preferred it as it was. The results point to the participants focusing on themselves and doing what is in their best interests and the exceptions to this are limited. Furthermore, for the participants who communicated what may be described as a collectivist culture orientation, there appear to be few opportunities to connect with other residents and form

meaningful relationships with them. Factors detracting from SOC and social cohesion included fear of crime, suspicion of difference, an individualistic cultural focus of certain residents, power differentials, and heterogeneity, such as difference in race, class, culture and age. The findings indicate a lack in the relational, collective and unified elements which are central to the definitions of SOC (McMillan, as cited in McMillan & Chavis, 1986) and social cohesion (Kearns & Forrest, 2000).

The findings point to the negative influence that GCs have on social interaction and inter-group relations, at the level of a GC as well as broader societal levels. As discussed in the findings chapter, safety emerged as a primary commonality among all the participants and was expressed as a major advantage of living within a GC. The social identity theory may offer one way to frame this unity against crime that emerged. Specifically, the categorisation component of this theory refers to the exaggeration of perceived inter-group differences and similarities (Foster, 2006). Across the data there is a frequent generalisation of groups outside the gates as dangerous and threatening to those within the GCs, serving to reinforce the in-group and their identity. Categorising groups outside the GCs as untrustworthy and unsafe inversely places those within the gates as trustworthy and safe. This may indicate one function of the GCs; to exclude certain groups of people and attempt to create a more homogenous community.

The tensions and inconsistencies that were found in the data show that SOC and social cohesion were not merely absent or present, but were rather present in certain instances and absent in others for particular residents. Interestingly, however, even when the findings pointed to SOC and social cohesion, an underlying lack of relational, social and community elements was apparent. Inconsistencies communicated by the participants speak to the complexity of the GC environment, wherein elements of race, culture, tradition, lifestyle factors, class, and physical elements of the residential environment intertwine. This appears to result in a melting pot of multi-level diversity which receives primarily two broad overt responses according to the data; namely ambivalence and neutrality. Participant responses point to a racial, and thus cultural, trend in their reactions to the multifaceted diversity within the gates. Ambivalence appeared to be depicted predominantly in the data of many black participants who at times relayed a desire for greater acceptance of diversity and integration within the gates but who at other times relayed a rejection of this. This may be representative of the transition from markedly different living environments described by these participants, specifically a move from more homogenous to heterogeneous environments in terms of culture, race and lifestyle. White participants conveyed primarily neutral reactions towards

the compound diversity in which they find themselves; however, upon analysis of their overt responses a covert ambivalence, and at times rejection, is indicated. This is not to suggest that it is only the white participants who may view difference negatively and who avoid it, as across the data of all participants a strong desire for homogeneity emerged as well as indications of discrimination to varying degrees. Nevertheless, what stands out from the data is the discrimination experienced by certain black participants, which no white participant communicated at any point. Discrimination against white individuals is not refuted but this research project gives focus to the GC context, a space in which exclusion and discrimination is experienced primarily by black residents according to the data. Race can thus be viewed as a principal component when exploring SOC and social cohesion within GCs given its infiltration into so many aspects of GC living relayed by the research participants.

Heterogeneity surfaced consistently as a barrier to connection between residents and community building. In particular, difference in terms of race, culture, levels of control within the gates and a general 'otherness' between residents was found to prevent social relations, interaction and integration. Difference was also found to be linked to exclusion, inequality and discrimination for residents who formed minority groups within the gates, such as black residents and those with minimal levels of influence and control within the GCs. A lack of trust between residents emerged for both black and white participants from the data and this was frequently associated with racial and cultural heterogeneity, where greater heterogeneity lead to decreased trust. Given participant responses, a cycle may exist whereby limited social interaction and social relations hinder trust between residents and this lack of trust in turn prevents social relations, suggesting weak social cohesion in this regard. A significant racial difference in this occurrence lies in that for white participants it appears that the continuation of the current separation and minimal social interaction with other residents maintains feelings of safety, whereas increased interaction and meaningful relations with other residents would seem to foster a greater sense of safety for certain black residents. Thus, although both black and white participants express a desire for and/or an enjoyment of homogeneity at some point in the data, it is the black participants who express a desire to interact and develop social relations with other groups within the gates. The collectivist-individualist cultural division may thus play a central role here, as discussed in chapter four. Cultural difference appeared to be central to social interaction and one determining factor of inter-group relations within the GCs. Given these diverse experiences, it may be that GCs cater primarily for particular cultures, and therefore races, and in doing so exclude others. Although no cultural or racial group is prohibited from living within the gates, once having

entered them, separation, exclusion and estrangement appear to be experienced by certain groups.

The social exclusion that appears to exist does not align with the dimensions relevant to the theme of inter-group relations that were discussed in chapter four and points to a deficiency in SOC and social cohesion within the GCs. This lack is especially evident from a racial perspective as exclusionary practices and discrimination appear to be aimed primarily towards black residents and staff. If this occurrence is considered in isolation, a sense of hopelessness may surround integration and inter-group relations within GCs. Instead, descriptions by the participants of greater interaction between racially and culturally diverse children within and outside the gates, as well as between domestic workers and children, may bode well for future integration and inter-group relations that may extend beyond the perimeters of the gates.

Race in addition played a role among younger generational groups within the gates, with greater multi-racial interaction and integration stated to be taking place between children. This appears to be suggestive of the effects of the racial inequality imposed on South Africa's past, where racial distinctions and the meaning attached to these remain relevant among older generations and which have, and continue to, impact social interaction between diverse racial groups. Given participant responses it may be that such differences and the associated assumptions are less significant among younger individuals, perhaps due to their birth in post-1994 South Africa. Descriptions of the interaction between children both within the gates and outside that were provided by the participants may suggest greater tolerance, respect, unity and integration amongst younger, diverse generations and thus a potential, and hopeful, continuation of this in the future. Ratele (2006, p. 9) refers to South Africa as "a society negotiating change, from apartheid state to an inclusive multi-racial democracy" and this change may be represented in part by the social interaction taking place between children within the GCs.

A natural environment, safety, common space and similarity between residents has been found to contribute to community relations (Chavis & Wandersman, 1990; Geniş, 2007; Pretty et al., 2006). This research contrastingly indicates minimal community relations, despite safety, natural environments and common space. Perhaps the lack of similarity between residents across dimensions of race, culture, background and age overshadows those factors that existing research has found to contribute to SOC and social cohesion (for example, Blandy & Lister, 2005; Geniş, 2007; Grant & Mittelsteadt, 2004; Landman, 2000a).

Instead, the results correspond with those of research that has found lower SOC within GCs and a negative effect of gating on social interaction (Li et al., 2012; Sakip et al., 2012).

Not only was SOC and social cohesion found to be limited within the GCs, but between GC residents and the wider society as well. Much South African research on GCs considers the segregation promoted by these enclaves and the detrimental effect they likely have on relations between those inside and those outside (Durington, 2009; Hook & Vrdoljak, 2002; Lemanski, 2004; Lemanski et al., 2008). Worldwide the concern is that GCs are separating citizens and creating fragmented and unequal societies, and in South Africa this is viewed as perpetuating "the social divisions that were inherent in the apartheid state into the post-apartheid context" (Lemanski, 2004, p. 101). As Seekings (2008, p. 2) states; "it would be astonishing if post-apartheid South African society was not shaped profoundly by the experience of apartheid". Contextual factors were clearly relevant to the findings of this research and racial elements, tied to South Africa's apartheid past of discrimination based on race, frequently emerged in residents' subjective experiences.

A notable thread running throughout the data in relation to race and integration is the response pattern to questions posed around discrimination within the GCs. White residents primarily answered immediately to point to a lack of discrimination within the gates. In contrast, the black residents were more likely to describe discrimination and inequality within the gates, specifically that which was personally experienced. This is an interesting phenomenon that may be understood in the context of South Africa's past. The white residents were highly unlikely to relay racial discrimination, and appeared firm in the stance that it does not take place within the gates. In addition, many appeared to avoid discussion around race and certain residents became visibly uncomfortable at the mention of race and discrimination. On the contrary, some black residents did describe racial discrimination, often intertwined with cultural inequality experienced in the GCs. Although apartheid is past it may be that to talk of racism, or simply of racial differences and related factors, as a white person is to accept the role of an oppressor and induce feelings of guilt. The notion of internalised dominance may assist in framing this phenomenon among the white residents. Internalised domination is defined as follows:

> The incorporation and acceptance by individuals within a dominant group of prejudices against others. Internalized domination is likely to consist of feelings of superiority, normalcy, and self righteousness, together with guilt, fear, projection, denial of reality, and alienation from one's body and from nature. Internalized domination perpetuates oppression of others and alienation from oneself by either

> denying or degrading all but a narrow range of human possibilities. One's own humanity is thus internally restricted and one's qualities of empathy, trust, love, and openness to others and to life-enhancing work become rigid and repressed (Pheterson, as cited in Tappan, 2006, p. 2120).

A denial of reality appears to be widespread across the data of many white participants, who provide responses that would seem to construct their GCs as utopias where all residents live in harmony and where discrimination, inequality and exclusion are absent. For example, one white participant placed black people in positons of equal economic possession who choose not to reside within the gates, rather than openly discussing the clear reality of white South Africans who have higher socio-economic statuses in comparison to the majority of the members of race groups who have been previously disadvantaged (Nattrass & Seekings, in Meyer & Finchilescu, 2006). Furthermore, particular results are suggestive of a restriction of humanity, a lack of openness to others and a mistrust of groups which are 'different' to their own.

The white participants' avoidance of both the topic of race and their experiences with race within the gates seems to contribute to the creation of two very different settings within the individual GCs. In relation to racial discrimination and inequality, a utopia within the GCs is created, where such incidences do not take place and where all groups live harmoniously. In contrast, the black participants engagement with the topic of race in the GCs creates a vastly different picture, one where certain racial and cultural groups feel excluded, where inequality and discrimination is experienced and where their own racial and cultural heterogeneity is resisted. In describing their subjective experiences of residing within the gates, two incompatible worlds are illustrated by the participants, with race being the dividing factor. The GC experience thus appears to be greatly influenced by the resident's race. Rather than this discussion around the findings from the data being viewed as an attack on white people and specifically the white GC residents of this study, it serves to relay the divergent experiences of the racial groups within the gates and an attempt to understand them. Such a discussion may also be fruitless if not placed against the backdrop of the South Africa's history which is marked by multiple discriminations. Thus, the intention is not to blame certain participants, but to relay their experiences and attempt to make sense of these, including framing them within pertinent South African history. The subjective nature of this attempt and associated limitations was noted in chapter three.

As mentioned above, the varied findings of this research indicate both positive and negative aspects of GCs and residing within one; however, what is also apparent is

appropriately described by Roitman (2005, p. 307) who states that although there are positive effects of GCs, "the negative impacts of segregation are more evident and dangerous in terms of society as a whole". Furthermore, a consideration of the internal dynamics of the GCs separate from the wider society appear equally dangerous. Thus, the results of this research indicate a primarily negative influence of GCs on social interaction and inter-group relations and limited SOC and social cohesion within the gates. As maintained by Lemanski et al. (2008), while on an individual level gating may be rational due to increasing crime in South Africa, the collective consequence is a divided city where principles of equality and unity in a post-apartheid context are countered.

Strengths and Contributions to Knowledge

This study highlighted gaps in the literature with regard to where the focus of research on GCs is aimed as well as the types of research conducted on this topic. Limited South African literature on GCs focused on the internal dynamics within GCs, via residents' subjective experiences and perspectives. Rather, attention was frequently given to the impact of these enclaves on the wider society, overlooking internal occurrences and divergences within the gates. This research had a primarily interior-directed emphasis in its exploration around GCs; however, this investigation was indivisible from external, widespread circumstances and events. Comparable to existing research, this study highlighted the interconnection between GCs and those spaces beyond the gates; however, this was achieved via a different route to much of the reviewed literature, looking closely at the processes within the gates from the perspective of the residents, who can be considered intimately tied to these processes.

Given the increasing popularity of residing within these enclaves in South Africa (Durington, 2006; Landman, 2004) and the associated intricate context in which these locations and their residents are subsumed (Landman, 2000b), further research on GCs may be valuable. Previous research has conveyed certain concerns regarding GCs (for example, Hook & Vrdoljak, 2002; Landman, 2000a; Lemanski, 2004); however, future research focusing its lens within the gates, with attention given to the internal dynamics among residents as well as to the processes and procedures, may throw further light on the function and impact of GCs both within and beyond the gates. This may assist to enhance understandings of these spaces and their occupants as well as the potential implications of these areas. This research has been carried out in an attempt to build on this knowledge, however, it is by no means an exhaustive account and additional research can contribute to and enrich the existing knowledge base of the GC phenomenon.

The qualitative focus of this study in which semi-structured interviews were conducted with GC residents appears limited in both South African and International research on GCs. This study, therefore, offered a distinct exploration and viewpoint concerning GCs. Furthermore, the interviewing of diverse groups across factors of age, gender and race contributed to the unique perspective provided of the GC phenomenon. It pointed to the intersection between these factors and living in a GC, thereby bringing to the fore a complexity not often exposed by existing literature, via the direct source of the residents themselves. The limitation of the small sample size is discussed below.

Limited investigation of SOC and social cohesion within GCs emerged from the reviewed literature (for examples, see Blandy & Lister, 2005; Landman, 2004; Sakip et al., 2012). The inclusion of the interconnection between these constructs and inter-group relations similarly appears to be novel in its application. This study therefore contributes to knowledge around South African residential security estates, considering these spaces and their inhabitants from a different perspective.

The relationship between race and space has been illustrated in existing research (for example, Alexander, 2007; Finchilescu et al., 2007; Holtman et al., 2005). This study contributes to such work and highlights the tenuous, deep-seated and perpetual matters of race and culture within the GC space. By including racially diverse residents in the study, varied experiences and realities of race within the space were conveyed. As presented and discussed in chapter four, the impact of race and culture on experiences of residing within a specific space, particularly in terms of relations with others, is complex.

In line with the intersection of race and space, the theoretical framework utilised in this research is unique in its application to the topic of GCs. The SOC dimensions outlined by McMillan and Chavis (1986), together with the social cohesion dimensions put forward by Kearns and Forrest (2000) and Novy et al. (2012) provided a framework for this research within which the findings could be interpreted, specifically from a social relations perspective. In addition, elements of these dimensions allowed for exploration and discussion around the physical space of the GCs, highlighting to some extent the intersection of social relations and physical space. The indivisibility of contextual factors from people and their relations within that context highlights the potential value of a framework with a social and relational basis, one that did not emerge often within existing literature.

A further methodological strength concerns the in-depth process of analysis carried out, with Braun and Clarke's (2006) steps of thematic content analysis serving to guide this process while allowing for flexibility and certain departures. This allowed for continuous

thorough engagement with the data and thus also with the processes of interpretation and discussion. While bearing in mind the concerns around subjective interpretation, establishing quality was endeavoured towards through processes of trustworthiness, transparency and rigour, as discussed fully in chapter three.

Limitations

Methodological limitations are apparent within this research. The small sample size of 11 participants results in the limited generalisability of the findings. The sample size allowed for an inductive exploration together with detailed descriptions and understandings consistent with qualitative research (Terre Blanche et al., 2006); however, the varied findings cannot be considered representative of all GCs and their residents. While the results of this study may be similar for other GC residents, this cannot be assumed, and the findings identified across the diverse age, race and gender groups may alter significantly if greater numbers of these respective groups are included in such a study. The findings pointed to complex and numerous interrelated factors in the experiences described by only a small number of participants, which cannot be considered to be representative of other populations, particularly when the broader South African context and its multifarious elements are taken into account.

Divergences and tensions within the findings were presented in chapter four and suggestions were postulated with regard to these. For example, certain responses indicated divergences and movement towards unity and integration; however, individual factors may account for these and they may not signify the possibilities stated in the discussion. A larger and more diverse sample would thus be beneficial in this regard.

The use of semi-structured and not structured interviews prevented complete uniformity in the way each interview was carried out, thereby, potentially influencing the findings and allowing for increased researcher subjectivity. Nevertheless, the benefits of utilising semi-structured interviews were considered (Kajornboon, 2005) and the flexibility afforded by this data collection tool allowed for communication which yielded detailed and pertinent data that may otherwise have remained unsaid.

The researcher's limited experience in conducting qualitative interviews may have impacted the data collection process and thus the findings which emerged through analysis. Although attention was paid to using prompt questions in order that relevant data was gathered as well as to delve deeply enough into certain situations (Kajornboon, 2005) engagement with the interview transcripts during analysis revealed instances where this may

have been achieved more effectively. For example, at times the researcher's responses appeared to end discussion prematurely, and further exploration would likely have proven beneficial in gaining more detailed information in relation to the areas under investigation.

Given the interpretive nature of the research, the researcher's biases, values and background needed to be identified due to their potential influence on the interpretations made (Creswell, 2009); however, complete objectivity and neutrality is not possible (Snape & Spencer, 2003) and thus significant information may have gone unnoticed and imbalanced attention may have been given to certain aspects of the data and not to other equally relevant information. The subjective and exploratory quality of the research directed the entire process in a specific direction. Macbeth (2001, p. 46) conveys how "the authors' purposes over the course of the project are perhaps the most regular objects of their reflexive criticism". The earliest research processes, such as the development of the research question(s), can be viewed as conveying a very particular purpose and are asserted to be influenced by the researcher's subjectivities (Maso, 2003). Moreover, the interview guide was composed of questions created by the researcher. Alternative questions may have revealed significantly different but valuable information, thereby, enabling the provision of diverse answers and additional relevant content regarding the participants' subjective experiences, indications around SOC and social cohesion as well as inter-group relations, which may have been overlooked.

The interview guide resulted in the construction of particular transcripts, which are all intentional texts from which the analysis is conducted (Macbeth, 2001). The interpretation and discussion were thus similarly impacted by the researcher's bias. The ripple effect of the researcher's earliest decisions in the research process are thus evident and point to the construction of particular findings and interpretations representative of only one reality that is influenced by the researcher's interests, values, experience and understandings and can be changed and reconstructed (Tindall, 2001). The limitation here lies not only in the likely bias and oversights inherent in the research, but also in the general qualitative research process of identifying these and the intention thereof. This extends to the possibility that awareness and communication of researcher subjectivity may improve neither the methodology nor the representations of the research study (Macbeth, 2001; Pillow, 2003), as discussed in chapter three.

The limits of applying an international framework to highly context-specific findings present a further limitation. Numerous elements of the theoretical framework provided a relevant structure on which to carry out an interpretation of the findings; however, it did not

adequately make room for pertinent contextual issues, such as race and the present-day impact of past events. While these matters were included comprehensively within the discussion as they could not be dissociated from the findings, this what not due to their presence as elements of the framework. The complexity of South Africa's contextual issues are vast (Landman, 2000b) and applying an international framework to South African research may result in a loss of significant information as well as findings, results and recommendations that are less applicable and useful in a South African context.

Directions for Future Research

Numerous areas may be further researched in line with this study. The abovementioned limitations provide potential avenues for further research. Use of larger sample sizes as well as greater diversity of participants along lines of race, age and gender would allow for increased generalisability of the findings. Furthermore, this may allow for greater consistency across the findings, for example the distinctions between the experiences of racially diverse participants.

The findings of the study pointed to distinct differences in subjective experiences among the diverse age groups, particularly with regard to relations with both GC and non-GC residents. Carrying out similar research with younger participants may therefore yield different results, pointing to the complexity of the past and present South African context and its effect on inter-group relations.

Race infiltrated much of the data and subsequent findings and discussion. As noted, the research process is inevitably influenced by the researcher (Tindall, 2001) and the researcher's race likely played a significant role during data collection. Qualitative researchers are indivisible from the research (Tindall, 2001) and racially diverse researchers may conduct future comparable studies given the impact that the race of this study's researcher appeared to have during data collection.

This research paid attention to SOC, social cohesion and related inter-group relations within residential security estates, resulting in multifaceted findings and potential implications both within these GCs as well as for the context at large. Further research may investigate comparable constructs within diverse residential spaces, such as townships, suburbs and varied types of GCs. The relevance of SOC, social cohesion and inter-group relations in the South African context (Landman, 2004; Ratele, 2006) renders such research valuable, the findings of which may be used first for deeper understanding followed by

potential action for intervention, such as that to increase SOC and foster productive inter-group relations.

Much of the data points to racial disparities, including desired racial homogeneity among certain participants as well as experiences of exclusion expressed by black residents. This research focuses on the GC space; other residential spaces may involve equally evident racial dynamics. Researching these alternative spaces may allow for the recognition of parallels and divergences regarding issues of race, thereby, suggesting potential enhancing and detracting factors for productive racial relations within residences. Such an increased understanding may be beneficial in a country where race is not a detached factor but is rather embedded in the context and is tied so often to matters of concern that constantly arise (Ratele, 2006).

Final Comment

The subjective experience of residing within a GC was explored in this study. An analysis and interpretation of these experiences, gathered through a thematic content analysis, pointed to the influence of GCs on social interaction and inter-group relations between those within the gates and between those within and outside the gates. In addition, a more focused exploration on GCs and social relations involved the investigation of SOC and social cohesion within GCs. The varied findings that emerged from the analysis were frequently associated with the diverse characteristics of the residents, and it was this diversity that appeared to contribute strongly to strained and limited social relations within the GCs. This research revealed no straightforward, unanimous findings and answers to the research questions. Overall, however, limited SOC and social cohesion within the GCs emerged, with seemingly enhancing factors of SOC and social cohesion being founded on an individual focus rather than on community and social relations. Furthermore, the GCs emerged as having a primarily negative influence on social interaction and inter-group relations, both at the level of the GC and the broader societal level. Pertinent contextual issues were frequently associated with these findings, particularly South Africa's history of racial segregation and inequality. The findings of this study both corresponded and diverged with existing research that has focused on GCs, their influence on multiple levels, the link between context and GCs, SOC and GCs as well as connections between SOC and social cohesion and space. A clear emergence from this study, however, was the connection between race and the spaces of GCs, which limited existing research appears to have focused on.

References

Abdullah, A., Salleh, M. N. M., & Sakip, S. R. M. (2012). Fear of crime in gated and non-gated residential areas. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences, 35*, 63-69.

Alexander, L. (2007). Invading pure space: Disrupting black and white racially homogenised spaces. *South African Journal of Psychology, 37*(4), 738-754.

Anderson, R. (2007). *Thematic content analysis (TCA): Descriptive presentation of qualitative data*. Retrieved from http://www.wellknowingconsulting.org/publications/pdfs/ThematicContentAnalysis.pdf

Ardalan, K. (2011). Democracy: Four paradigmatic views. *Journal of Alternative Perspectives in the Social Sciences, 3*(1), 104-146.

Atkinson, R., & Blandy, S. (2005). Introduction: International perspectives on the new enclavism and the rise of gated communities. *Housing Studies, 20*(2), 177-186.

Ballard, R. (2004). Middle class neighbourhoods or 'African kraals'? The impact of informal settlements and vagrants on post-apartheid white identity. *Urban Forum, 15*(1), 48-73.

Barry, M. B., Dewar, D., Whittal, J. F., & Muzondo, I. F. (2007). Land conflicts in informal settlements: Wallacedene in Cape Town, South Africa. *Urban Forum, 18*, 171-189.

Bekink, B. (2006). *Municipal services and service delivery and the basic functional activities of municipal governments*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Pretoria, Pretoria [Tshwane], South Africa.

Beumer, C. (2010, June). *Social cohesion in a sustainable urban neighbourhood*. Working paper for Sustainable Urban Neighbourhoods (SUN), Netherlands.

Blakely, E. J., & Snyder, M. G. (1998). Forting up: Gated communities in the United States. *Journal of Architectural and Planning Research, 15*(1), 61-72.

Blakely, E. J., & Snyder, M. G. (1999). *Fortress America: Gated communities in the United States.* Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Blandy, S., & Lister, D. (2005). Gated communities: (Ne)gating community development? *Housing Studies, 20*(2), 287-301.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77-101.

Breakwell, G. M. (2006). Interviewing methods. In G. M. Breakwell, S. Hammond, C. Fife-Schaw, & J. A. Smith (Eds.), *Research methods in psychology* (3rd ed., pp. 232-253). London, UK: Sage.

Burger, J. (2009). *The reasons behind service delivery protests in South Africa*. Retrieved August 7, 2012, from http://www.polity.org.za/article/the-reasons-behind-service-delivery-protests-in-south-africa-2009-08-05

Burr, V. (2003). *Social constructionism* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Routledge.

Cameron, S., Gilroy, R., & Miciukiewicz, K. (2009). Social cohesion in housing and neighbourhood research in Europe. *Urban Studies*. Retrieved December 15, 2012, from http://www.socialpolis.eu/uploads/tx_sp/EF03_Paper.pdf

Campbell, C. (2006). HIV/Aids: Politics and inter-group relations. In K. Ratele (Ed.), *Inter-group relations: South African Perspectives* (pp. 171-192). Cape Town, SA: Juta & Co.

Chase, J. (2008). Their space: Security and service workers in a Brazilian gated community. *The Geographical Review, 98*(4), 476-495.

Chavis, D. M., Hogge, J. H., McMillan, D. W., & Wandersman, A. (1986). Sense of community through Brunswik's lens: A first look. *Journal of Community Psychology, 14*(1), 24-40.

Chavis, D. M., & Wandersman, A. (1990). Sense of community in the urban environment: A catalyst for participation and community development. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 18*(1), 55-81.

Clark, S. L. (2012). In search of housing: Urban families in rural contexts. *Rural Sociology, 77*(1), 110-134.

Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, Chapter 2, s12(1)(c) (1996). Republic of South Africa.

Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, Chapter 2, s21(3) (1996). Republic of South Africa.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dirsuweit, T. (2002). Johannesburg: Fearful city? *Urban Forum, 13*(3), 3-19.

Dupuis, A., & Thorns, D. (2008). Gated communities as exemplars of 'forting up' practices in a risk society. *Urban Policy and Research, 26*(2), 145-157.

Durington, M. (2006). Race, space and place in suburban Durban: An ethnographic assessment of gated community environments and residents. *GeoJournal, 66*(1-2), 147-160.

Durington, M. (2009). Suburban fear, media and gated communities in Durban, South Africa. *Home Cultures, 6*(1), 71-88.

Durrheim, K. (2005). Socio-spatial practice and racial representations in a changing South Africa. *South African Journal of Psychology, 35*(3), 444-459.

Eagle, G. (2012). *Ethical issues and procedures in conducting research*. Lecture slides, Department of Psychology, University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa.

Evans, S. (2010). The unsettling urban uncanny: The case of secured settlements. *Image & Narrative, 11*(3), 111-121.

Farley, R., & Frey, W. H. (1994). Changes in the segregation of whites from blacks during the 1980s: Small steps toward a more integrated society. *American Sociological Review, 59,* 23-45.

Finchilescu, G., Tredoux, C., Mynhardt, J., Pillay, J., & Muianga, L. (2007). Accounting for lack of interracial mixing amongst South African university students. *South African Journal of Psychology, 37*(4), 720-737.

Forrest, R., & Kearns, A. (2001). Social cohesion, social capital and the neighbourhood. *Urban Studies, 38*(12), 2125-2143.

Foster, D. (2005). Racialisation and the micro-ecology of contact. *South African Journal of Psychology, 35*(3), 494-504.

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

Geniş, S. (2007). Producing elite localities: The rise of gated communities in Istanbul. *Urban Studies, 44*(4), 771-798.

Gergen, K. J. (1985). The social constructionist movement in modern psychology. *American Psychologist, 40*(3), 266-275.

Gergen, K. J. (2009). *An invitation to social constructionism* (2nd ed.). London, UK: SAGE.

Grant, J., & Mittelsteadt, L. (2004). Types of gated communities. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design, 31*(6), 913-930.

Grant, J. L., & Rosen, G. (2009). Armed compounds and broken arms: The cultural production of gated communities. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 99*(3), 575-589.

Hammett, D. (2010). Ongoing contestations: The use of racial signifiers in post-apartheid South Africa. *Social Identities, 16*(2), 247-260.

Hidalgo, M. C., & Hernández, B. (2001). Place attachment: Conceptual and empirical questions. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 21*(3), 273-281.

Holtman, Z., Louw, J., Tredoux, C., & Carney, T. (2005). Prejudice and social contact in South Africa: A study of integrated schools ten years after apartheid. *South African Journal of Psychology, 35*(3), 473-493.

Hook, D. (2004). Frantz Fanon and racial identity in post-colonial contexts. In K. Ratele, N. Duncan, D. Hook, N. Mkhize, P. Kiguwa, & A. Collins (Eds.), *Self, Community & Psychology* (pp. 6-1 - 6-22). Cape Town, SA: UCT Press.

Hook, D., & Vrdoljak, M. (2002). Gated communities, heterotopia and a 'rights' of privilege: A 'heterotopology' of the South African security-park. *Geoforum, 33*(2), 195-219.

Hook, D., & Vrdoljak, M. (2006). 'Fortress society': The 'gated community' and the politics of space, exclusion, privilege. In K. Ratele (Ed.), *Inter-group relations: South African perspectives* (pp. 235-254). Cape Town, SA: Juta & Co.

Hulse, K., & Stone, W. (2006). *Housing, housing assistance and social cohesion*. Australia: Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute.

Hussain, A. (2013). Trauma of apartheid in Nadine Gordimer's My Son's Story. *Indian Streams Research Journal, 2*(12), 1-3.

James, B. (2004). *Community attachment: Determinants, indicators and measures*. Wellington, NZ: Foundation for Research, Science and Technology.

Johnston, R., Poulsen, M., & Forrest, J. (2005). Ethnic residential segregation across an urban system: The Maori in New Zealand, 1991-2001. *The Professional Geographer, 57*(1), 115-129.

Kajornboon, A. B. (2005). *Using interviews as research instruments*. Retrieved January 23, 2013, from http://www.culi.chula.ac.th/e-journal/bod/annabel.pdf

Kearns, A., & Forrest, R. (2000). Social cohesion and multilevel urban governance. *Urban Studies, 37*(5), 995-1017.

Kenna, T. (2010). Fortress Australia? (In)security and private governance in a gated residential estate. *Australian Geographer, 41*(4), 431-446.

Kiguwa, P. (2006). Social constructionist accounts of inter-group relations and identity. In K. Ratele (Ed.), *Inter-group relations: South African Perspectives* (pp. 111-136). Cape Town, SA: Juta & Co.

Kiguwa, P. (2006). The rainbow nation: Constructs of national identity in post-apartheid South Africa. In G. Stevens, V. Franchi, & T. Swart (Eds.), *A race against time: Psychology and challenges to deracialisation in South Africa* (pp. 317-334). Pretoria, SA: University of South Africa.

Kim, J., & Kaplan, R. (2004). Physical and psychological factors in sense of community: New urbanist Kentlands and nearby Orchard. *Environment and Behavior, 36*(3), 313-340.

Landman, K. (2000a). *An overview of enclosed neighbourhoods in South Africa.* Pretoria, SA: CSIR Publication.

Landman, K. (2000b). *Gated communities: An international review.* Pretoria, SA: CSIR Publication.

Landman, K. (2000c, July). *The urban future: Enclosed neighbourhoods?* Paper presented at the Urban Futures Conference, South Africa.

Landman, K. (2002a, June). *Gated communities in South Africa: Building bridges or barriers?* Paper presented at the International Conference on Private Urban Governance, Germany.

Landman, K. (2002b, September). *Planning in the African context: Reconsidering current approaches to gated communities in South Africa.* Paper presented at the Planning Africa 2002: Regenerating Africa through planning Conference, South Africa.

Landman, K. (2004). *Gated communities in South Africa: Comparison of four case studies in Gauteng.* Pretoria, SA: CSIR Publication.

Lemanski, C. (2004). A new apartheid? The spatial implications of fear of crime in Cape Town, South Africa. *Environment and Urbanization, 16*(2), 101-112.

Lemanski, C., Landman, K., & Durington, M. (2008). Divergent and similar experiences of 'gating' in South Africa: Johannesburg, Durban and Cape Town. *Urban Forum, 19*, 133-158.

Lewin, C. (2005). Understanding and describing quantitative data. In B. Somekh, & C. Lewin (Eds.), *Theory and methods in social research* (2nd ed., pp. 220-230). London, UK: Sage.

Lewis, J. (2003). Design issues. In J. Ritchie, & J. Lewis (Eds.), *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers* (pp. 47-76). London, UK: Sage.

Li, S., Zhu, Y., & Li, L. (2012). Neighborhood type, gatedness and residential experiences in Chinese cities: A study of Guangzhou. *Urban Geography, 33*(2), 237-255.

Low, S. M. (1997). Urban fear: Building the fortress city. *City & Society, 9*(1), 53-71.

Low, S. M. (2001). The edge and the center: Gated communities and the discourse of urban fear. *American Anthropologist, 103*(1), 45-58.

Low, S. M. (2003). *Behind the gates: Life, security, and the pursuit of happiness in fortress America.* New York, USA: Routledge.

Lynch, M. (2000). Against reflexivity as an academic virtue and source of privileged knowledge. *Theory, Culture & Society, 17(*3), 26-54.

Macbeth, D. (2001). On "reflexivity" in qualitative research: Two readings, and a third. *Qualitative Inquiry, 7*(1), 35-68.

Manzi, T., & Smith Bowers, B. (2005). Gated communities as club goods: Segregation or social cohesion? *Housing Studies, 20*(2), 345-359.

Marcus, G. (1998). What comes (just) after "post"? The case of ethnography. In N. Denzin, & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The landscape of qualitative research: Theories and issues* (pp. 383-406). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Maso, I. (2003). Necessary subjectivity: Exploiting researchers' motives, passions and prejudices in pursuit of answering 'true' questions. In L. Finlay, & B. Gough (Eds.), *Reflexivity: A practical guide for researchers in health and social sciences* (pp. 39-51). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Mathiti, V. (2006). Homelessness. In K. Ratele (Ed.), *Inter-group relations: South African perspectives* (pp. 214-234). Cape Town, SA: Juta & Co.

McMillan, D. W., & Chavis, D. M. (1986). Sense of community: A definition and theory. *Journal of Community Psychology, 14*(1), 6-23.

Meyer, I., & Finchilescu, G. (2006). The social dominance theory perspective on discrimination and prejudice. In K. Ratele (Ed.), *Inter-group relations: South African Perspectives* (pp. 66-86). Cape Town, SA: Juta & Co.

Myambo, M. T. (2010). The limits of rainbow nation multiculturalism in the new South Africa: Spatial configuration in Zakes Mda's *Ways of Dying* and Jonathan Morgan's *Finding Mr. Madini*. *Research in African Literatures, 41*(2), 93-120.

Myers, D. G. (2008). *Social Psychology (9th ed.)*. New York, USA: McGraw-Hill.

Neves, D. (2006). The land question. In K. Ratele (Ed.), *Inter-group relations: South African Perspectives* (pp. 193-213). Cape Town, SA: Juta & Co.

Novy, A., Swiatek, D. C., & Moulaert, F. (2012). Social cohesion: A conceptual and political elucidation. *Urban Studies, 49*(9), 1873-1889.

Nowell, B., & Boyd, N. (2010). Viewing community as responsibility as well as resource: Deconstructing the theoretical roots of psychological sense of community. *Journal of Community Psychology, 38*(7), 828-841.

Oldfield, J. (2007). Introduction: Imagining transatlantic slavery and abolition. *Patterns of Prejudice, 41,* 239-243.

Ortlipp, M. (2008). Keeping and using reflective journals in the qualitative research process. *The Qualitative Report, 13*(4), 695-705.

Padgett, D. K. (2008). *Qualitative methods in social work research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Parkes, A., Kearns, A., & Atkinson, R. (2002). What makes people dissatisfied with their neighbourhoods? *Urban Studies, 39*(13), 2413-2438.

Pillow, W. (2003). Confession, catharsis, or cure? Rethinking the uses of reflexivity as methodological power in qualitative research. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 16*(2), 175-196.

Pow, C. (2009). Public intervention, private aspiration: Gated communities and the condominisation of housing landscapes in Singapore. *Asia Pacific Viewpoint, 50*(2), 215-227.

Pretty, G., Bishop, B., Fisher, A., & Sonn, C. (2006). *Psychological sense of community and its relevance to well-being and everyday life in Australia.* Melbourne, AUS: Australian Psychological Society.

Prezza, M., Amici, M., Roberti, T., & Tedeschi, G. (2001). Sense of community referred to the whole town: Its relations with neighboring, loneliness, life satisfaction, and area of residence. *Journal of Community Psychology, 29*(1), 29-52.

Ratele, K. (2006). Introduction: Inter-group psychologies, after apartheid. In K. Ratele (Ed.), *Inter-group relations: South African Perspectives* (pp. 1-22). Cape Town, SA: Juta & Co.

Ratele, K. (2006). Racially motivated attacks. In K. Ratele (Ed.), *Inter-group relations: South African Perspectives* (pp. 274-299). Cape Town, SA: Juta & Co.

Riley, S., Rodham, K., & Gavin, J. (2009). Doing weight: Pro-ana and recovery identities in cyberspace. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, *19*(5), 348-359.

Ritchie, J., Lewis, J., & Elam, G. (2003). Designing and selecting samples. In J. Ritchie, & J. Lewis (Eds.), *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers* (pp. 77-108). London, UK: Sage.

Roitman, S. (2005). Who segregates whom? The analysis of a gated community in Mendoza, Argentina. *Housing Studies, 20*(2), 303-321.

Roitman, S., Webster, C., & Landman, K. (2010). Methodological frameworks and interdisciplinary research on gated communities. *International Planning Studies, 15*(1), 3-23.

Ruonavaara, H., & Kouvo, A. (2009, September). *Neighbour relations in contemporary society: A survey of ideas and a blueprint for a framework for investigation*. Paper presented at the ISA Housing Assets, Housing People conference, Scotland.

Sakip, S. R. M., Johari, N., & Salleh, M. N. M. (2012). Sense of community in gated and non-gated residential neighborhoods. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences, 50,* 818-826.

Sanchez, T. W., Lang, R. E., & Dhavale, D. M. (2005). Security versus status?: A first look at the census's gated community data. *Journal of Planning Education and Research, 24*(3), 281-291.

Seekings, J. (2008). The continuing salience of race: Discrimination and diversity in South Africa. *Journal of Contemporary African Studies, 26*(1), 1-25.

Shenton, A. K. (2004). Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects. *Education for Information, 22,* 63-75.

Smith, J. A., & Eatough, V. (2006). Interpretive phenomenological analysis. In G. M. Breakwell, S. Hammond, C. Fife-Schaw, & J. A. Smith (Eds.), *Research methods in psychology* (3rd ed., pp. 322-341). London, UK: Sage.

Snape, D., & Spencer, L. (2003). The foundations of qualitative research. In J. Ritchie, & J. Lewis (Eds.), *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers* (pp. 1-23). London, UK: Sage.

South African Police Service (2014). *Crime statistics: April 2013 – March 2014*. Retrieved December 13, 2014, from http://www.saps.gov.za/resource_centre/publications/statistics/crimestats/2014/crime_stats.php

Spocter, M. (2011). Spatio-temporal aspects of gated residential security estates in non-metropolitan Western Cape. *Urban Forum, 22*(2), 169-181.

Statistics South Africa (2013). *Mid-year population estimates*. Retrieved September 29, 2013, from http://www.statssa.gov.za/publications/P0302/P03022013.pdf

Stevens, G., Duncan, N., & Bowman, B. (2006). Ethnicity: It's about *making* a difference. In G. Stevens, V. Franchi, & T. Swart (Eds.), *A race against time: Psychology and challenges to deracialisation in South Africa* (pp. 51-72). Pretoria, SA: University of South Africa.

Stone, W., & Hulse, K. (2007). *Housing and social cohesion: An empirical exploration*. Australia: Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute.

Tanulku, B. (2011). Gated communities: From "self-sufficient towns" to "active urban agents". *Geoforum, 43*(3), 518-528.

Tappan, M. B. (2006). Reframing internalized oppression and internalized domination: From the psychological to the sociocultural. *Teachers College Record, 108*(10), 2115-2144.

Taylor, G. W., & Ussher, J. M. (2001). Making sense of S&M: A discourse analytic account. *Sexualities, 4*(3), 293-314.

Terre Blanche, M., & Durrheim, K. (2006). Histories of the present: Social science research in context. In M. Terre Blanche, K. Durrheim, & D. Painter (Eds.), *Research in practice: Applied methods for the social sciences* (2nd ed., pp. 1-17). Cape Town, SA: UCT Press.

Terre Blanche, M., Kelly, K., & Durrheim, K. (2006). Why qualitative research? In M. Terre Blanche, K. Durrheim, & D. Painter (Eds.), *Research in practice: Applied methods for the social sciences* (2nd ed., pp. 271-284). Cape Town, SA: UCT Press.

Tindall, C. (2001). Issues of evaluation. In P. Banister, E. Burman, I. Parker, M. Taylor, & C. Tindall (Eds.), *Qualitative methods in psychology: A research guide* (pp. 142-159). Buckingham: Open University Press.

Triandis, H. C. (1989). The self and social behaviour in differing social contexts. *Psychological Review, 96*(3), 506-520.

Triandis, H. C., & Gelfand, M. J. (1998). Converging measurement of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*(1), 118-128.

Triandis, H. C. (2001). Individualism-collectivism and personality. *Journal of Personality, 69*(6), 907-924.

Trinh, T. M. (1989). *Woman, native, other: Writing postcoloniality and feminism.* Bloomington, USA: Indiana University Press.

Trinh, T. M. (1991). *When the moon waxes red: Representation, gender and cultural politics*. New York, USA: Routledge.

Valle, E. (2008). Sense of community: A comparative study of two design methods - new urbanism and participatory design. *Focus: Journal of the City and Regional Planning Department, 5*(1), 37-40.

Van der Walt, C., & Bowman, B. (2007). Intergenerational rites of passage. In N. Duncan, B. Bowman, A. Naidoo, J. Pillay, & V. Roos (Eds.), *Community psychology: Analysis, context and action* (pp. 137-149). Cape Town, SA: UCT Press.

Vena, V. (2011, April 18). Jo'burg residents rubbish Pikitup strike. *Mail & Guardian*. Retrieved August 12, 2012, from http://mg.co.za/article/2011-04-18-joburg-residents-rubbish-pikitup-strike

Vesselinov, E., Cazessus, M., & Falk, W. (2007). Gated communities and spatial inequality. *Journal of Urban Affairs, 29*(2), 109-127.

Wrong, D. H. (1995). *The problem of order: What unites and divides society*. Cambridge, UK: Harvard University Press.

Wu, F. (2005). Rediscovering the 'gate' under market transition: From work-unit compounds to commodity housing enclaves. *Housing Studies, 20*(2), 235-254.

Wilkinson, R. G. (1996). *Unhealthy societies: The afflictions of inequality*. London, UK: Routledge.

Zorn, T. (n.d.). *Designing and conducting semi-structured interviews for research*. Retrieved January 8, 2013, from http://wms-soros.mngt.waikato.ac.nz/NR/rdonlyres/em25kkojrnxofpq3j7avsnl46vkmera63kk2s6nd5ey2pypoxs32ne7dykntjde4u2qhffhpol6bzi/Interviewguidelines.pdf

Appendices

Appendix A: Interview Guide

1. Introductory questions

    - What is your current age?
    - How long have you lived here?
    - Where did you live previously?

2. The experience of living in a gated community: Reinforcement, integration and fulfilment of needs

    - How would you describe your experience of living in a gated community? (substitute gated community with name of the particular gated community)
    - What are the pros and cons of living here?
    - How would you describe the quality of life in the gated community?
    - Are your needs being met in this community? Elaborate.

3. Membership, social interaction, social networks and social capital

    - Do you interact with other residents of the gated community? When?
    - Do you socialise with other residents? What does this include - for example; dinners, sporting activities, club functions, etc.
    - Do you experience a sense of belonging and connection within the gated community? Explain.
    - Have you ever felt excluded from social interaction while living in the gated community? When?
    - Does the social interaction within the community differ to that of your previous living areas (home)? How?
    - How would you describe trust between residents, including yourself?

4. Common values and a civic culture

    - What values, if any, do you share with other residents?
    - How was this similar to, or different from, your previous residence?
    - What influence do you feel you have in the community?
    - In what way, if any, has the community influenced you?
    - How do you feel about the rules set out for living in the gated community?
    - How do you think the other residents feel about the governing body and the rules?

5. Social order, social solidarity and social control

- Do you experience, or have you heard of, conflict in the gated community? If so, what caused it?
- Do you feel that you share goals with the other residents in terms of living in the gated community? What goals?
- What is your experience of cooperation between residents in the gated community?
- Would you say that all social groups are respected in the gated community? Examples to support answer.

6. Place attachment and identity, and ecology

- Do you feel a connection to the gated community?
- What are the physical aspects of the gated community that you like and that you feel positive about?
- Do residents contribute to the surroundings in any way? How?

Appendix B: Participant Information Sheet

Dear Resident,

My name is Vicky Jean Talbot and I am conducting research for the purpose of obtaining a Master's degree in Community-based Counselling Psychology at the University of the Witwatersrand. I am researching the experience of residing in a gated community, with particular interest in social interaction, feelings of belonging and relationships between residents within gated communities. I would like to invite you to participate in my study.

Participation in this study will involve an interview that will take approximately one hour. With your permission, the interview will be audiotaped to be used in the analysis for the research to ensure accuracy in the reporting of the data. You may choose not to answer questions if you prefer not to. Only my supervisor and I will have access to the audio recording which will be kept securely on a password protected computer both during and after the research process. The audio recordings will be kept for future use by either myself or my supervisor. Direct quotations from the interview may be used in the research; however, all identifying information will be removed from the study, ensuring confidentiality. You will be referred to as "interviewee" followed by a numerical figure when direct quotations are used. You may request to withdraw the recording from the study at any time. All information gathered during the interview will remain confidential; therefore, your identity will not be disclosed or connected to the information you provide during the interview. The interview transcripts, containing no identifying information, will be kept in a secure location both during and after the research process. No one other than me and my supervisor will have access to this. This research study may be written up in the form of a research report and may also be published in a journal article. The interview transcripts will not be destroyed once the research is completed as the possibility for future comparative research may arise. They will be stored securely on a password protected computer. Should you request feedback on the research, this will be provided in the form of a one page summary of the findings of this study.

No risks or benefits are expected from participating in this research. Participation in this research is voluntary and you may withdraw from the study at any time without any consequence. You may choose not to participate and this will not be held against you in any way.

Should you choose to participate, you are requested to detach and keep this sheet. You are also requested to read and sign the informed consent forms on the next two pages. These forms will be stored in a sealed envelope with my supervisor.

Should you have any further queries, please feel free to contact either me or my supervisor. Our contact details appear in the signature below.

Yours Sincerely

_____ _____

Vicky Jean Talbot

talbot.vicky@gmail.com

Ms Tanya Graham

Tanya.Graham@wits.ac.za

Appendix C: Participant Consent Form

I _____ hereby consent to participating in Vicky Talbot's research on the experience of residing in a gated community, focusing on sense of community and social cohesion. I have read and understood what participation entails as set out in the information sheet. I understand that:

- Participation in the study is voluntary and I will be allowed to withdraw from the study at any time
- I may refuse to answer any questions I would prefer not to
- No information that may identify me will be used in the write up of this research study, and my responses will remain confidential
- I am informed as fully as possible as to the aims of the research and possible implications of the research
- The interview transcripts will not be destroyed after completion of the study
- No risks or benefits are expected from participating in the research
- Direct quotations from the interview may be used in the research. To maintain confidentiality I will be referred to as 'Interviewee' followed by a numerical figure

Signed: _____

Date: _____

Appendix D: Participant Consent to Audiotape the Interview

I _____ hereby consent to having my interview with Vicky Talbot audiotaped for research purposes. I have read and understood what this entails as set out in the information sheet. I understand that:

- Only the researcher (Vicky Talbot) and her supervisor will have access to the interview recording
- My identity will be protected and no identifying information will appear in the research report or publications
- The audio recording will be kept securely throughout the research process
- The audio recording will not be destroyed after the research has been examined
- I may request to withdraw the recording from the study at any time

Signed: _____

Date: _____

Appendix E: Ethics Clearance

UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND, JOHANNESBURG

HUMAN RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE (SCHOOL OF HUMAN & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

CLEARANCE CERTIFICATE	**PROTOCOL NUMBER: MACC/13/011 IH**
PROJECT TITLE:	Living in a gated community: The subjective experience of sense of community and social cohesion
INVESTIGATORS	Talbot Vicky
DEPARTMENT	Psychology
DATE CONSIDERED	08/04/13
DECISION OF COMMITTEE*	Approved

This ethical clearance is valid for 2 years and may be renewed upon application

DATE: 11 April 2013

CHAIRPERSON _____
(Professor Andrew Thatcher)

cc Supervisor: Ms. T Graham
Psychology

DECLARATION OF INVESTIGATOR (S)

To be completed in duplicate and **one copy** returned to the Secretary, Room 100015, 10th floor, Senate House, University.

I/we fully understand the conditions under which I am/we are authorized to carry out the abovementioned research and I/we guarantee to ensure compliance with these conditions. Should any departure be contemplated from the research procedure, as approved, I/we undertake to submit a revised protocol to the Committee.

This ethical clearance will expire on 31 December 2015

PLEASE QUOTE THE PROTOCOL NUMBER IN ALL ENQUIRIES