

https://dspace.org/

Intergroup attitudes of black learners attending a multiracial school and black learners attending a single race school

Mohololа, Faith Mapula

2008-04-21T10:29:20Z
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/4770

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

INTERGROUP ATTITUDES OF BLACK LEARNERS ATTENDING A MULTIRACIAL SCHOOL AND BLACK LEARNERS ATTENDING A SINGLE RACE SCHOOL

By

Faith Mapula Mohololа

0107906N

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

Johannesburg, June 2007

DECLARATION

I declare that this dissertation is my own work and that any work that is not mine has been rightfully and properly acknowledged. It is submitted for the degree of Master of Arts (Clinical Psychology) at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before for any degree or examination at any other university.

_____.

Faith Mapula Mohololа

…. day of…….. 2007

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to offer my sincere thanks to:

The God almighty for I know all things are possible through him.

To my supervisor, Professor Gillian Finchilescu, for your guidance, encouragement, active and attentive interest in the project.

To the learners at Greenside High school and Fons Luminis High school that generously and willing participated in the study.

To the Gauteng Department of Education for granting me the permission to conduct this study.

To my family and friends for your constant prayers, love and encouragement.

To my partner for life, Eduardo Mussanhane for his constant support and patience

NOTE ON RACIAL CLASSIFICATION

The study utilises racial classification in a way that may be found offensive, given South African's Apartheid history. During the years of Apartheid, members of the society were categorised and labelled into different racial groups consisting primarily of two racial categories Whites and Blacks. The latter racial category mainly incorporated- members of society with a darker skin tone as Indians, Coloureds and Africans as one racial group. It should be noted, however that the study uses the racial terms 'Black' and 'Whites' and for this study the term 'Black' mainly refers to those members of society that were classified as African and does not refer to Indians or Coloureds. The terms 'Black' and 'Whites' are used with the realisation that these terms are historically loaded and may not be the terms of preference both for the participants in and readers of this research.

ABSTRACT

Desegregated schools have provided many learners of different racial and ethnic groups the opportunity to encounter regular intergroup contact. However for those learners who attend racially segregated schools the opportunity for regular intergroup contact is limited. According to the contact hypothesis frequent integroup contact between members of different social groups can promote positive intergroup attitudes, providing that contact occurs under favourable conditions. This research compares the intergroup attitudes of Black learners attending a multiracial school (desegregated school) and Black learners attending a single race school (segregated school). A sample of 106 Black learners completed questionnaires, consisting of a number of sub-scales derived from two surveys of Holtman (2002) and Muianga (2005). The questionnaires assessed factors relating to the level of affective prejudice, social distance, the amount of general contact with Whites outside the school context, the degree of racial identification, meta-stereotype, social distance, school contact with White learners and experience of contact with White learners. For the purpose of the current study only responses from Black learners were required. Two statistical analyses were used to analyse the data: t-test analysis and multiple linear regression analysis.

The t-test analysis revealed significant results indicating that Black learners attending the multiracial school encounter more general contact with Whites outside of the school context and have lower levels of social distance than Black learners in the single race school. Results of the multiple linear regression analysis for Black learners in each school revealed that meta-stereotype is the strongest factor that explains affective prejudice amongst Black learners in each school. Similarly results of the multiple linear regression analysis using the whole sample revealed that meta-stereotype is a significant predictor of affective prejudice, substantiating results reported by the two separate multiple linear regression analysis of affective prejudice. Results of multiple linear regression analysis concerning social distance reveal that none of the entered variables explained social distance amongst Black learners in the single race school. However experience of contact with White learners emerged as the only factor that explains social distance amongst Black learners attending the

multiracial school. In addition the multiple linear regression analysis of the whole sample revealed that the type of school that the learners attend contributes significantly to social distance of the Black learners.

The result of the study support the contact hypothesis in that it reveals that Black learners with greater amounts of contact with Whites have more positive feelings towards interactions with Whites. The study argues that intergroup attitudes of Black learners in both the multiracial and single race school is primarily shaped by social changes that have occurred since 1994 and social norms that govern the nature of interracial contact amongst South Africans. These factors together with underlying internal factors outlined in the study mediate intergroup attitudes of Black learners used in this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Declaration	i
Acknowledgement	ii
Notification	iii
Abstract	iv
Content	vi
List of tables	ix
Chapter One	1
INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background of the study	6
1.2 Chapter Outline	
Chapter Two	7
LITERATURE REVIEW	7
2.1 Introduction	7
2.2 Contact Hypothesis	7
2.2.1 Friendship potential as a fifth contact condition	10
2.2.2 Emotional components of contact effects	13
2.2.3 Majority and minority group status and effect of contact	19
2.2.4 Generalization of contact effects	21
2.3 Intergroup contact and desegregated schools	22
2.4 Research Aims	29
Chapter Three	30
METHODOLOGY	30
3.1 Research Design	30
Non-experimental research design	30
3.2 Sample	30
3.2.1 Participants	30
3.2.2 Sampling Strategy	32
3.3 Measuring Instruments :Questionnaire	32
3.3.1 Demographic Information	32
3.3.2 General contact outside the school context	32
3.3.3 Racial identification	33
3.3.4 Meta-stereotype	33
3.3.5 School contact	34
3.3.6 Experience of school contact	34
3.3.7 Affective prejudice	35
3.3.8 Social distance	35

3.4 Procedures 35
3.5 Methods of analysis 37
3.6 Ethical consideration 38

Chapter Four 40
RESULTS 40
4.1 Introduction 40
4.2 Psychometric properties of measuring instruments 40
4.2.1 Psychometric properties of the measuring instruments 41
4.3 Basic descriptive statistics 44
4.4 T-test analysis: comparison of intergroup attitudes of Black learners attending the multiracial and Black learners attending the single race school 45
4.4.1 Affective prejudice of Black learners 46
4.4.2 Social distance of Black learners 46
4.4.3 General contact outside the school context of Black learners 47
4.4.4 Meta-stereotypes of Black learners 47
4.4.5 Racial identification of Black learners 48
4.5 Predictor variables of affective prejudice and social distance 48
4.5.1 Multiple linear regression analysis of Black learners attending the single race school 49
4.5.2 Multiple linear regression for Black learners attending the multiracial school only 50
4.5.3 Multiple linear regression of the whole sample 52

Chapter Five 55
DISCUSSION 55
5.1 Introduction 55
5.2 Comparison of intergroup attitudes of Black learners in each school 55
5.2.1 Racial identification of Black learners attending the single race school and Black learners attending the multiracial school 55
5.2.2 Meta-stereotype of Black learners in the multiracial school and the single race school 57
5.2.3 General contact with Whites outside the school context of Black 57

learners in multiracial and single race school
5.2.4 Intergroup attitudes of Black learners in the multiracial and single race school 58
5.3 Predictor variables of affective prejudice and social distance 61
5.3.1 Predictors variables of affective prejudice of Black learners attending a single race and Black learners attending a multiracial school 61
5.3.2 Predictors of affective prejudice of the combined sample 63
5.3.3 Predictors of social distance of Black learners attending the multiracial school and the single race school 63
5.3.4 Predictors of social distance of the combined sample 65
5.4 Conclusion 66
5.5 Limitation of the research 66
5.6 Recommendations 68

Reference list 70
Appendices 77
Appendix A
Letters
Appendix B
Questionnaires
Appendix C
Table of correlation analysis

LIST OF TABLES

Table 4.2.1: Psychometric properties of the measuring instruments 41

Table 4.3.1: Descriptive statistics 44

Table 4.4.1: T-test analysis of Black learners attending the single race school and Black learners attending race school and Black learners attending the multiracial school 45

Table 4.5.1(I): Summary of multiple linear regression analysis for variables predicting affective prejudice in Black learners attending single race school 49

Table 4.5.1(II): Summary of multiple linear regression analysis for variables predicting social distance in Black learners attending single race school 50

Table 4.5.2(I): Summary of multiple linear regression analysis for variables predicting affective prejudice in Black learners attending multiracial school 51

Table 4.5.2(II): Summary of multiple linear regression analysis for variables predicting social distance in Black learners attending multiracial school 52

Table 4.5.3(I): Summary of multiple linear regression analysis for variables predicting affective prejudice amongst Black learners in both schools 53

Table 4.5.3(II): Summary of multiple linear regression analysis for variables predicting social distance in Black learners attending both schools 53

Table 5.1: Table of correlation analysis 80

CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

The education system in South Africa has undergone various transformations that mirror the political conditions and transformations of the South African society. Schooling in South Africa was initially characterised by missionary and colonial forms of education. Following the emergence of the Apartheid regime in 1948, the South African education system was subsequently restructured to suit the new education policies established by the regime. Likewise the establishment of the democratic government in 1994 resulted in further restructuring of the education system (Vally & Dalamba, 1999).

The Apartheid regime was entirely aimed at racial segregation and restricted contact amongst all South Africans in all sectors of the society, including the education sector. The education system during the Apartheid regime was solely structured to enforce unequal and racially segregated schooling practices. This form of education system restricted interracial contact between learners, thus schools were racially segregated reinforcing the non-contact culture of the Apartheid regime. In order to maintain the non-contact culture, the education system was shaped by various educational policies specifically designed for each racial group. These policies were namely the Bantu Education Act of 1953, Indian Education Act of 1965, the National Education Act of 1967 and the Coloured Persons Act of 1963 (Soudien, 2004; Vally & Dalamba, 1999). These educational policies stipulated the type of education that learners of different racial groups should receive. In addition the education system consisted of 19 different education departments allocated into four different sectors. The four sectors consisted of the House of Assembly (White), House of Representative (Coloured), House of Delegates (Indian) and Department of Education and Training (Black). The Department of Education and Training was divided ethnically into the various Black South African ethnic groups (Carrim, 1998; Chisholm & Sujee, 2006; Vally & Dalamba, 1999). These four sectors functioned separately, with each sector regulated by its own laws and staff. Funding distributed to each sector was unequal and varied according to the racial category that the sector served. The House of Assembly

received the largest proportion of funding, while the Department of Education and Training received the least proportion of funds. In comparison to learners of other racial groups, Black learners were at a disadvantage. The Bantu Education Act specifically designed for Black learners only meant poor quality of education that involved provision of inadequate and limited educational resources and funds. It also included poor learning material, inadequately trained staff, limited classrooms, no libraries and authoritarian style of management (Vally & Dalamba, 1999).

In 1976 the gradual built up of Black learners' resentment and resistance towards the Bantu Education Act ultimately unfolded resulting in the 1976 Student Uprising, in which Black learners protested against the Act. Following this outburst, Catholic schools as well as private schools began to illegally admit a limited number of Black learners into their schools. Soon after in 1985 Indian and Coloured schools began to admit Black learners. Eventually a few White schools also began to unofficially admit black learners. By early 1990's the Apartheid government officially allowed White schools to admit a limited number of Black learners. However this process of desegregating White schools was strictly guided by specific conditions outlined by the Apartheid government (Carrim, 1998; Soudien 2004; Vally& Dalamba, 1999)

Firstly White schools were divided and classified under three specific models: Model A, B and C. Model A required White schools to close down as state schools and reopen as private schools. Model B allowed schools to remain state schools and have open admission policy. And model C allowed White schools to convert to semi-private and semi-government schools, whereby the government would pay teachers' salaries, while other financial expenses of the school would be borne by the school and the community. Overall each model allowed the admission of learners from various racial groups into White schools (Carrim, 1998; Vally & Dalamba, 1999). Later in 1992 all White schools were converted to operate as the model C schools. In 1993 it was officially established that White schools could engage in unrestricted desegregation surpassing all government laws that guided the school desegregation process. In 1996 the Apartheid education system, together with its education policies lapsed when the new South African School Act was implemented following the transformation of the South African society into a democratic state. The 1996 School Act classified all South African schools into two categories: public (government –

owned schools) and private school (independent schools). This new School Act implemented new changes to the education system in hope of erasing past injustices of the Apartheid education system (Sujee, 2004; Vally & Dalamba, 1999). A unified educational policy was established, which stipulated that all learners shall be governed by the same educational laws and shall have access to an equal education. In addition this policy provided all learners the freedom to attend any schools of their choice. In 1997 the new curriculum framework, named Curriculum 2005 was implemented. This new Curriculum reframed the nature of learning and teaching, enforcing that all public schools adopt the outcome based education strategy.

During the last decade, the transformations of the South Africa education system have inspired a number of studies (Carrim, 1998; Chisholm & Sujee, 2006; Pillay 2004; Soudien, 2004; Sujee, 2004; Vally & Dalamba, 1999). These studies have analysed various statistical surveys and statistics obtained from Education Department nationally. Results of these studies have presented similar patterns of the process of school desegregation. The first pattern indicates that there has been no migration of Coloureds, Whites and Indians learners into former Black schools. Secondly it is evident that a larger proportion of Black learners have immigrated to former Indian and Coloured schools and only a small amount of Black learners have immigrated to former White schools.

Thirdly a pattern of ethnic (Zulu, Xhosa, Tswana, Sotho, Venda) desegregation has emerged in former Black schools. It appears that Black learners from different ethnic groups have immigrated into former Black schools not necessary of their ethnic groups and this has increased learner population in former Black schools. For instance in a recent study by Chisholm and Sujee (2006) the statistical results of the Gauteng schools only, indicated that 31% of Black learners in Gauteng attend former White schools, former Indian schools in Gauteng comprise of 62% of Black learners and former Coloured schools in Gauteng seem to have taken a larger proportion comprising of 85% Black learners. Similar results were also indicated for schools in other provinces nationally. According to Sujee (2004) the larger proportion of Black learners immigrating into former Indians and Coloureds schools may be due to affordability of the school fees and travelling costs. As the expenses of attending

former White schools may be much higher than that of the former Indians and Coloureds schools.

Desegregation of South African schools was partially aimed at integrating learners of different racial groups in the same schooling environronment with the hope of providing equal education for all. Carrim (1998), Vally and Dalamba (1999) and Soudien (2004) argue that the pattern of school desegregation in South Africa has not really achieved a sense of integration amongst learners of different racial groups. The pattern of school desegregation has mainly followed a predominant trend known as the assimilation approach. Assimilation is broadly defined as the process in which members of a minority group are expected to suppress their identities and cultures, change and adopt to the cultures and identities of the group whose social context they enter into (Carrim, 1998; Vally & Dalamba, 1999). In South Africa this assimilation process has meant that learners that have immigrated into former White, Indian and Coloured schools have merely had to adapt to the cultural ethos, norms, routines and curriculum of the schools (Chisholm & Sujee, 2006). Furthermore Vally and Dalamba (1999) assert that the mechanical process of desegregation has only allowed for the physical proximity of learners of different racial groups in the same school without interrogating the quality of the contact between these learners. For Soudien (2004) it is not necessarily the physical contact between learners that counts, but the nature of the interactions that occurs between learners that is fundamentally important to establish integration.

A number of contact studies have examined the effect of contact on the race relations and racial attitudes amongst learners (Holtman, 2002; Luiz & Krige, 1981; Mynhardt, 1982; Wilhelm, 1994). Results presented by these studies have been inconsistent, as intergroup contact studies conducted during the Apartheid period tend to report contradicting results about the effects of contact, while the small quantity of intergroup studies post 1994 tend to report positive effects of contact amongst learners (Finchilescu & Tredoux, in press). In addition many of the contact studies conducted during the Apartheid regime had methodological problems in general, as interracial contact amongst learners of the various racial groups was restricted and limited. Therefore results often reported unfavourable racial attitudes amongst learners of the

different racial groups (Mynhardt & du Toit, 1991). These results were not conclusive as contact between learners of the different racial groups was limited.

Considering the small number of contact studies conducted to investigate the racial attitudes of learners in desegregated schools post 1994, it is evident that there is a need to explore racial attitudes of learners that attend desegregated schools, in order to expand the body of contact studies in South Africa. Not only do learners in desegregated schools have the opportunity to encounter regular interracial contact with fellow learners of different racial groups, studies show that learners that have immigrated into desegregated schools are simply expected to assimilate into the prevailing ethos of these schools (Chisholm & Sujee, 2006). This suggests that Black learners that have immigrated into desegregated white schools have had to embrace the general ethos of the school that they attend. Furthermore Dixon (2001) posits that desegregation creates new forms of physical co-presence, bringing individuals into an immediacy that did not exist. These transformed boundary processes shape how this new intimacy between self and other is experienced and interpreted. Thus it is important to explore the underlying racial attitudes that Black learners hold beneath this assimilation process.

This study aims to explore the racial attitudes of Black learners that attend desegregated white schools (multiracial schools) and segregated Black schools (single race schools) located in the Johannesburg region. Black learners are chosen as the primary sample of this study as there is a few contact studies that have exclusively examine the racial attitudes of Black learners attending desegregated white school and those Black learners that attend a Black single race school.

The study chooses to focus on Black, as racial contact between Blacks and Whites s was strictly minimized during the Apartheid regime as opposed to contact of these two groups with other racial groups. However changes that have occurred since 1994 such as desegregation of white schools has provided learners of these two racial groups the opportunity to encounter regular contact. To understand the effect of contact between learners that attend these desegregated schools, the contact hypothesis is considered as one of the theories that provide some insight into intergroup contact and effects of such contact in school setting. The contact hypothesis originally proposed by Gordon Allport (1954) states that intergroup

contact amongst members of different group would diminish prejudice, under specific contact conditions. Therefore this suggests that, 'interracial contact between members of different racial groups would diminish racial prejudice and potentially promote positive interracial attitudes, under specific contact conditions' (Pettigrew, 1998, p25). It is against this background that this study explores the racial attitudes of Black learners in desegregated white schools and compares it to the racial attitudes of Black learners in segregated black schools, in order to examine the impact of contact on interracial attitudes.

1.2 Chapter Outline

The thesis commences with chapter one that provides a brief background of the current study and then provides a summary of the chapters included in the study. Chapter two contains a review of the contact literature pertinent to the area of investigation in this study. The literature review outlines the contact hypothesis, since it is the underpinning theoretical framework that is central to this study. In addition this chapter included a review of theoretical developments on the contact hypothesis and contact literature pertaining to the effects of school desegregation on intergroup attitudes. This chapter ends with the research aims. Chapter three outlines the methods of the research. It considers issues such as the research design, specification of sampling and provides an overview of the instruments used in the study. Issues relating to validity, reliability, interpretations and use of the measuring instruments are discussed. Methods of data collection are examined; ethical considerations and statistical analyses relating to the study are discussed. Chapter four describes the results of the study. The chapter includes descriptive statistics, t-test analysis as well as the multiple linear regression analyses. Chapter five discusses the main findings obtained in the study. It further discusses limitations of the study before concluding with recommendations based on the findings.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1Introduction

Following the end of World War II, a number of psychologists and sociologists interested in intergroup relations and intergroup attitudes began hypothesising about the determinants of attitudes change between members of different social groups (Cook, 1957). A consensus that developed amongst these social scientists was that the experience of face-to-face contact with members of different social groups is an important factor for attitude change. Building upon these ideas, Gordon Allport (1954) in his book 'The Nature of Prejudice' proposed the contact hypothesis, which states that regular intergroup contact between members of different ethnic and racial groups could reduce negative intergroup attitude and potentially promote positive intergroup attitude provided that contact occurs under favourable contact conditions (Amir, 1976; Miller & Brewer, 1984; Pettigrew, 1997). For the last fifty years the contact hypothesis has been an enduring theoretical perspective in the study of intergroup contact and intergroup attitudes.

2.2Contact Hypothesis

Allport (1954) proposed that the outcome of intergroup contact depends on the nature and quality of the contact situation. He states that regular interactions between members of different groups reduce prejudice, providing it occurs under favourable conditions. Allport (1954) proposed four optimal contact conditions that are crucial for favourable outcomes of integroup contact. The four optimal contact conditions are: (a) equal status of participants within the contact condition, (b) cooperation and mutual interdependence amongst intergroup participants, (c) strive for achievement of common goal amongst intergroup participants (d) support of authorities, laws and social norms (Allport, 1954; Miller & Brewer, 1984; Pettigrew, 1969, 1998).

- Equal status of participants within the contact situation:

According to Allport (1954) it is vital that intergroup participants in the contact situation expect and perceive equal status between each other. This perception

allows members in the contact situation the opportunity to become better acquainted with each other, as they would come to realise that they differ less in respect of opinion and belief than previously thought. However, Miller and Brewer (1984) contested that the perception of equal status between members of different social groups at a structural level may not be the same perception of equal status at a psychological level. Furthermore the pre-existing social status of different group members is likely to transfer into new contact situations thus making it difficult for group members to perceive equal status amongst each other. At the same time, simply eliminating the different social status in the contact situation can elicit social competition directed towards establishing status difference. Amir (1969) suggested that it is sometimes easier to assign members of different status position to equal status position within a contact situation than to bring together individuals who are of equal socio-economic and educational status. However, Miller and Brewer (1984) suggest that the perception of equal status is likely to occur when there is intergroup acceptance between members of the different social groups.

- Cooperation and mutual interdependence amongst intergroup participants:

This condition specifies that intergroup contact interaction between participants in the contact situation should be characterised by cooperation (Allport, 1954). In comparison to competitive intergroup contact, cooperative intergroup contact promotes intergroup acceptance and reduce prejudices. In addition cooperative intergroup contact also increases opportunities for the development of intergroup friendships. Cooperative intergroup interactions provide the opportunity for group members to acquire correct information about other group members (Miller & Brewer, 1984). When contact is structured towards cooperation and group members are interdependent, the outcomes of such contact are usually positive (Pettigrew, 1998). A number of studies indicate that structured cooperative contact reduces prejudice (Sherif, 1966).

Furthermore Miller and Brewer (1984) assert that the type of intergroup relations (such as friendship) that develops during intergroup contact depend on whether the focus of interactions is task-orientated or interpersonally orientated. When interactions in intergroup contact are task-orientated group members are likely to be

more focused on task requirement and performance. This limit the opportunity for group members to learn anything personal about other outgroups members. In contrast interactions that are interpersonally orientated allow group members to evaluate each other with reference to personal details.

- Strive for achievement of common goal amongst intergroup participants:

Achievement of a common goal is a contact condition that works together with the intergroup cooperation condition. When group members in a contact situation are goal-orientated and actively join to achieve a mutually desirable goal, prejudice can be reduced (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew, 1998), because group members are able to unlearn negative stereotype held towards each other (Pettigrew, 1998; Sherif, 1966).

- Support of authorities, laws and social norms:

This condition highlights that intergroup contact is more readily accepted and has more positive effects if there is increased social support from authorities, social laws and the rest of the community (Allport, 1954, Pettigrew, 1998). Moreover support from authority establishes norms of acceptance, which can affect intergroup contact in the three following ways. (a) The implementation of sanction and reward actions by authorities can promote the achievement of things that are desired; (b) norms of tolerance can help to create a social climate, which promotes positive effect for contact; (c) support of authority can also influence changes in attitudes amongst different group members (Amir, 1969)

For instance the legal sanctions segregating members of different racial groups during the Apartheid period is perceived as a system that enforced intergroup hostility and prejudice. However, when there is institutional and social support for intergroup contact, it may advocate and promote norms for tolerance (Mynhardt & Du Toit, 1991). A study conducted in 1948, after the desegregation of the Marines in the USA revealed that White seamen had more positive racial attitudes after taking more voyages with Blacks, a condition which was supported by authority figures (Kenworthy, Turner & Hewstone, 2004).

An increasing number of contact studies conducted in various laboratories and social settings provide empirical evidence in support of the positive effects of the optimal contact conditions (Amir, 1969; Cook, 1962; Hewstone & Brown, 1986; Pettigrew, 1997, 1998). Many of these studies have drawn similar conclusions that Allport's optimal contact conditions are essential situational conditions that promote positive intergroup attitudes and prejudice reduction. At the same time these research studies have also presented an extended list of proposed contact conditions argued to be essential for positive contact effect. However Pettigrew (1998) argues that many of these listed contact conditions are not essential conditions for optimal contact, but may be confused with facilitating conditions. Since the list of conditions tends to vary from each contact study. It is possible that these conditions relate to underlying factors that influence the effects of intergroup contact. More recent work by Pettigrew and Tropp (2000) states that the optimal contact conditions are not necessarily essential contact conditions but are facilitative conditions that are crucial for positive effects of contact. However one crucial contact condition that has been incorporated in contact literature, as a fifth contact condition is 'friendship potential' proposed by Pettigrew (1998) in his reformulated of the contact hypothesis.

2.2.1 Friendship potential as a fifth contact condition

Early contact literature emphasize that having contact with members of different groups is not enough to reduce prejudice. They stated that intergroup contact must be frequent and intimate enough to lead to greater reduction of prejudice (Cook, 1957; Rose, 1981). This perspective suggested that acquaintance potential is an important factor in intergroup contact, as "acquaintance potential in a contact situation involves the promotion of interactions that reveal enough details about members of the outgroup to encourage seeing them as individual rather than stereotype group members" (Miller & Brewer, 1984, p294). A condition that is assumed to increase opportunity for acquaintance potential during intergroup contact is cooperative task-structured interactions (Rose, 1981).

Building upon this idea, contemporary theorists conceptualised this concept as friendship potential, they acknowledge that intergroup contact must provide the opportunity for close interactions between group members to enable mechanisms of self-disclosure and friendship to develop (Eller & Abrams, 2004; Pettigrew, 1998; van

Dick, Wagner, Pettigrew, Petzel, Smith-Castro & Jackson, 2004; Wright, Aron, McLaughlin-Volpe & Ropp, 1997). Pettigrew (1997) conducted a data-analysis of a probability survey using four samples obtained from France, Britain, Netherlands and West Germany. The data analysis examined attitudes of 3800 majority group members towards minority group members. Findings of the study revealed that majority group members that have outgroup friends scored significantly lower on five different prejudice measures. A similar study by Hamberger and Hewstone (1997) compared the effects of friendships between intimate contact and contact at work on subtle and blatant prejudice. Results showed that intimate contact as friends had a significant impact on predicting subtle and blatant prejudice, while contact at work had minimal impact on the prediction of prejudice.

Further elaborations by Rose (1981) and van Dick et al (2004) agree that it is the different contact opportunities offered by different contact settings that influence intergroup relations during intergroup contact. Rose (1981) classified contact settings as either intimate or superficial, emphasising that contact promotes positive intimate intergroup relations. Similarly van Dick et al (2004) differentiated between distal contact opportunities (contact in neighbourhoods or classrooms) and proximal contact opportunities (contact between friends, acquaintances). Proximal contact opportunities are more intimate than distal contact opportunities. Nevertheless distal contact opportunities can increase proximal contact opportunities. A study by DuBois and Hirsch (1990) as cited in van Dick et al (2004) reports that children that live in mixed race neighbourhoods and those that attend mixed-race schools have greater chances of building a friendship with cross-group members. Furthermore a study by van Dick et al (2004) examining the effects of cross-group friendship on attitude change found that cross-group friendship is a partial criterion for the reduction of prejudice. Additional findings from the study reveal that it is the subject's perceived importance of contact and the value placed on the relationship that are critical factors that mediate reduction of prejudice.

Pettigrew (1998) argues that the effects of intergroup friendship can also generalise to other outgroup members not directly involved in the contact situation. Intergroup friendships may lead to interactions in other social settings, which broadens the contact. In turn this provides a greater range of information about the outgroup

member in a range of different social settings, thus lessening the possibility of situation–specific attitude change (Rose, 1981). Building further on Pettigrew's proposition the extended contact hypothesis states that knowledge of a close relationship between an ingroup member and outgroup member results in further modification of one's attitude towards the outgroup members (Wright et al, 1997). This theoretical perspective proposes that there are three underlying mechanisms that mediate and promote extended contact effects. These are (a) positive ingroup exemplar, (b) positive outgroup exemplar and (c) inclusion of other in self.

- Positive ingroup examplar: in a perceived cross-group friendship an ingroup member can influence the attitude and behaviour of the observer because the ingroup member is perceived as interchangeable with the self and can provide information about how group members understand the contact situation and how group members should respond. Therefore an ingroup member serves as an effective source of referent information, demonstrating positive intergroup attitudes and tolerant ingroup norms. In addition cooperative interactions with ingroup member may serve to reduce fears and negative expectations of the observer. Resulting in a more positive impression of the outgroup member and even direct positive interactions with the outgroup member that would permit direct contact effect to operate (Wright et al, 1997).

- Positive outgroup examplar: friendly behaviour of an outgroup member with an ingroup member can serve as a basis for modification of negative stereotype about outgroup member. The outgroup member who is observed interacting with ingroup member may provide information about the nature of relevant intergroup relations, as well as the attitudes and norms of the relevant outgroup. Moreover when interactions between outgroup member and ingroup member demonstrates close friendship the observer may conclude that outgroup member feels positively towards ingroup. In both scenarios the effectiveness of both positive ingroup examplar and positive outgroup examplar mechanism are likely to depend on the level to which group members are salient (Wright et al, 1997).

- Including other in the self: this mechanism proposes that individuals spontaneously internalises the ingroup members as a part of the self. In an observed friendship between an ingroup and outgroup members, the ingroup member is observed as part of the self by the observer and the outgroup member is considered to be part of the ingroup member's self. The effect is that the self sees members of that particular outgroup as part of self. Therefore it is more likely that the self-response to members of that outgroup in a positive way.

These three-mechanism work together, to influence the attitudes of group members that are not directly involved in the cross group friendship (Wright et al, 1997). A study by Paolini, Hewstone, Cairns & Voci (2004) examined the generalization effect of direct and indirect friendships. They found that direct friendship has a stronger effect on outgroup prejudice as it leads to a greater reduction of prejudice, whilst indirect friendship was strongly related to perceived outgroup variability than outgroup prejudice. These results suggests that both direct and indirect friendships are important in promoting positive intergroup attitudes, however each has different implications for generalising the effects of friendship. It is evident that the effects of friendship do not only reduce prejudices but can also generalize to outgroup members.

Despite having identified the necessarily situational optimal contact conditions, Allport (1954) speculated that 'contact must reach below the surface in order to be effective in altering prejudice' (p276). In agreement with Allport, a number of researchers emphasise that it is important to consider underlying mediating factors involved in the process of attitude change (Cook, 1957; Miller & Brewer, 1984; Pettigrew, 1998). Emotions are one of the underlying mediating factors that have received considerable attention amongst contact researchers.

2.2.2 Emotional components of contact effects

Various researchers have emphasized that emotions are crucial components in intergroup contact. (Brewer & Miller, 1996; Hewstone & Islam, 1993; Pettigrew, 1998; Stephan & Stephan, 1985). These researchers have elaborated on the original contact hypothesis, emphasising that emotions are part of the internal processes that

mediate effects of intergroup contact .One of the most common emotions experienced by individuals during intergroup contact is anxiety. Intergroup anxiety is usually experienced during the initial stages of intergroup contact; it is a strong negative emotion that influences outcomes of intergroup contact (Stephan & Stephan, 1985; Vorauer, Main & O'Connell, 1998). Indicators of intergroup anxiety include feelings of fear of negative evaluations during intergroup contact, as well as, insecurity regarding appropriate behaviour in intergroup contact situation. According to Oskamp (2000) integroup fears and threats are major sources of prejudice. To provide a comprehensive perspective of intergroup anxiety, Stephan and Stephan (1985) outlined an influential intergroup anxiety model, proposing that intergroup anxiety is determined by a set of antecedents as well as the anticipation of negative consequences.

The intergroup anxiety model highlights three antecedents that determine the amount of anxiety people experience during intergroup contact. These include (a) prior intergroup relations (b) prior cognitions concerning outgroup members and (c) structure of interactions (Stephan & Stephan, 1985). Prior intergroup relations refer to intergroup contact encounters that the individual has experienced. The amount of prior intergroup contact and conditions under which contact has occurred affect intergroup anxiety. High levels of anxiety are often associated with minimal intergroup contact. Individuals with minimal intergroup contact usually experience discomfort during intergroup contact, which heightens anxiety (Blair, Park & Bachelor, 2003). In contrast, when contact is extensive, norms of intergroup relations evolve so intergroup anxiety is often minimized and low. Similarly when conditions of contact are unfavourable, characterised by conflict, competition and unequal group status anxiety levels are often elevated.

In part prior intergroup contact determines prior intergroup cognition, which is knowledge that ingroup members have about outgroup members. When prior intergroup contact is absent or minimal individuals often have little knowledge about outgroup members and intergroup contact cognition is relatively simple. However when contact is frequent the cognitive schemas about the outgroup members become more complex as members attain a better perspective of the outgroup member. Ingroup members are likely to experience increased intergroup anxiety when this

knowledge is limited, as an ingroup member may anticipate negative consequences from interactions with outgroup members (Stephan & Stephan, 1985; Voci & Hewstone, 2003).

Furthermore anxiety during contact can also be elicited by structural factors, which usually involve situational factors. These factors usually include, type of contact situation (unstructured versus structured interactions), type of interdependence of group members (cooperative or competitive), group composition (size of ingroup and outgroup members involved in intergroup interactions) and relative status (prior status difference between groups) (Stephan & Stephan, 1985). Anxiety levels are generally high when intergroup contact occurs in unstructured contact situation, when the nature of interactions is competitive, as well as when there is an uneven number of ingroup and outgroup members (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2000; Sherif, 1966; Stephan & Stephan, 1985; Voci & Hewstone, 2003).

Consequences of intergroup anxiety can have negative effects on intergroup relations because when anxiety levels are high normative behaviour pattern such as avoidance of intergroup contact is amplified. This causes cognitive and motivational information processing biases, heightens self- awareness and amplified emotional and evaluative reactions (Brewer & Miller, 1996; Stephan & Stephan, 1985). A study investigating intergroup anxiety and intergroup contact amongst a group of Hispanic students revealed supporting evidence for the proposed anxiety model. The findings indicated that high levels of intergroup anxiety are associated with low levels of contact with outgroup members, stereotyping of outgroup members and assumed dissimilarity to outgroup members (Stephan & Stephan, 1985). In addition Pettigrew and Tropp (2000) estimated that 20-25% of the effect of contact in reducing prejudice is explained by a reduction in intergroup anxiety.

Meta-stereotypes is one of the specific sources of anxiety that individuals experience in intergroup interactions. Meta-stereotypes refer to a person's belief concerning the stereotypes that outgroup members' hold about his/her own group (Vorauer et al, 1998). Feeling stereotyped constitutes a potent threat to one's self- concept, as the individual feels that they are viewed as possessing socially undesirable traits. Thus this may evoke feelings of fear of negative evaluation and uncertainty regarding

appropriate behaviour during intergroup contact. As a result these feelings elicit a sense of anxiety which stems from contact with outgroup members (Vorauer et al, 1998). Consequently a person may often engage in selective interactions with outgroup members; this means that individual's seek out interaction partner that validate one's self view. When contact is unavoidable individuals usually have hostile reactions to criticism that individual believe is directed towards them. Meta-stereotypes thus have both affective and behavioural reactions.

One study that provides evidence of affective and behavioural reactions mediated by meta-stereotypes is that of Curtis and Miller (1986). In this study participants were falsely lead to believe that they were either liked or disliked by another participant whom they were due to interact with. Results illustrated that participant who had personal encounters with participants under the impression that they were liked, actually lead participants to be liked and while opposite results were presented for participants who believed they were disliked. Being liked was associated with more self-disclosure, expression of similarity, a more positive tone and general attitudes. These behaviours were reciprocal from both participants in the intergroup interaction. Therefore this study illustrates that falsely leading participants to believe that they were liked or disliked elicited certain behaviours between participants in the intergroup interaction. In another study by Vorauer et al (1998), which hypothesized that low prejudice individuals hold more negative meta-stereotypes than high prejudice individuals' revealed results that are supportive of the hypothesis. The findings of the study reported that lower levels of prejudice were associated with beliefs that Aboriginal Canadians' view of White Canadians is negative. This hypothesis was based on the argument that low prejudice people have high identification with outgroup members and are inclined to adopt the negative perspective of the outgroup towards the in-group, whereas high prejudice individuals have lower identification with outgroup and higher identification with in-group. Therefore in-group members are less inclined to adopt the outgroup perspective. In both these studies it is evident that meta-stereotypes affect one's attitudes, social judgement and affective reactions towards outgroup members. Furthermore meta-stereotypes may minimize the opportunity for individuals to disclose personal information and the opportunity to receive feedback from outgroup members.

In contrast to the negative emotions that mediate process of intergroup contact, positive emotions evoked during contact conditions also mediate the process of intergroup contact (Pettigrew, 1998). Empathy is one such emotion that is positive. Contemporary theorists state that empathy has a mediation role in promoting positive intergroup attitudes and improving intergroup relations (Kenworthy et al, 2004; Stephan & Finlay, 1999). Empathy often referred to as 'perspective taking'. It is broadly defined as the ability to image how another person understands their situation and how this person feels as a result of it (Allport, 1954). Stephan and Finlay (1999) proposed three forms of empathic reactions that may unfold when intergroup members empathise with each other. These included (a) cognitive empathy, (b) reactive empathy and (c) parallel empathy.

Cognitive empathy relates to understanding the ways that others view the world, it includes understanding and learning about norms, values beliefs and cultural practice of another, as well as learning about the way the outgroup views the ingroup. Cognitive empathy allows people to see that they are less different from members of other groups and that they share a common humanity and destiny. This perception reduces perceptions of dissimilarity and feelings of threats that group members feel towards each other.

Reactive empathy is characterised by one's emotional reactions to the emotional experiences of another person. Reactive empathy can evoke two types of emotional responses: compassion related emotions and negative emotions. Compassion-related emotions occur when there are feelings of concern about the suffering of the other. Feelings of this type tend to be predominantly positive and can result in favourable changes in attitudes towards the outgroup member. In contrast, negative emotions are evoked by feelings of distress elicited by the suffering of the other this can influence favourable changes in attitudes towards outgroup member.

Lastly parallel empathy mainly means that the ingroup member mirrors and experiences the same emotions experienced by the outgroup members. For instance an outgroup member is likely to respond with positive emotions to favourable intergroup contact if ingroup member is friendly towards the outgroup member. Similarly an outgroup member can also respond with negative emotions in response to outgroup

insults. These three forms of empathy have positive consequences for intergroup relations and intergroup attitudes. Empathy induces a perception of increased similarities between the self and other by making thoughts about the member become self-like (Galinsky & Moskowitz, 2000).

According to Pettigrew (1998) it is both cognitive and affective factors that mediate the internal underlying elements of intergroup contact. He proposed that both these factors operate in four interrelated processes to mediate attitude change. These four interrelated processes consist of (a) learning about the outgroup, (b) changing behavior, (c) generating affective ties and (d) ingroup reappraisal. Intergroup contact between members of different social groups provides an opportunity for group members to obtain new information about outgroup members. The new information obtained can correct and alter negative views held about outgroup members and provides more insight about outgroup members. Thus this can improve attitudes in a positive manner (Stephan & Stephan, 1985). Likewise intergroup contact also provides new information about ingroup members, which can include ingroup norms and customs. This process of ingroup reappraisal alters perceptions about ingroup members.

Intergroup contact encounters often require group members to behave according to certain expectations during intergroup contact. When expectations involve embracing and accepting outgroup members' behaviour, group members may change their behaviour to meet up with this expectation. When behaviour is modified, attitudes are altered. This behaviour process is often sustained if intergroup contact is repetitive. At the same time emotions that develop during intergroup contact also influence change in attitudes depending on the positive or negative emotion evoked by intergroup contact.

In light of the contact literature considered thus far, it is evident that reduction of prejudice and positive effects of intergroup contact includes the operation of the specified situational optimal contact conditions (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew, 1998), as well as various underlying mediating factors. There are two other important mediating factors that affect the outcomes of intergroup contact. These are the experiences that members of different status groups have in the contact situation and the generalization

of contact effects. These two aspects were traditionally neglected by earlier contact theory.

2.2.3 Majority and minority group status and effects of contact

Further developments on contact literature contest that the group status of members in the contact situation plays a pivotal role in mediating the effects of contact (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2000). Members of different status group such as minority group members and majority group members have different expectations and perceptions about the contact based on their histories of contact experiences within the broader society (Hyers & Swim, 1998). In a contact situation minority group members may become concerned about becoming victims of prejudice, while majority group members may become concerned about being perceived as prejudiced (Plant & Devine, 2003). "It is therefore possible that ongoing histories of devaluation would inhibit the degree to which intergroup contact would be associated with positive intergroup attitudes among members of minority status groups, relative to the effects that might be observed among members of majority status group" (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2000, p96). In addition, members of majority status group are generally less aware of their privileged status unless there is a demand to do so in the immediate social interactions. In contrast members of minority status tend to be well aware of their groups devalued status and may tend to feel that they are likely to be perceived and evaluated in terms of their devalued group membership. Furthermore the perception of the established optimal contact conditions in the contact situation may differ for members of different group status. For instance members of the minority status group may view that such conditions have not been implemented successfully, while the perception of the majority group may differ. These different perceptions can influence the intergroup attitudes of members of different group status in distinct ways.

Pettigrew and Tropp (2000) conducted a study to examine the difference in contact-prejudice relationship among members of minority and majority status group using a meta-analytic approach to analyse 516 studies, which consisted of 716 independent samples. Findings of the study suggest that contact-prejudice effects vary significantly in relation to the societal status of the group involved. These results indicated that the contact-prejudice relationship was generally weak for members of minority status

groups than for members of majority status groups. In addition, the results also indicated that optimal contact conditions predicted a greater reduction in prejudice for majority members than for minority members.

A similar study by Brown and Bigler (2002) examined the effects of group status on intergroup attitudes amongst children in one classroom. Results indicated that children of the minority status had higher levels of prejudice. The study concluded that salience of group status amongst group members plays a critical role in intergroup attitude. Furthermore minority and majority group members may experience different levels of anxiety based on their previous contact experience (Islam & Hewstone, 1993; Plant & Devine, 2003). A study by Hyers and Swim (1998) examining the effects of intergroup anxiety amongst minority (African–American) and majority (Caucasian-American) group members found that the minority group members were less affected by intergroup anxiety than the majority group members, although both groups reported equal levels of anxiety. It is noted that when Caucasian- American were anxious there were more attentive to the intergroup encounter and the surrounding environment, which hindered their involvement in intergroup interactions. In contrast anxious African –American were more likely to contribute more to group task.

Further results of the study indicated that although the African-American seemed to cope slightly better with intergroup anxiety than their counterpart, this did not mean that they regarded the contact experience as a positive one. Shelton (2003) provided evidence that different group concerns about intergroup contact can influence the subjective experiences of both the interacting partner and concerned partner. Results of the study found that Whites that were told not to appear prejudiced experienced greater intergroup anxiety and experienced the contact encounter as unpleasant, while the Black partners reported a liking for Whites that appeared less prejudice than whites that appeared prejudice. It also seems that Black participants experienced the contact encounter more pleasant when they anticipated prejudice from the White participants than when they have no prejudice expectations.

2.2.4 Generalization of contact effects

Earlier proposition by Pettigrew (1969) suggested that even under optimal contact conditions, cross-group acceptance generated by contact is typically limited to the particular contact situation. Pettigrew's argument was based on a study of steelworkers who learned to work easily with Blacks as co-workers. However these interracial attitudes did not extend to concerns over interracial neighbourhoods. Likewise, Cook (1978) found that attitude change towards particular outgroup members with whom one has had contact does not easily translate into more favourable attitudes towards other outgroup members.

Several researchers formulated various generalization models so as to explain how contact effects generalize beyond the contact situation. These models include the decategorisation model (Miller & Brewer, 1984), salient categorization strategy (Hewstone & Brown, 1986) and recategorisation model (Gaertner, Mann, Murrell & Dovidio, 1989). The decategorisation model proposed that optimal contact conditions could minimize the tendency to categorise group members as in-group and outgroup members. This would allow those involved in the intergroup interactions to focus on personal information that differentiated the outgroup member from their group as a whole (Kenworthy et al, 2004; Miller & Brewer, 1984). The individualised information about the outgroup member disconfirms the validity of category-based stereotype and causes the person to abandon them. Consequently the categorisation model argues that complete decategorization is unlikely to occur for categories that are visually obvious (i.e. race, gender). Furthermore attitudes towards the outgroup as a whole would remain unchanged under decategorized contact, due to the conditions intended to produce the attitude change. The categorization model proposes that it is important that category salience remains relatively high between intergroup members involved in intergroup interactions. In order for positive effects of contact to generalize to the entire outgroup. Hewstone and Brown (1986) warn that when categorization is emphasized during integroup contact this can reinforce perceptions of group difference, which may result in anxiety, discomfort and fear. The recategorisation model states that recategorization is vital during intergroup interactions because group member come to adopt a superordinate level of categorization. This form of categorization happens when group members come to perceive that they share an overarching group membership with outgroup members.

Each of the models presents a distinct approach to generalisation of contact effects; however each model has its own limitation (Kenworthy et al, 2004). Therefore these models fail to provide a definitive perspective of generalization of contact effects.

Aiming to overcome these flaws, Pettigrew (1998) suggests that generalization of contact effects will have optimal effects if all three levels of models of generalization are salient at different phases in the contact process. Building on the ideas presented in the models Pettigrew (1998) proposes a broader generalization model that incorporates all three models. He suggests that all models operate sequentially to achieve optimal generalization effects. The model postulates that early contact is best when there is decategorization of group members that is closely followed by the process of salient categorization and ultimately followed by recategorization. Therefore this model recognizes that each model is important at different stages during contact (Kenworthy et al, 2004). A number of research studies have provided supporting evidence for generalisation of attitude change from specific outgroups members to outgroup members as a whole (Hewstone & Brown, 1986; Pettigrew, 1997). Results of Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) meta-analysis studies confirm that generalization effects of contact extend much further than commonly thought.

The contact hypothesis has inspired a wealth of contact studies in diverse social settings such as workplace, neighbourhoods and educational institutions (Pettigrew, 1998). Likewise within the South African context a number of contact studies have examined the effects of contact across different sectors in neighbourhoods, work context and educational institutions. The scope of contact studies conducted in educational institutions has mainly included research in desegregated schools and racially mixed universities. The following part of the literature review will focus on studies and literature pertaining to intergroup contact and intergroup attitudes of learners, particularly learners in desegregated schools, as this is central for the present study.

2.3 Intergroup contact and desegregated schools

School desegregation has occurred in various countries worldwide including South Africa. Like South Africa the main aim of desegregating schools in many of the

countries is to provide equal educational opportunities and resources to all learners of diverse racial and ethnic groups (Sigelman, Bledsoe, Welch & Combs, 1996; Vally & Dalamba, 1999). In addition school desegregation within South Africa was also a way of racially mixing learners of diverse racial groups that were previous racially segregated in their schooling context (Harber, 1998). Similar to other desegregated schools worldwide, desegregated schools in South Africa have provided learners of diverse racial and ethnic groups the opportunity for regular intergroup contact (Lacy, Mason, Middleton, 1998; Slavin & Cooper, 1999). This transition has made desegregated schools one of the main sites of naturally occurring racial contact However, school desegregation in South Africa was established under challenging circumstances accompanied by resistance and eruptions of intergroup violence amongst learners and opposition of community (Finchilescu & Tredoux, in press). Consequently the pattern of school desegregation has unfolded in a particular fashion, characterised by the common trend of assimilation approach (Soudien, 2004). This meant that learners that have immigrated into the various desegregated schools have had to adapt to the cultural ethos of the new schools. Various studies have reported that it is largely Black learners that have migrated into previously White, Indian and Coloured schools. At the same time, the proportion of Black learners in previous White schools is smaller than the proportion of Black learners in previous Indian and Coloured schools. It is evident that there has been no migration of White and Indian learners into predominantly Black schools, while only a few Coloured learners have migrated into predominantly Black schools (Carrim, 1998; Chisholm & Sujee, 2006; Pillay 2004; Soudien, 2004; Sujee, 2004; Vally & Dalamba, 1999).

A number of researchers in South Africa hypothesized that given the historical context of education in South Africa; school desegregation would lead to racial conflict unless the structure of schooling is changed (Harber, 1998). In contrast researchers in America believed that school desegregation would lead to more positive racial attitudes. This belief was based on the principles of the contact hypothesis that contact between members of different races fosters positive racial attitudes (Sigelman et al, 1996). Pettigrew (1969) argues that desegregated social settings are typically the most suitable context to explore the principles of contact hypothesis, because truly integrated institutions afford the type of equal- status,

common goal, interdependent and authority-sanctioned contact that maximises cross-racial acceptance.

Desegregated school settings have inspired a considerable body of research concerned with the effects of desegregation on intergroup attitudes of learners. International studies investigating the effects of school desegregation on racial attitudes have generally presented inconsistent results (Amir, 1969; Cook, 1984; Dutton, Singer & Devlin, 1998, Gerard; 1983; Lacy et al, 1983; Miller, Brewer & Edwards, 1985, Pettigrew, 1998; Slavin & Cooper, 1999; Schofield, 1997, 2001; Stephan, 1978; Stephan & Rosenfield, 1978). Similarly studies in South Africa concerned with intergroup attitudes of learners in desegregated schools have presented inconsistent results across the different periods of restricted contact (Apartheid period) and unrestricted contact period (post-Apartheid period). Results of studies conducted during the Apartheid period have largely shown contradictory results of racial attitudes (see Cowley, 1991; Luiz & Krige, 1981, 1985; Mynhardt, 1982), while the small number of studies conducted in the post- Apartheid period tends to report positive effects on racial attitudes and tolerant racial attitudes (Holtman 2002; Smith & Stone, 1999; Smith, Stone & Naidoo, 2003; Wilhelm, 1994).

Numerous reasons have emerged as to why results of studies in desegregated schools have been inconsistent over the years. It has been argued that the studies of desegregated schools that were conducted during the times when the legal and social conditions did not support inter-racial contact, were not a valid test of the contact hypothesis. Such contact in the absence of institutional support was unlikely to facilitate positive changes in attitudes. In other cases intergroup contact between members of different racial groups was restricted or communities were opposing school desegregation (Mynhardt, 1982; Stephan & Rosenfield, 1978). Therefore these hostile conditions tend to perpetuate racial prejudice even further. In fact Brown (1995), Harber (1998), Stephan and Rosenfield (1978) argue that there are a few desegregated schools that have met the required optimal contact condition. A study by Schofield (1997) evaluated the effects of a single school in the USA that had established integration policies that incorporated the required optimal contact conditions for successful intergroup contact. For instance a numerical balance between Black and White learners was achieved, teachers of different ethnicities were

employed the school authorities. These teachers were publicly supportive of racial integration and attempts were made to minimize competition in the schools. Similarly Harber (1998) also evaluated the racial attitudes of one school in South Africa that had not only desegregated but had also attempted to democratise its management structure and foster a school climate that facilitated optimal contact conditions between its learners. Both studies reported positive racial attitudes amongst its learners. However additional findings by Schofield (1997) revealed evidence of ethnic segregation amongst learners in their informal interactions. Similarly a field study by Dixon (2001) demonstrated that racial mixing in classrooms in frequently offset by segregation in other domains. Learners use of space i.e. playgrounds and cafeteria may work to reproduce segregation. These findings illustrate that often racial mixing in the classroom environment and racial attitudes displayed in the classroom may be situation specific and that these attitudes do not necessarily translate beyond the classroom environment. This resurrection of boundaries does not only limit the opportunity for contact but also confirms the salience of 'race' within the school environment. A study by Dutton, Singer and Devlin (1998), evaluated the effect of school's population on a child's racial identity across three different schools (integrated, Black and White school). The results of the study revealed that children in integrated school setting mentioned race and ethnicity significantly more often than children in either of the other two school settings. This finding suggests that exposure to other racial groups in integrated schools increases saliences of one's race. Therefore children in integrated schools are more conscious of their race groups and more likely to define themselves in terms of their racial categories than children in racially segregated schools. A study by Smith and Stone (1999) revealed that Afrikaans speaking Whites who had a higher degree of group identification and higher support of in-group culture had more negative attitudes towards non-white outgroup members than other racial groups that reported lower levels of group identification. This finding lends support to the idea that members of groups who experience more prejudice than others are more motivated to maintain distinction between their own groups and outgroups. Thus salience of race in desegregated school can limit the opportunity for increases intergroup contact amongst learners of the different racial groups.

Furthermore Brown (1995) posits that the typical classroom activities in many desegregated schools limit the operation of optimal contact conditions, as class activities usually involve minimal cooperation between learners. Learners usually have to compete with each other for better academic performance. This competitive atmosphere is easily extended beyond the classroom environment because even outside of the classroom learners compete for limited positions in various schools organization and sport teams, thus making cross-ethnic interaction between learners competitive and superficial (Johnson & Johnson, 1984; Slavin & Cooper 1999). As a result this type of competitive atmosphere in the schooling environment serves as an indicator of unequal status amongst learners both in the classroom and beyond the classroom context (Gerard, 1983). Subsequently when group status is salient in desegregated school this can limit the opportunities for intergroup contact. Schofield (2001) states that minority group status makes in-group versus out-group distinction more salient for learners that are classified as minority group members than for majority group members. Consequently, minority group members are predicted to show higher levels of group identification than learners of the majority group status. Since often minority group members belong to social groups that are associated with negative stereotype by the majority culture. Thus when group status is salient learners intergroup attitudes may be less likely to change in a positive manner (Schofield, 1997, 2001). In support of Schofield perspective and Brown and Bigler (2002) state that group status salience affects intergroup attitudes via a cognitive process in which learners develop a hypothesis about group differences. It is evident that there are various naturally occurring factors that mediate the process of intergroup contact in desegregated school. Consequently desegregated schools seldom incorporate the necessary conditions that would facilitate successful intergroup contact.

However contemporary theorists have suggested that desegregated schools can maximise optimal contact conditions within the schooling environment, if the school introduces specific programs that will promote the opportunities for successful intergroup contact and positive attitudes. Cooperative learning techniques are the most commonly used interventions that maximize opportunities for successful intergroup contact. These include, Jigsaw teaching technique, Student Teams- Achievement Division (STAD), Teams-Games-Tournament (TGT) (Johnson & Johnson, 1984; Lacy et al, 1983; Miller et al, 1985; Schofield, 2001; Slavin& Cooper, 1999).

Cooperative learning techniques involve a small team of learners working collaboratively in a group towards the achievement of academic success for each team member, with minimal supervision from the teacher. This type of learning provides the opportunity for social interactions amongst learners of diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds, thus encouraging the development of friendship. Cooperative learning techniques satisfy all the key conditions of the contact hypothesis. In that firstly cooperative learning organizes the learning experiences of the learners so that they are cooperatively interdependent on one another in a small group. Secondly cooperative learning techniques involve a high degree of learner to learner interactions, thus the increased contact amongst learners of different backgrounds is likely to generate 'acquaintance potential' that is essential for successful contact. Thirdly cooperative learning techniques attempt to establish equal status amongst learners by emphasising the importance of each member's contribution to the overall group product. Lastly since cooperative learning techniques are introduced and encouraged by the teacher, this support serve as institutional support towards intergroup contact for the learners.

It is however important to recognize that even if optimal contact conditions are arranged in school environments, school life is only a part of the children's experience of intergroup contact. When learners of different racial and ethnic groups return home at the end of each school day, they return to different social environments that contribute to their intergroup attitudes (Brown, 1995; Stephan & Rosenfield, 1978). Therefore it is also important to consider factors that influence the attitudes of learners beyond the school context. There are at least three main social agencies that have been identified to influence the intergroup attitudes of learners in the broader social context. These include parents, mass media and peer groups. According to the socialization model prejudice in children is acquired through direct socialization by these social agencies. This conclusion was drawn after various empirical studies provided evidence of direct correlation between children attitudes and parents, mass media and peer groups. However social psychologist contest that socialization is only part of the process of how children develop and maintain prejudice attitudes. They argue that children play a more active role in the development process than what the socialization model proposes. Social psychologists have linked the development of prejudice to the social and affective changes that occur in children through their development (Brown, 1995). One of the most useful theories of this approach is that

of Aboud (1988, as cited in Brown 1995). This theory proposes that during the early years of development children classify the world into broad categories (i.e. male/female, like/dislike) and associate these categories with different emotional responses that derive from a combination of their own personal experiences and observation of the experiences of others. As children develop their cognitive structures also develop, which changes their thinking about the world. Thus the child begins to recognize the possibility of individual variation within groups and the initial rigid stereotypes become more flexible and amendable to change in response to individuating information. In addition as children mature they become more aware of the norms of the adult society and social undesirability of expressing certain kinds of prejudice too overtly. Consequently these developmental changes can reduce prejudice and discrimination.

The development of children's attitudes involves a dynamic process in which children together with the various social agencies (parents, school, mass media and peer groups) actively seek to understand, judge and take control of their social world. Therefore "racial attitudes are shaped by natural outgrowth of an interaction between the world and internal psychological processes of children" (Brown, 1995, p 159). Stephan and Rosenfield (1978) examined the determinants of changes in racial attitudes of White elementary school children during school desegregation. The multiple regression analysis revealed that increases in children's self-esteem, increases in children's interethnic contact, low parental authoritarianism and non-punitive parental rearing practices were all significantly related to positive changes in racial attitudes. These findings indicate that children's intergroup attitudes are influenced by both social and psychological factors.

It is evident that desegregated schools are important context that provide the opportunity for regular intergroup contact amongst learners of various racial groups in South Africa. However contact encountered at school does not always occur under favourable optimal contact conditions that facilitate the promotion of positive intergroup attitudes amongst its learners. There are numerous naturally occurring factors within the school environment that impact on the intergroup attitudes of learners. Further developments on the original contact hypothesis have provided evidence of internal psychological process that influence intergroup attitudes. The

small number of contact studies conducted in desegregated school in the post Apartheid period are mainly focused on the effects of school contact on racial attitudes of the learners. It is evident that there are more studies that are needed to explore the effect of contact and other underlying factors on racial attitudes of leaners in South Africa. Therefore this study focus on the following research aims

2.4 Research Aims

The central aim of this study is to test whether the attitudes towards Whites of Black learners attending a multiracial school (desegregated white school) are more positive than the attitudes of Black learners attending a single race Black school. Thus the primary hypothesis for the study is: There will be a difference in the intergroup attitudes of black learners that attend a single race school and Black learners attending a multiracial school.

In addition, the study will explore whether the degree of race identification, the amount of contact and experience of contact, and degree of perceived negative meta-stereotypes explains intergroup attitudes.

CHAPTER THREE
METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

Non-experimental research design

The present research study employed a non-experimental research design to explore the intergroup attitudes of Black learners attending a multiracial school and a single race school. There was no manipulation of any variable; therefore the design can be classified as non-experimental with quantitative questionnaire design.

The participants from the two schools (multiracial school and single race school) differed with regard to the degree of intergroup contact encountered with White learners inside the school contexts. In keeping with the nature of the research design the two high schools were matched according to the following factors:

- Medium of instruction in both schools is English.
- Both schools are government –owned schools.
- The ratio of teacher- learner in classrooms of both schools is approximately 30-35 learners per class.
- Junior grade learners only (grade eight and nine)
- Both schools are considered to be middle-class schools**.**

The schools were matched so as to minimize the effect of potential extraneous variables that could affect the results of the study**.**

3.2 Sample

3.2.1 Participants

The sample for this research study consisted of 106 participants (50 female and 56 males), drawn from a population of learners at two high schools, a multiracial school and single race school located in the Johannesburg area. The population of learners in the multiracial school is made of learners of different racial groups i.e. Indians, Coloureds, Whites and Blacks. And the population of learners in the single race

school is made of learners of the Black racial group only. For the purpose of the study only data obtained from the Black learners in each school were included in the final analysis.

The sample obtained from the multiracial school constituted 33.9% (n=36) of the total sample. Of these 61.1 %(n=22) were female and 38.8% (n=14) were male. Due to time constraints and various other school commitments only learners in the junior grades, mainly grade eight and nine learners were allowed to participant in the study. There were 91.6 %(n=33) grade 8 participants, while 8.3% (n=3) were grade 9 participants. Furthermore 69.4% (n=25) of participants resided in suburbs, 27.7% (n=10) of participants lived in township and 2.7% (n=1) lived in other unspecified residential areas. With regard to home language of the participants, 11.1% (n=11) of participants reported English to be their home language, 25.0% (n=9) indicated that Sotho as their home language. Similarly another 25.0% (n=9) of participants reported Tswana to be their home language. Another 5.5 %(n=2) indicated Xhosa as their home language. In addition 25.0% (n=9) of participants indicated Zulu as their home language, while 19.4% (n=7) of participants reported an unspecified home languages that were not included in the list of languages in the questionnaire.

The sample of the single race school made up 66.0 %(n=70) of the total sample. The females' participants constituted 40.0% (n=28) of this sample, while 60.0% (n=42) were male participants. Similar to the multiracial school, only learners in the junior grades were allowed to participate in the study as specified by the school principles for similar reasons to those given by the school principle in the multiracial school. There were 64.2% (n=45) grade 8 participants and 35.7 %(n=25) of participants were in grade 9. Approximately 84.2% (n=59) of participants resided in the township area, 8.5% (n=6) of the participants lived in the suburbs and 5.7% (n=4) lived in other unspecified residential areas. There were 40.0% (n=28) of participants that indicated Zulu as their home language, 34.2% (n=24) reported Tswana to be their home language, 12.8% (n=9) indicated Sotho as their home language and 4.2% (n=3) indicated Xhosa to be their home language, while 8.5% (n=6) participants reported an unspecified home language that were not included in the list of languages in the questionnaire.

For the overall sample of participants in the single race school and the multiracial school the mean date of birth was approximately 1992.

3.2.2 Sampling strategy

The study employed a non-probability sampling strategy as participation in the study depended on the willingness and availability of participants. This essentially characterises the participants as a volunteer sample.

3.3 Measuring Instruments

Questionnaire

Seven variables, namely general contact outside the school context, racial identification, meta-stereotypes, and school contact, experience of school contact, affective prejudice and social distance were measured. These variables are operationalised by means of scales with sound psychometrics properties. Two questionnaires were compiled, one for the sample in the single race school, investigating almost all of the variables listed above except for the following variables: school contact and experience of school contact. The second questionnaire was compiled for the sample in the multiracial school, which examined all the variables listed above (refer to Appendix B). The scales included in the questionnaires were derived from two sources, an intergroup attitude survey developed by Gillian Finchilescu and Colin Tredoux, conducted by Muianga (2005) at University of Cape Town and a survey that investigated the intergroup attitudes of learners in integrated schools in the Western Cape by Holtman (2002).

3.3.1 Demographic Information

Data relating to the following demographic information was elicited from participants: name of school attended by learner, gender, grade, age, residential area and home language.

3.3.2 General contact with Whites outside the school context

This scale measures the amount of intergroup contact black learners have with Whites beyond the school context. This scale is an adopted version of the Contact Scale used

by Holtman (2002). The scale consists of six statements measuring contact in various social settings. The statements include, contact with Whites at your own home, in residential areas or social events. Responses to the items were scored on a 4-point likert scale indicating 'never', 'seldom', 'fairly often' and 'very often'. A high score is associated with greater contact and low score is associated with minimal contact. The responses on the six items were averaged producing a mean score that range from 1 to 4. Holtman (2002) reported alpha coefficient of .85 for Black African learners and .93 for White Afrikaans learners.

3.3.3 Racial identification

This scale was derived from Bornman (1988); it has been used by Appelgryn and Bornman (1996) and Holtman (2002). The scale assesses the participant's degree of identification with in-group members, negative/ positive feelings associated with group membership as well as attitudes towards the preservation of their group identity. For this study the scale assessed the Black learners' degree of identification with their own racial group by indicating agreement or disagreement with various statements. This scale consists of eight items on a 5-point Likert scale. The various statements tap the black learner's' loyalty, pride, commitment and respect towards their own racial group. Responses ranged from 'agree strongly' (1) to 'disagree strongly (5)'. High scores indicated strong identification with one's racial group and low scores were indicative of weaker identification with one's racial group. In this scale the scores item 1, 2,4,5,6 & 7 were reversed so that the low and high scores for each item reflected the indicated direction. A calculation of these responses produced a mean score that range between 1 to 5. Appelgryn and Bornman (1996) reported a Kuder-Richardson 20 reliability coefficient of 0.90. Holtman (2002) reported Kuder-Richardson 20 reliability coefficient of .60 for Coloured and Black African learners and .61 for White Afrikaans learners and .70 for White English learners.

3.3.4 Meta-stereotypes

Finchilescu and Tredoux developed this scale; it was used by Muianga (2005). The scale consisted of 5 items measured on a 7-point semantic differential scale and it measures the participants' perceptions about how they think Whites feels towards Blacks. For the purpose of the study three additional items were included. The scale

used in the study comprised of 8 pairs of bipolar adjectives that require participants' to mark a block that is as close to the relevant adjective that describes their perceptions. The adjectives ranged between 'hostile' or 'friendly', 'positive' or 'negative'. A low score is associated with beliefs that Whites hold minimal or no negative perceptions about Blacks and a high score is associated with beliefs that White hold strong negative perceptions about Blacks. The scores for item 1, 3, 4& 7 were reversed scores .The average of the responses on the 8 items produced a mean score that ranged from 1 to 7. Muianga (2005) reported alpha coefficient for Black African students of .89.

3.3.5 School contact

The scale measured the amount of intergroup contact the participant encounters with White schoolmates inside the school the context as well as outside the school context. It is important to note that this scale was included in the questionnaire administered to the Black learners in the multiracial school only. This scale was designed by Holtman (2002) and it consists of 8 items measured on a 4 point Likert scale. The items tap into information regarding informal and social intergroup contact such as voluntary seating arrangement in classroom and interactions during lunchtimes at school. Responses ranged between 'never', 'seldom', 'fairly often' and 'very often'. Low scores are indicative of minimum contact with white learners and high scores indicate greater contact with white learners. The calculation of the responses produces a mean score that ranged from 1 to 4. Holtman (2002) reported alpha coefficient of .94 for Black African learners and .98 for White Afrikaans learners.

3.3.6 Experience of school contact

This scale is included in the questionnaire administered to the Black learners attending the multiracial school only. The scale was derived from Bornman (1988) and has been used by Holtman (2002). It is a 7-point semantic differential scale, however like Holtman (2002) a 5-point version was used for this study. The scale measures the quality of the participant's experience of contact with white learners at school. Items consisted of six pairs of bipolar adjective. The adjectives included a choice between 'courteous' or 'rude', 'meaningless' or 'meaningful'. Responses were calculated to produce a mean score that ranged from 1 to 5. A low score is indicative

of positive experience of intergroup contact with white learners and a high score is indicative of negative experiences of intergroup contact with white learners. Holtman (2002) reported an alpha coefficient of .71 for Black African learners and .76 for White Afrikaans learners.

3.3.7 Affective prejudice

This scale is an adopted version of the Affective prejudice scale used by Muianga (2005), based on a scale developed by Zanna (1994). It is a 7-point semantic differential scale consisting of six pairs of bipolar adjectives. The scale focuses on the participant's feelings towards Whites. The adjectives ranged between two poles such as 'warm' or 'cold', 'friendly' or 'unfriendly'. This scale requires the participant to select a box somewhere ranging between the two adjective poles. A minimum mean score of 1and maximum of 7. A low score is associated with positive feelings towards Whites and a high score is indicative of negative feelings towards Whites. Muianga (2005) reported an alpha coefficient of .87.

3.3.8 Social distance

Social distance is a measure of prejudice. This scale is developed by Bogardus (1925). An adapted version of this scale was used in this study. This version has been used by Muianga (2005). The scale consists of six items scored on a 5-point Likert scale. The items measure the participant's desire for contact with Whites. This scale essentially measures participants prejudice feelings towards interactions with Whites. The items range from least intimate form of social closeness such as the participant's reaction about admitting White people into his/her school, family or home. The five response options required participant to state the level of social intimacy or their desire for distance with Whites. A low score is associated with a greater desire for contact with Whites and a high score is indicative of a minimal desire for contact with Whites. The calculated mean scores of the responses ranged from 1 to 5. The alpha coefficient for Black African learners was .88 reported by Muianga (2005).

3.4 Procedures

Data for this study was collected during the month of November 2005 at the single race school and January 2006 at the multiracial school. Permission for this research

was obtained from various sources: the Gauteng Department of Education, the school principals of the two high schools that participated in the study and by the participants' guardians/ parents (see Appendix A). Each of the sources that granted permission was given either a written or verbal summary of the purpose of the study. Completion-time for the questionnaire ranged from 25-35 minutes and appeared to be uniform between classroom-groups.

A week prior to the data collection, relevant class teachers introduced the researcher to learners in the relevant grades. The researcher presented the study to the learners as an attitude survey about adolescent view towards each other. Consent letters were subsequently handed-out to those learners interested in participating in the study, so that they obtained permissions from their guardians/ parents (see Appendix A). On the day of the data collection participants that indicated their desire to participate in the study, were handed the questionnaires and asked to follow all instructions contained in the questionnaire carefully. Participants were also asked to answer all questions as honestly as possible and not discuss questions with each other, but to direct all questions to the researcher. The researcher remained in the classroom while all the participants completed the questionnaires and clarified any ambiguities participants raised. Each participant was thanked for participating in the study on the last page of the questionnaire; in addition the researcher verbally thanked all the participants after completing the questionnaires. A debriefing group session was offered to any participants that felt unsettled as a result of the questions in the questionnaire; however none of the participants opted for the debriefing sessions in any of the schools.

A separate questionnaire was compiled and administered to the Coloured, White and Indian learners in the multiracial school. However data obtained from these questionnaires was not analysed. An overall total sample of 114 Black learners from both schools completed the questionnaires. From the original total sample 3 subjects from the single race school and 5 from the multiracial school were excluded because they had not completed a sufficient amount of the questionnaire.

3.5 Methods of analysis

Data analysis began with analysing the reliability of the measuring instruments. In order to examine the reliability of the measuring instruments used in this study, two primary reliability measures were used the Cronbach's alpha and exploratory factor analysis. According to Kerlinger (1986) reliability refers to the consistency and stability of a measuring instrument. Little faith can be put in the results obtained and the conclusion drawn if one is unaware of the reliability and validity of one's data and measuring instruments. Cronbach's alpha is one of the widely used measures of reliability; it is estimated by determining the degree to which each item in a scale correlates with other items in the scale. The reliability is based on the intercorrelations among all the single test items, the higher the correlation, and the stronger the reliability. As a general rule of thumb, an instrument with an alpha coefficient of 0.6 or above is demonstrated to have satisfactory internal reliability (Howell, 2002). In this study Cronbach's alpha was calculated to determine the internal reliability coefficient of the measuring instruments.

In addition factor analysis was used to substantiate the reliability of the measuring instruments. Factor analysis calculates whether the items of the scales measure a single factor. Although factor analysis can be used for various other statistical procedures, in this study factor analysis was specifically used to identify problematic items, for instance items that load similarly on two factors or items that load weakly on all factors, these items could be seen as lacking internal consistency. If an item does not contribute positively to the internal reliability (the Cronbach alpha increases without the item) the item should rather be excluded from the scale, resulting in a more reliable measurement of a concept (Howell, 2002). The choice of when an increase in Alpha is sufficient to warrant the exclusion of an item is at the discretion of the researcher.

Following the analysis of reliability of measuring instruments, an analysis of the descriptive statistics was conducted. Descriptive statistics are used to organise, describe and summarize a collection of quantitative data obtained about the sample and the measures instruments (Howell, 2002). Essentially descriptive statistics are used to present quantitative descriptions of the raw data in manageable forms. In order

to merely summarise and explain the distribution of the sample in this study, descriptive statistics namely the means, standard deviations, minimum and maximum values were utilized for the raw data.

Further analysis undertook included the independent t-test. T-tests are statistical techniques that can determine whether one group of numerical scores is statistically higher or lower than another group of scores, essentially the t-test assesses whether the means of two groups are statistically different from each other (Kerlinger, 1986; Howell, 2002). The t-test analysis conducted in this study addresses the primary research questions: Do Black learners attending the multiracial school and those attending the single race school differ in relation to their intergroup attitudes (as measured by affective prejudice and social distance).

In addition to the above statistical analysis, further statistical analysis conducted included the multiple linear regressions. For the purpose of this study multiple linear regressions is conducted with the aim of exploring variables that significantly contribute to the levels of affective prejudice and social distance amongst the Black learners attending the multiracial and those attending the single race school. Essentially multiple linear regressions systematically test the significance of the contribution of each predictor variable on the dependent variables. Multiple linear regressions use several predictor variables that can potentially account for more variation in the dependent variables than a single variable (Kerlinger, 1986).

For the t-test analysis and the multiple linear regression analysis a significant alpha level of 0.05 was chosen in order to reduce the potential for making a Type 1 error that is, accepting a hypothesis when the results are solely due to chance (Howell, 2002).

3.6 Ethical considerations

The following measures were undertaken to ensure that this research study adheres to the necessary research ethical practices.

The protocol for the study was reviewed and approved by the University of the Witswatersrand Internal Ethics Review Panel: School of Humanities and Community Research Committee. The Ethics Committee of the Gauteng Department of Education and school governing board of each school that participated in the study.

Participants were informed that the questionnaires are an attitude survey about adolescents' views towards each other. The participants consent form (Appendix A) included the protection of confidentiality, anonymity and the voluntary nature of the participants' participation. In addition the researcher verbally reminded the participants about confidentiality of their participation in this research prior to administering the questionnaires. Participants were also requested not to write their names on the questionnaires. In each school a group debriefing session was offered for those participants that felt unsettled as a result of the questions contained in the questionnaire, however none of the participants opted for the debriefing sessions offered in both schools.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

4.1 Introduction

The following chapter presents the results of the statistical analysis performed in this study. The statistical analysis was carried out on the statistical computer programme: SAS (Cary, 2000).

- In the first section, the psychometrics properties of the scales are described, followed by an outline of the basic descriptive statistics of the scales used in this study.

- The second section of this chapter presents results of the t-tests analysis. The t-test analysis is conducted to establish whether there are significant differences in the intergroup attitudes of Black learners attending a multiracial school and those Black learners attending a single race school.

- The last section outlines the multiple linear regression analysis. These analyses were conducted to determine predictor variables that influence the variables-affective prejudice and social distance

4.2 Psychometric properties of measuring instruments

To determine the internal reliability of the measuring instruments used in this study; internal reliability coefficients (Cronbach's alpha) and factor analysis was conducted for each of the measuring instruments. Table 4.2.1 presents details relating to the internal reliability coefficient and factor loading of each measuring instrument.

4.2.1:Psychometric properties of the measuring instruments

Racial Identification		School Contact		Meta-stereotypes		Social Distance	
Item	**Factor loading**	**Item**	**Factor loading**	**Item**	**Factor loading**	**Item**	**Factor loading**
A1	-0.45	B1	-0.56	C1	-0.79	D1	-0.76
A2	-0.60	B2	-0.45	C3	-0.56	D2	-0.74
A3	-0.30	B3	-0.79	C4	-0.38	D3	-0.69
A4	-0.22	B4	-0.68	C5	-0.47	D4	-0.62
A5	-0.35	B5	-0.78	C6	-0.87	D5	-0.76
A6	-0.39	B6	-0.85	C7	-0.54	D6	-0.58
A7	-0.48	B7	-0.77	C8	-0.60		
A8	-0.37	B8	-0.82				
Overall Cronbach's Alpha= 0.57		**Overall Cronbach's Alpha= 0.89**		**Overall Cronbach's Alpha= 0.80**		**Overall Cronbach's Alpha= 0.84**	

General Contact Outside the School Premises		Affective Prejudice		Experience of School Contact	
Item	**Factor loading**	**Item**	**Factor loading**	**Item**	**Factor loading**
E1	-0.75	F1	-0.62	G3	-0.53
E2	-0.53	F3	-0.39	G5	-0.66
E3	-0.57	F4	-0.56	G6	-0.93
E4	-0.40	F5	-072		
E5	-0.30	F6	-0.62		
E6	-0.34				
Overall Cronbach's Alpha= 0.66		**Overall Cronbach's Alpha= 0.71**		**Overall Cronbach's Alpha= 0.73**	

- The racial identification scale consists of 8 items, of which none of the items were excluded. All items (items 1 to 8) loaded significantly onto one factor but presented a low internal reliability coefficient (Cronbach's alpha) of .57. This internal reliability coefficient could not be improved much by exclusion of any of the items in the scales, thus the reliability of the scales remains unchanged. This low reliability suggests that the scale is not a good measure for racial identification in learners, as Holtman (2002) also reported a low reliability coefficient of .60 on Coloured and Black African learners. Appelgryn and Bornman (1996) used this scale on a population of White and Black adults and reported a high reliability coefficient of .90 for both Blacks and Whites.

- For the school contact scale, the internal reliability coefficient (Cronbach's alpha) is high at .89. This indicates that the reliability for this scale is satisfactory. All 8 items loaded significantly on one factor. No items were excluded from this scale.

- Item 2 from the meta-stereotypes scale was excluded following the factor analysis procedure as this item had a weak loading on the one factor and low item-total correlation. It is possible that in item 2 the terms used 'positive and negative' may have been too technical to be used under this scale, therefore learners may have misunderstood these terms in relation to other terms used in this scale. The remaining item 1, 3, 4,5,6,7 and 8 loaded significantly on the one factor. After excluding item 2 from this final calculation the internal reliability coefficient of the scale is satisfactory at .80 making this scale a reliable measure for meta-stereotypes.

- The social distance scale presented an acceptable internal reliability coefficient (Cronbach's alpha) of .84. All items loaded significantly on the one factor.

- On the scale, general contact with Whites outside the school context the internal reliability coefficient (Cronbach's Alpha) is relatively acceptable at .66. There were no items excluded from the scale following the factor analysis, the internal reliability of this scale cannot be improved by any means at this stage. All the items 1 to 6 loaded significantly on the one factor.

- In the scale, affective prejudice item 2 was excluded from the final factor loading computed. Item 2 used the terms 'positive and negative' to relate to feelings of the learners. It is possible that these terms are not the most suitable for describing feeling, thus learners may have found them confusing. Item 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6 loaded significantly onto one factor. The internal reliability coefficient (Cronbach's alpha) improved substantially following the exclusion of item 2, as presented in table 4.2.1. The internal reliability coefficient of this scale is satisfactory at .71.

- On the scale, experience of school contact, item 1 (courteous/rude), item 2 (pleasant/unpleasant) and item 4 (spontaneous/forced) were excluded from the scale following the factor analysis procedure. It is possible that the terms used in the excluded items may have been complex and learners may have had difficulty understanding these terms. The three remaining items (items 3, 5 &6) loaded significantly onto one factor. The calculated internal reliability coefficient (Cronbach's alpha) is satisfactory at 0.73.

In summary, most of the scales utilised in this study have shown themselves to be reliable with Cronbach's alpha values of above 0.6, except the racial identification scale, which has a slightly lower reliability of 0.57. An alpha value of 0.6 is the minimum cut off mark that is accepted as a reliable scale (Howell, 2002). The reliability of the racial identification scale remains unchanged, as reliability of the scale does not improve much by excluding any one of the items. The internal reliability coefficient of satisfactory scales ranged from 0.66 to 0.89. Various items were excluded from certain scales, namely Experience of contact, Meta-stereotypes and Affective prejudice as this increased the Cronbach's alpha positively.

4.3 Basic descriptive statistics

The following section presents results of the basic descriptive statistics of the measuring instruments (scales) comprising of the mean values, standard deviation, minimum and maximum scores as well as the mean values. Table 4.3 presents the basic descriptive statistics of each of the measuring instruments.

Table 4.3.1 Descriptive statistics:

Variables	N	Mean	Std Dev	Maximum	Minimum	Median
General Contact Outside School Context	106	2.43	0.67	4.00	1.00	2.33
Experience Of School Contact	36	2.41	1.04	4.66	1.00	2.00
Affective Prejudice	106	2.68	1.12	5.60	1.00	2.60
Social Distance	106	3.05	1.08	5.00	1.00	3.25
Meta-stereotypes	106	3.01	1.26	7.00	1.00	2.71
Racial Identification	106	3.94	0.52	5.00	2.62	4.00
School Contact	36	2.71	0.78	4.00	1.50	2.81

The mean score for Affective Prejudice is 2.68. This mean score is more than a standard deviation below the midpoint of the scale (4). This suggests that the bulk of the samples have positive feelings towards Whites. The mean score value for the meta-stereotypes scale is 3.01, which is approximately 75% of a standard deviation below the midpoint value of 4. This mean value indicates that the bulk of scores were below the midpoint (as mentioned earlier a low score on the meta-stereotypes is associated with beliefs that Whites hold minimal or no negative perceptions about Blacks). For the scale, Social Distance the mean score is 3.05. This mean value is close to the midpoint value of 3. This mean value is suggestive of a fairly dispersed variation of score with regard to social distance. The mean score for the scale, Experience of School Contact is 2.41. This mean score is barely half a standard deviation below the midpoint of the scale 3, suggesting that the variation of scores are fairly dispersed. The mean score for racial identification is 3.94 and this score is over a standard deviation of 0.52 from the midpoint value of 3. This mean value indicates

that the bulk of the scores were above the midpoint value suggesting that the bulk of the samples have a strong identification with the Black racial group.

The mean value for General Contact outside the School Context is 2.43 with midpoint of 2.5 and the mean value for School Contact is 2.71 with midpoint 3. These mean values are close to the midpoint values of their scales and less than one standard deviation below the midpoint suggesting that the variability of the scores in each scale are fairly dispersed.

4.4 T-test analysis: Comparison of the intergroup attitudes of Black learners attending the multiracial school and Black learners attending the single racial school.

This section presents results of the t-test analysis that address the primary aim of the study: Do Black learners attending the multiracial schools and those attending the single race school differ in relation to intergroup attitudes (as measured by affective prejudice and social distance scales)? For the purpose of the study analysis affective prejudice and social distance functioned as the primary dependent variables and variables general contact outside the school context, racial identification and meta-stereotypes functioned as additional dependent variables. Single race school and multiracial school functioned as independent variables. Table 4.4 reports the t-test analysis results

Table 4.4.1 T-test analysis of Black learners attending the single race school and Black attending the multiracial school

Variable	Type of School	N	Means	T-value	P-value
Affective Prejudice	Multiracial	36	2.34	1.09	.06
	Single race	69	2.80		
Social Distance	Multiracial	36	2.54	3.66	.00
	Single race	70	3.31		

General Contact Outside School Context	Multiracial Single race	36 70	2.81 2.24	-4.50	.00
Meta-stereotypes	Multiracial Single race	36 69	2.96 2.98	0.10	.91
Racial Identification	Multiracial Single race	36 70	4.01 3.90	-1.07	.29

*p<. 05

4.4.1 Affective prejudice of Black learners

The results of the comparative analysis of affective prejudice between Black learners attending the multiracial school and Black learners attending the single race school indicate a non-significant score of (t=1.90 df=103,p<06), indicating that there is no difference between affective prejudice of Black learners attending the multiracial school and Black learners attending the single race school. However this result is close to the level of significance, thus this may imply that Black learners attending the multiracial school may have slightly more positive feelings towards Whites than Black learners attending the single race school.

4.4.2 Social distance of Black learners.

To address the second part of the primary hypothesis, a t-test analysis was conducted to determine whether there is a difference in levels of social distance between Black learners attending the single race school and those attending the multiracial school. Results indicate a significantly higher score of (t=3.66, df=104, p<. 00) for the Black learners in the single race school (as mentioned in section 3.2.9 a high score of social distance is associated with minimal desire for contact with Whites and a low score is associated with greater desire for contact with Whites). This result indicates that Black learners attending the multiracial school have a higher desire for contact with Whites than Black learners that attending the single race school.

In addressing the primary hypothesis of this study, the results of the affective prejudice have indicated no difference between affective prejudices amongst Black learners, however there is a slight tendency for significance. Results on the social distance indicate that Black learners attending the multiracial have a higher desire for contact with Whites than Black learners attending the single race school.

Further t-test analysis were conducted to establish whether there were significant differences between Black learners attending the multiracial school and those attending the single race school in relation to variables: general contact with Whites outside the school context, meta-stereotypes and racial identification.

4.4.3 General contact with Whites outside the school context of Black learners

The t-test analysis conducted to determine whether there is a difference in general contact with Whites outside of the school context between Black learners attending the multiracial school and those Black learners attending the single race school indicated a significant difference (t= -4.50, df=104, p<. 00). Black learners attending the multiracial school scored significantly higher mean score than Black learners attending the single race school. This difference indicates that Black learners attending the multiracial school have more intergroup contact with Whites outside the school context than Black learner attending the single race school.

4.4.4 Meta-stereotypes of Black learners

A further investigation conducted to investigate whether the level of meta-stereotypes differed amongst Black learners attending the multiracial school and those Black learners attending the single race school indicated a non-significant result (t= 0.10, df= 103, p<. 91). This finding indicates that the meta-stereotypes of Black learners attending the single race school and Black learners attending the multiracial school do not differ.

4.4.5 Racial identification of Black learners

A final investigation of t-test analysis conducted examined whether there is a difference in racial identification of Black learners attending the multiracial school and those Black attending the single race school. Non-significant results (t= -1.07, df= 104, p<. 28) were found on the scale racial identification for Black learners attending the single race school and those attending the multiracial school. This result suggests that there is no difference in racial identification of Black learners attending the single race school and Black learners attending the multiracial school.

4.5 Multiple Linear Regression: predictor variables of affective prejudice and social distance

This section presents results of the multiple linear regression analysis conducted to investigate predictor variables that contribute to the variables affective prejudice and social distance between Black learners attending the multiracial school and those Black learners attending the single race school. Separate multiple linear regression analyses were conducted for Black learners in each school. The following variables, racial identification, general contact outside the school context and meta-stereotypes functioned as independent variables in the multiple linear regression analysis of Black learners in the single race school only. And variables: school contact, racial identification, general contact with Whites outside the school context, meta-stereotypes, school contact and experience of school contact functioned as independent variables for the multiple linear regression analysis of Black learners attending the multiracial school only. Affective prejudice and social distance functioned as dependent variables for both the samples. In addition two more multiple linear regression analyses were conducted to investigate predictor variables that contribute to affective prejudice and social distance of the whole sample that is Black learners in both the single race school and multiracial school. In these two analyses type of school, racial identification, general contact outside the school context and meta-stereotypes constituted the independent variables. Affective prejudice and social distance functioned as dependent variables.

4.5.1 Multiple linear regression analysis of Black learners attending the single race school

This section presents results of the multiple linear regression of Black learners attending the single race school only. Table 4.5.1(I) and 4.5.2 (II) reported results of affective prejudice and social distance of these learners

Table 4.5.1 (I) Summary of Multiple linear regression analysis for variables predicting affective prejudice in Black learners attending single race school.

Variables	Beta	Std Err	B	T (70)	P-level
INTERCEPT		1.13	3.72	3.30	0.00
Racial Identification	-0.19	0.22	-0.36	-1.65	0.10
General Contact Outside School Context	-0.07	0.19	-0.13	-0.66	0.51
Meta-stereotypes	0.31	0.10	0.27	2.71	0.00

R^2=. *15*; Adjusted R^2=. 11; *F (*3, 64) =3.95;*p*<. 012

The full model of affective prejudice for Black learners attending the single race school presents statistically significant results (*F* (3, 64) =3.95, *p*=0.012) and the model explaining 15.6% of variance in affective prejudice of Black learners attending the single race school. The variable that provides the greatest explanation in affective prejudice of Black learners attending the single race school is meta-stereotypes as indicated by table 4.5.1, Beta=0.31, *p*=. 00. This positive beta value of .31 indicates a moderate positive relationship between meta-stereotypes and affective prejudice and vice versa. This implies that the higher the levels of meta-stereotypes (in which high meta-stereotypes score is associated with beliefs that Whites hold strong negative perceptions about Blacks) the greater the negative feelings Black learners have towards Whites and vice versa.

Table 4.5.1 (II) Summary of Multiple linear regression analysis for variables predicting social distance in Black learners attending the single race school.

Variables	Beta	Std Err	B	T (70)	P-level
INTERCEPT		1.18	2.41	2.03	0.04
Racial Identification	0.10	0.23	0.19	0.84	0.40
General Contact Outside School Context	0.14	0.20	0.25	1.21	0.22
Meta-stereotypes	-0.15	0.10	-0.13	-1.30	0.19

R^2 =. *06*; Adjusted R^2=. *01*; *F (*3, 65) =1.42; *p*<. 24

The results of the multiple linear regression analysis indicate that the model for the social distance scale (desire for contact with Whites) of Black learners attending the single race school is not significant (*F* (3, 65) =1.42; *p*<. 24). The model indicates non- significant results for all variables considered in the regression model above. Therefore none of the variables considered contributed significantly to social distance of Black learners attending the single race school.

4.5.2 Multiple linear regression for Black learners attending the multiracial school only

The following section presents results of the multiple linear regression of Black learners attending the multiracial school only. Table 4.5.2(I) and 4.5.2 (II) reports results of affective prejudice and social distance of black learners attending the multiracial school.

Table 4.5.2 (I) Summary of Multiple linear regression analysis for variables predicting affective prejudice in Black learners attending multiracial school

Variables	Beta	Std Err	B	T (36)	P-level
INTERCEPT		1.44	3.27	2.26	0.03
School Contact	-0.30	0.25	-0.44	-1.76	0.08
Racial Identification	-0.15	0.27	-0.37	-1.33	0.19
General Contact Outside School Context	-0.01	0.30	-0.03	-0.11	0.91
Meta-stereotypes	0.54	0.11	0.49	4.31	0.00
Experience of School Contact	0.16	0.12	0.18	1.40	0.17

R^2=. *59*; Adjusted R^2=. *53*; *F (*5, 30) =8.93; *p*<. 00

The results presented for the multiple linear regression analysis of affective prejudice for Black learners attending the multiracial school indicate a statistical significant model, (*F* (5, 30) =8.93, *p*=. 00) which explains 59.8% of variance of affective prejudice amongst Black learners attending the multiracial school. Meta-stereotypes presented as the only significant predictor variable that provides the greatest explanation of affective prejudice amongst Black learners attending the multiracial school. The beta value of .54, *p*=. 00 indicates a moderate positive relationship between meta-stereotypes and affective prejudice, thus as the levels of meta-stereotypes increase there is also an increase in affective prejudice and vice versa. Furthermore it appears that there is a slight tendency for variable school contact to be a possible predictor variable (beta= -0.30, *p*= .08). The negative beta value indicates a moderate negative relationship between school contact and affective prejudice. This suggests that as the amount of school contact increases levels of affective prejudice tend to decrease and vice versa. However it is possible that the regression coefficients are unstable as the sample size is relatively small (36 participants).

Table 4.5.2 (II) Summary of Multiple linear regression analysis for variables predicting social distance in Black learners attending multiracial school

Variables	Beta	Std Err	B	T (36)	P-level
INTERCEPT		1.54	3.17	2.06	0.04
School Contact	-0.44	0.26	-0.05	-0.20	0.84
Racial Identification	-0.04	0.29	-0.09	-0.32	0.74
General Contact Outside School Context	-0.32	0.32	-0.50	-1.56	0.12
Meta-stereotypes	0.25	0.12	0.19	1.60	0.12
Experience of School Contact	0.33	0.13	0.31	2.26	0.03

R^2=. *37*; Adjusted R^2=. *27*; *F (5*, 30) =3.59; *p*<. 01

The full model of multiple linear regression presented is statistically significant (F (5, 30) =3.59, *p*=0.01) and the models explains 37.4% of variance of social distance amongst Black learners attending the multiracial school. Experience of school contact presented as the only significant predictor variable of social distance amongst Black learners attending the multiracial school. The beta value of .33, *p*=. 03 indicates a moderate positive association between social distance and experience of school contact implying that as the levels of experience of contact increases so does the level of social distance increase. This means that the more positive the learners' experience of contact with White learners the greater the desire for contact Whites.

4.5.3 Multiple linear regression of the whole sample

The following section presents results of multiple linear regression analysis of the whole sample (combined sample of Black learners in multiracial and single race school). Results of affective prejudice and social distance are presented in the table 4.5.3(I) and 4.5.3(II)

Table 4.5.3 (I) Summary of Multiple linear regression analysis for variables predicting affective prejudice amongst Black learners in both schools

Variables	Beta	Std Err	B	T (99)	P-level
INTERCEPT		0.88	3.55	3.99	0.00
Meta-stereotypes	0.42	0.08	0.38	4.87	0.00
Racial Identification	-0.16	0.08	-0.34	-1.93	0.06
General Contact Outside School Context	-0.14	0.95	-0.23	-1.51	0.13
School	-0.10	0.09	-0.25	-1.16	0.25

R^2=. *27*; Adjusted R^2=. *25*; *F (4*, 99) =9.60; *p*<. 00

The results presented for the multiple linear regression analysis of affective prejudice for Black learners in both the multiracial and single race school indicated a statistically significant model, (*F* (4, 99) =9.60, *p*=00) which explains 27.9% of variance of affective prejudice amongst Black learners in both the single race school and multiracial school. Meta-stereotypes presented as the only significant predictor variable that contributes to affective prejudice amongst Black learners in both the multiracial and single race school. The beta value of .42, *p*=. 00 indicates a moderate positive relationship between meta-stereotypes and affective prejudice, implying that as the levels of meta-stereotypes increases there is also an increase in affective prejudice and vice versa. Furthermore it appears that there is a slight tendency for variable racial identification to be a potential predictor variable (beta= -0.16, *p*=. 06), given that the p-value is close to significance. The negative beta value indicates a moderate negative relationship between racial identification and affective prejudice. This suggests that as the level of racial identification of Black learners increases, the levels of affective prejudice decrease and vice versa.

Table 4.5.3 (II) Summary of Multiple linear regression analysis for variables predicting social distance amongst Black learners in both schools

Variables	Beta	Std Err	B	T (100)	P-level
INTERCEPT		0.97	2.97	3.05	0.00
School	-0.34	0.10	-0.77	-3.27	0.00

Racial Identification	0.05	0.09	0.11	0.58	0.56
General Contact Outside School Context	-0.02	0.10	-0.03	-0.23	0.81
Meta-stereotypes	-0.00	0.09	-0.00	-0.00	0.99

R^2=. *12;* Adjusted R^2=. *08*; F *(4,100*) =3.45; *p*<. 01

The result of the multiple linear regression analysis for social distance using the whole sample indicates a statistically significant model (*F* (4,100), *p.*01*)* that explains 12.1% of variance of social distance amongst Black learners in both the multiracial school and single race school. School presented as the only significant predictor variable that provides the greatest explanation for social distance for the Black learners in both the single race and multiracial school. The beta value of –0.33, *p*=00 indicates a moderate negative relationship between the type of school attended by the learners and social distance. As the multiracial school was coded 01 and the single race school was coded 0, this indicates that attendance of the multiracial school is associated with greater desire for contact with Whites and attendance of the single race school is associated with less desire for contact with Whites.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

5.1 Introduction

The central aim of this study was to examine the intergroup attitudes of Black learners attending a multiracial school and Black learners attending a single race school. The research hypothesised that intergroup attitudes of Black learners attending the multiracial school and Black learners attending the single race school would differ. Presented below is the discussion of the research findings pertaining to the research hypothesis. In addition a discussion is presented concerning the factors that explain the intergroup attitudes of Black learners in each school. The chapter closes with a discussion of the research limitations and recommendations for future research.

5.2 Comparison of intergroup attitudes of Black learners in each school

In order to test the research hypothesis, a comparative analysis was conducted to explore whether there is a difference in the intergroup attitudes (as measured by social distance and affective prejudice) of Black learners attending the multiracial school and Black learners attending the single race school. In addition further comparative analyses were conducted to determine whether the amount of general contact with Whites outside the school context, the degree of racial identification and the degree of perceived negative meta-stereotypes differed between the Black learners in each school, as these factors may vary amongst Black learners because of the type of school that the learners attend. As Black learners in the multiracial school have an opportunity for regular intergroup contact with White learners inside the school context and Black learners have limited opportunity for contact with White learners in the school context.

5.2.1 *Racial identification of Black learners attending the single race school and Black learners attending the multiracial school*

Findings of the comparative analysis for racial identification revealed a non-significant difference, indicating that there is no difference in the level of racial identification between Black learners that attend the single race school and Black

learners that attend the multiracial school. This implies that the level of racial identification amongst Black learners in each school is the same irrespective of the school that these learners attend. This result does not indicate that attending a multiracial racial school does not necessarily lead to stronger racial identification nor does it lead to weaker identification with one's racial group. Therefore this result yields a different result to a previous study conducted in the South Africa that examined the racial identity of children in an integrated school and two largely segregated White and Black schools (Dutton et al, 1998). The finding of the study revealed that children in the integrated school had a strong identification with their own racial group than children in predominantly White and Black schools.

Nevertheless, the descriptive results indicate that overall the Black learners have strong racial identification. This result is consistent to previous studies that have shown strong racial identification amongst adolescents of various racial groups in South Africa (Duckitt & Mphuthing, 1998; Smith & Stone, 1999). It is possible that this finding stems from the effects of the changes that have occurred in South Africa since 1994. For instance the dominant ideology of the "Rainbow Nation" sets the tone that each racial group is equally important and equally valued in the society. Therefore it may be that Black learners are more willing to identify with their own racial group because they feel that it is valued by the society. Furthermore it is possible that these Black learners tend to identify strong with their racial group, as it is associated with a positive self-concept. This idea lends support to the Social Identity Theory, which argues that our sense of who we are stems in large part from membership of and affiliation to various social groups. It is assumed that there is a general preference for positive self-concept rather than a negative one (Hinkle & Brown, 1990).

Alternatively it is possible that this non-significant result may not be a true reflection of the level of racial identification amongst Black learners in both schools, as the scale presented a low reliability coefficient. The low reliability coefficient raises concerns of whether this scale reflects the true nature of the level of racial identification amongst Black learners in both schools. Holtman (2002) also reported a low reliability coefficient of racial identification amongst Black learners that attended racially mixed schools. Thus the low reliability coefficient presented in this study

suggests that the racial identification scale may not be an appropriate measuring tool for a young population since this scale was original tested on an adult population by Appelgryn and Bornman (1996).

5.2.2 Meta-stereotypes *of Black learners in the multiracial school and the single race school*

A comparison of the meta-stereotypes between Black learners in the multiracial and Black learners in the single race school revealed a non-significant result, which suggests that there is no difference in the valence of meta-stereotypes amongst Black learners attending the single race school and Black learners attending the multiracial school. The results of the descriptive statistic suggest that Black learners in both the school have beliefs that Whites hold a relatively positive perception of Blacks. It is possible that these positive meta-stereotypes amongst these Black learners might be the effects of the social culture and laws of the post-Apartheid South Africa. Laws of desegregation and "equality and freedom for all" have created new perceptions about members of all racial groups, which give an impression that members of all racial groups are worthy and equal. These perceptions challenge and discourage old Apartheid perceptions of inferiority and superior group status between Blacks and Whites. Thus it may be that Black learners positive meta-stereotypes stem from internalisation of the culture of equality and fairness for all.

5.2.3 *General contact with Whites outside the school context of Black learners in multiracial and single race school*

The comparative analysis of general contact with Whites outside the school context between Black learners attending a single race school and Black learners attending a multiracial school presented a significant result. A significantly higher mean score was obtained for Black learners in the multiracial school indicates that Black learners attending the multiracial school encounter more general contact with Whites outside the school context than Black learners attending the single race school. This result can be attributed to the fact that from the sample of Black learners in the multiracial school 69.4% of these learners live in racially mixed residential areas and only 8.5% of Black learners in the single race school reside in racially mixed neighbourhoods. Therefore it is likely that Black learners attending the multiracial school would encounter more general contact with Whites outside the school context perhaps

because these learners tend to live in racially mixed neighbourhoods. Whereas Black learners in the single race school may not always have the same opportunities for contact with Whites in their living environments as demographic information indicates that 84.2% of the Black learners in the single race school live in the township, which is predominantly Black occupants. This finding support Schofield (1997) hypothesis that learners that attend desegregated schools are more likely to live in desegregated residential area and have more social contact with learners from other ethnic and racial backgrounds. Although this result indicates that there is a difference in the amount of contact with Whites between Black learners in both schools, it is also important to note that this result also indicates that Black learners in general do encounter contact with Whites regardless of the schools that these learners attend.

5.2.4 *Intergroup attitudes of Black learners in the multiracial school and the single race school*

Intergroup attitudes of Black learners in the multiracial school and Black learners in the single race school were examined using two measures of prejudice namely affective prejudice and social distance. Although both these scale focus on prejudice mainly with regard to participants feeling, the scales differ as one scale measure direct prejudice feeling (affective prejudice) and social distance measures prejudice feelings indirectly. As mentioned earlier in section 3.2.8 the affective prejudice measure focuses on participants' direct feelings towards Whites. While social distance focuses on the participants' feelings towards interactions with Whites. Contrary to the research hypothesis, results of affective prejudice revealed a non-significant difference between Black learners in the single race school and Black learners in the multiracial school. However it must be noted that the result is close to the level of significance. This suggests that there is a slight tendency that affective prejudice of Black learners in the single race school and Black learners in the multiracial school could differ. With Black learners in the multiracial school more likely to have more positive feeling towards Whites (as indicated by a high mean score) than Black learners in the single race school.

However the non-significant result is inconsistent to findings of a similar study by Dutton et al (1998) that revealed that children in integrated school were more accepting of other races than children in predominantly White and Black schools. The

result of this study suggest that Black learners feelings towards Whites; although relatively positive as indicated by the result of the descriptive statistics is the same irrespective of the schools that these learners attend. Therefore the multiracial school context does not necessarily promote greater positive intergroup attitudes amongst these learners as expected. One possible reason for this is that the multiracial school used in this study may not incorporate the optimal contact conditions that would facilitate effective intergroup contact amongst Black and White learners as this would leads to greater positive effects of contact. It is however important to note that this formulation is tentative as this study did not examine the conditions of contact amongst learners in the multiracial school. Therefore this formulation does not warrant any conclusions in this regard.

Alternatively the lack of difference between Black learners in each school may be attributed to the effects of the interaction of the socialization process and developmental process of Black learners in both schools considering that the mean age of these learners is 14.2 years. One model that explains the effect of this interaction is that of Aboud (1988, as cited in Brown, 1995). According to this model these Black learners are at a stage where rigid stereotypes become more flexible and susceptible to change in response to individuation information that can be obtain during intergroup contact and information from social agencies such as parent, mass media and peer groups. In addition this is the stage that these learners are more aware of the norms of society that accept and disapproved certain behaviours. Therefore it is possible that Black learners in both schools refrain from expressing negative feeling towards Whites overtly as this is considered socially undesirable by the broader society. At the same time positive attitude of these learners may stem from the individual information obtained from intergroup contact with Whites In addition this result may be the effect of internalising the laws of racial acceptance and reconciliation encouraged by the democratic laws.

Although there is no difference in the positive feelings towards Whites between Black learners in each school, overall the Black learners have positive feeling towards Whites, as indicated by the descriptive statistics. This finding is consistent with previous studies, which tend to report low levels of prejudice amongst Black adolescents' (Holtman, 2002; Wilhelm, 1994). This result may be attributed to the

norms of racial acceptance and tolerance in the post-Apartheid South Africa. These laws make up the contact condition of institutional support, which advocate and promote norms of racial acceptance (Mynhardt & du Toit, 1991). Furthermore this result supports Duckitt and Mphuthing (1998) hypothesis that over time favourable racial acceptance towards other racial groups would emerge amongst young people of different racial groups.

The result of social distance indicates that there is significant difference between Black learners in the multiracial and Black learners in the single race school. This result indicates that Black learners in the multiracial school have a higher desire for contact with Whites than Black learners attending the single race school. The difference in the level of desire for contact with Whites amongst Black learners in the two schools may be explained by the different amount of contact encounters that Black learners in each school experience. Stephan and Stephan (1985) state that minimal intergroup contact between members of different social groups is often associated with high levels of anxiety. Consequently high levels of anxiety affect one's experience of contact in a negative way and elicit normative behaviour such as avoidance of contact. This would decrease one's desire for contact with another group. Due to the lesser degree of contact experience with Whites amongst Black learners in the single race school it may be that these learners experience greater intergroup anxiety during or prior to intergroup contact, affecting their level of desire for contact with Whites.

Alternatively the intergroup anxiety model would suggest that since Black learners in multiracial school have a greater degree of general contact experience with Whites. These learners may have a better knowledge about norms of intergroup relations therefore their intergroup anxiety is often minimized and these learners may feel less intimidated in intergroup contact encounters with Whites. As a result it is more likely that these learners will have a higher desire for contact with Whites (Stephan & Stephan, 1985). Furthermore the low desire for contact with Whites amongst Black learners in the single race school may be due the physical distance with Whites elicited by school context. It is likely that these learners will have a lower desire for contact with Whites as compared to the Black learners in the multiracial school.

Taken together the findings of the affective prejudice and social distance do not entirely support the research hypothesis. The findings have shown that intergroup attitudes of Black learners in the single race school and multiracial school only differ with regard to their desire for contact with Whites (social distance) but there is no difference in their feeling towards Whites. Further analyses were conducted, to examine factors that explain the variation in the intergroup attitudes (as measured by affective prejudice and social distance) of Black learners in both schools.

5.3 Predictor variables of affective prejudice and social distance

5.3.1 *Predictors variables of affective prejudice of Black learners attending a single race school and Black learners attending a multiracial school*

Two separate multiple linear regression analyses were conducted, one for the Black learners in the multiracial school and the other for Black learners in the single race school. The findings of both multiple linear regression analyses indicate that meta-stereotypes is the only significant predictor for affective prejudice amongst Black learners in both the multiracial and single race school. The positive beta values reported in both the multiple linear regression analyses indicates that positive meta-stereotypes amongst Black learners in both schools are associated with positive attitudes towards Whites and vice versa.

These results support the findings of Curtis and Miller (1986), which revealed that the more one believes that he or she is liked by a member of the other group, the more friendlier the individual is towards the outgroup member. And this produced reciprocal behaviour from the outgroup member. The opposite result was reported for those participants that believed that the outgroup member dislikes them. Vorauer et al (1998) postulates that negative meta-stereotypes (the belief that outgroup holds negative perceptions towards one's social group) can evoke feelings of fear about negative evaluation and uncertainty about appropriate behaviour in contact situation with outgroup member. Consequently this evokes anxiety about intergroup contact with the outgroup members. Often individuals with high levels of anxiety may avoid contact with outgroup members, thus this minimizes their opportunity to gain personal information about outgroup members. Therefore their negative perceptions and feelings towards that outgroup member cannot be altered and their feelings remain the

same (Stephan & Stephan, 1985). In accordance with this perspective of the intergroup anxiety model a possible explanation for this result may be that Black learners used in this study are more likely to experience minimal intergroup anxiety as they belief that Whites hold positive perception towards them. Subsequently these learners may gain information about Whites during intergroup contact, thus their feeling towards Whites is likely to be altered according to the information gained.

Further results in the multiple linear regression analysis of affective prejudice of Black learners in the multiracial school indicates that the amount of actual contact with White learners at school is a potential predictor variable. The negative beta value presented by the model indicates that greater amount of school contact with White learners is associated with positive feelings towards White. This finding is similar to the results of the studies conducted by Stephan and Rosenfield (1978) and Dutton et al (1993) that reported that increased interracial contact between learners in integrated schools resulted in more positive attitudes. Overall this tentative result supports the contact hypothesis that greater intergroup contact between members of different groups promotes positive intergroup attitudes.

The factors: general contact with Whites outside the school context, racial identification used in the analysis for the Black learners in the single race school only, as well as experience of school contact used in the analysis of the multiracial school only were non-significant. This implies that these factors do not explain the level of affective prejudice for the Black learners in each school. It may be that these variables relate more to situational and behavioural determinants that produces effective intergroup interactions rather than mediating the internal emotional components that alter negative feelings towards Whites.

5.3.2 *Predictors of affective prejudice of the combined sample*

Similar to the results of the two multiple linear regression analyses of affective prejudice discussed earlier, the result of multiple linear regression analysis of the Black learners as a combined sample revealed that meta-stereotypes is the only significant predictor of affective prejudice. The beta value of the multiple linear regressions indicates a positive relationship between affective prejudice and meta-stereotypes. This means that positive meta-stereotypes are associated with positive feelings towards Whites. This result substantiates findings of multiple linear regressions presented in section 5.3.1, that meta-stereotypes are a strong predictor of feelings towards Whites. In addition the multiple linear regression also indicates that racial identification is close to significance, suggesting that there is a tendency that racial identification may contribute to Black learners feeling towards Whites. The negative relationship indicated by the beta value suggests that the stronger the racial identity of Black learners the lower the score on affective prejudice (as mentioned earlier low scores are indicative of positive feeling towards Whites). This result is similar to the result of Duckitt and Mphuthing (1998) that revealed an association between high level of African ethnic identification and positive attitude towards English speaking Whites. The absence of significant result of variables: school and general contact with Whites outside the school context may be due to the fact of collinearity between these two factors as indicated in correlation analyses (see Appendix C). Therefore the combined effects of these two factors remain insignificant in multiple linear regression analysis.

5.3.3 Predictors of social distance of Black learners attending multiracial school and single race school

To examine the predictors of social distance two separate multiple linear regression analyses were conducted for Black learners attending the multiracial school and Black learners attending the single racial school. Results of the analysis for Black learners in the multiracial school show that experience of school contact is the only significant factor that explains the level of social distance amongst these Black learners. The positive beta value in the multiple linear regression models indicate that positive contact experiences with White school learners are associated with greater desire for contact with Whites and the opposite association is expected when experience with White learners is negative. This result can be understood in light of Stephan and

Stephan (1985) proposition which explains that prior intergroup contact experiences, depending on whether these experiences are positive or negative heightens or decreases one's intergroup anxiety. Unpleasant contact experiences create a negative impression about the anticipated course of contact that can lead to greater anxiety about future intergroup encounters. This can lead to normative behaviour such as avoidance of intergroup contact thus minimizing the desire for contact with Whites. Likewise positive intergroup contact experiences may increase the desire for contact, as the individual often feels comfortable and less anxious about the intergroup contact encounter.

The factors meta-stereotypes, general contact with Whites outside the school context and racial identification did not explain social distance amongst Black learners in the single race school. The absence of meta-stereotypes as a significant predictive factor may be due to the fact that social distance explores a different aspect of prejudice. Therefore different mediating factors may contribute differently to the two measures of prejudice used in this study. As indicated earlier meta-stereotypes is a strong mediating factor for affective prejudice, yet this factor does not have the same effects on social distance. This may be due to the fact that social distance focuses more on the feelings regarding interactions with Whites. Like meta-stereotypes it may be that factors: general contact with Whites outside the school context and racial identification do not make a significant impact on the Black learners level of social distance but rather that these factors influence a different dimension of the intergroup contact process. It is evident that the factor (experience of school contact) that emerged as a significant factor for Black learners in the multiracial school was not included in the multiple linear regression analysis of Black learners in the single race school, as it was impossible to measure these learners experience of contact with White learners since these learners do not have the opportunity for contact with White learners inside the school context. Perhaps it may be useful in future research to explore the experiences of intergroup contact with Whites that occurs outside the school context to assess factors that influences the desire for contact with Whites amongst these learners that do not have direct contact with whites inside the school context

5.3.4 *Predictors of social distance of the combined sample*

The result of the multiple linear regression analysis of social distance using the whole sample indicates that school is the only significant factor that explains social distance amongst Black learners. This implies that there is an association between the type of school that the Black learners attend and the level of social distance. The negative beta value presented in the analysis model suggests that the multiracial school is associated with a higher desire for contact with Whites (therefore this sample had lower scores on social distance), while the single race school is associated with lesser desire for contact with Whites. This result provides further understanding into the result of the comparative analysis that revealed that Black learners in the multiracial school have a higher desire for contact with Whites than Black learners in the single race school. The opportunity for daily intergroup contact with Whites for the Black learners in the multiracial school could be an explanation for the association between multiracial school and the higher desire for contact with Whites. This finding supports the contact hypothesis that regular intergroup contact leads to greater reduction of prejudice and promotes positive intergroup attitudes. Black learners in the multiracial school have extensive contact opportunities with White learners inside the school context such as in the classrooms, during lunch breaks and perhaps during sport activities at school. Therefore the extensive contact opportunities provided within the school context allows Black learners the opportunity to gain more information about White learners. This may make Black learners to feel more comfortable and less intimated to interact with Whites thus increasing their desire for contact with Whites (Stephan & Stephan, 1985). Similar to the findings of the two separate multiple linear regression analyses of social distance, further findings in this analysis also indicated that racial identification, general contact with Whites outside the school context and meta-stereotypes do not explain social distance of Black learners in both schools. This result substantiates the results found in the two separate multiple linear regression analyses.

5.4 Conclusion

In conclusion the findings in this study do not supported the primary hypothesis of the study entirely. The study shows that intergroup attitudes of Black learners attending the multiracial school and Black learners attending the single race school only differs in terms of the Black learners level of social distance. Black learners in the multiracial school were found to have lower levels of social distance than Black learners in the single race school. Furthermore the results indicate that meta-stereotypes is an important and the only factor that explains the variation of affective prejudice amongst Black learners in all the multiple linear regression analyses conducted. The findings also shows that experience of school contact is the only factor that explains the level of social distance amongst Black learners in the multiracial school, while no factor explained the level of social distance amongst Black learners in the single race school. However when the two samples are combined school emerged as the only predictor that explains the social distance of the Black learners.

The findings of the study do support the principle of the contact hypothesis that Black learners in the multiracial school who were reported to have greater amounts of contact encounters with White had more positive feelings towards Whites, particularly with regard to feelings towards interactions with Whites. Furthermore the findings supports contact literature that has improved on the original contact hypothesis, which shows that there are underlying mediating factors that are involved in the process of prejudice reduction and promotion of positive attitudes. The contact hypothesis serves as a useful theoretical tool in understanding the results presented in this study. Furthermore the effects of social changes since 1994 and the current norms and culture of the South African society provide further understanding of these results. It is hoped that the present study will stimulate future research to explore further in this area in order to gain more qualitative understanding of crucial factor that impact and determine the intergroup attitudes of the youth of South Africa.

5.5 Limitations of the research

While not necessarily, a limitation, it must be noted that this study constituted a preliminary inquiry, employing a non-experimental research design to investigate the intergroup attitudes Black learners attending a single race school and Black learners

attending a multiracial school. As such the findings in this study may be considered as indicators of the direction that needs to be taken by further research in this area. It is also necessary too that the nature of the research design be borne in mind, as the research design does not permit the direct attribution of causality in understanding the variables, thus extra caution must be taken when interpreting the results. This also implies that in this study no systematic attempts were made to directly control for possible effects of the third variables (i.e. other than those directly under investigation) on the outcomes.

Moreover this study utilised a non-probability sampling strategy, in which participation in the study primarily depended on the willingness and availability of participants. According to Howell (2002) non- probability sampling methods though convenient are arbitrary and little is done to ensure that the sample represents the whole population. Similarly Judd, Smith and Kidder (1991) assert inferences cannot be drawn from a non-probability sample. Therefore the results that were obtained in this study may only be applicable to Black learners who were used in the study, these results do not necessarily make a reflection of other Black South African learners or other learners across various provinces and schools in South Africa. Another key concern in this study is the sample size of participants obtained in the different schools. A total of 36 completed questionnaires were collected from the sample in the multiracial school and a total of 70 completed questionnaires were collected from the sample in the single race school. A total of 8 questionnaires were excluded due to been incomplete. This brings the problem of the unequal sample size of used in the study, which may affect the way in which the overall group difference are interpreted statistically. However obtaining a roughly equal sample size of participants in each school at this stage is challenging as the amount of Black learners in single race school is always generally larger than the amount of Black learners in a racially mixed school due to the racial composition of the schools population. In addition only junior grade learners were allowed to participate in this study; this forms another limitation in that the junior grades may only represent a certain population of learners in both schools. Therefore these results may not be necessarily generalised to learners in the senior grades (i.e. grd10-12) of these schools

With regard to the self-report questionnaire, a major limitation with using this type of questionnaire is that it limits the opportunity to obtain richer data from the participants, as they cannot elaborate further on certain factors that the participants may wish to express. Perhaps an inclusion of qualitative questions would have provided more meaningful material that would lay basis for future research. In addition since all the research questionnaires were administered by the researcher during schooling hours it is possible that this may have influenced the responses of the participants as learners may have treated this task as another educational tasks that requires them to give the best answer so as to improve their academic marks, although the research explained that the questionnaire had nothing to do with their academic performance at school. Lastly the present study is a cross-sectional study and as such limits the conclusion of the study to inferences regarding association, rather than cause and effect relation.

5.6 Recommendations

At this point a number of recommendations are proposed for future contact research. The present study has only focused on intergroup attitudes of Black learners, further research studies on intergroup attitudes of learners belonging to other racial group that attend desegregated and segregated schools would expand the body of contact research studies relevant to the South African context. It is also important that future research explore whether intergroup contact between learners, particularly learners in desegregated school occurs under optimal contact conditions.

It would also be useful if future research studies investigating the intergroup attitudes of learners obtain a larger sample size, particularly when using a quantitative approach, as this will enable them to generalize and interpret the results with higher levels of confidence. Furthermore since the current study examined the intergroup attitudes of black learners only it may be advantageous that further research in this area explores the intergroup relations that develop between Black and White learners, as well as explore if positive attitudes of the Black learners are generalized to the broader population of the White racial population in other social settings. Methodologically it may be useful to utilize longitudinal design in contact studies as this would assist in clarifying the direction of causality of intergroup contact and

intergroup attitude. In addition using qualitative research methods to investigate the attitudes of learners might provide greater clarity and richer data into this complex phenomenon.

REFERENCE LIST

Allport, G.W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley.

Amir, Y. (1969). Contact hypothesis in ethnic relations. *Psychological Bulletin, 71,* 319-341.

Amir, Y. (1976). The role of intergroup contact in change of prejudice and race relations. In P.A. Katz (Eds.), *Towards the elimination of racism* (pp245-280). New York: Pergamon.

Appelgryn, A.E.M. & Bornman, E. (1996). Relative deprivation in contemporary South Africa. *Journal of Social Psychology, 136,* 381-97.

Barnee, M. & Amir, Y. (1981). Attitudes and attitude change following intergroup contact of religious and non-religious students in Israel. *Journal of Social Psychology, 115,* 65-71.

Blair, I., Park, B., & Bachelor, J. (2003). Understanding intergroup anxiety: Are some people more anxious than others? *Group Process and intergroup relations, 6, 151-169.*

Bogardus, S. (1925). Measuring social distance. *Journal of Applied Sociology, 9,*299-308.

Bornman, E. (1988). Tussengroepverhoudinge met spesifieke verwysing na die werksituasie. Unpublished M.A.thesis, University of South Africa, Pretoria

Brett, E. (1963). *African attitudes*. Johannesburg: South Africa Institute for Race Relations.

Brewer, M.B. & Miller, N. (1996). *Intergroup Relations*. Buckingham, U.K: Open University Press.

Brown, R. (1995). *Prejudice: its social psychology*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd.

Brown, C.S. & Bigler, R.S. (2002). Effects of minority status in the classroom on children's intergroup attitudes. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 83,* 77-110.

Carrim, N. (1998). Anti-racism and the 'new' South African Educational order. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 28(3),* 301-313.

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

Chisholm, L. & Sujee, M. (2006). Tracking racial desegregation in South African schools. *Journal of Education, 40,141*-159.

Cook, S.W. (1957). Desegregation: a psychological analysis. *American Psychologist, 12,* 1-13.

Cook, S.W. (1962). The systematic analysis of socially significant events: a strategy of social research. *Journal of Social Issues, 18,* 66-84.

Cook, S.W. (1978). Interpersonal and attitudinal outcomes in cooperating interracial group. *Journal of research and development in Education, 12,* 97-113.

Cook, S.W. (1984). The 1954 social science statement and school desegregation: A reply to Gerard. *American Psychologist, 39,* 810-832.

Cowley, B.B. (1991). *The assessment of the impact of desegregation schooling on young children, utilizing their drawing*. MA thesis, University of Cape Town, Cape Town.

Curtis, R.C. & Miller, K. (1986). Believing another likes or dislikes you: Behaviour making the belief come true. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 5,284*-290.

Dixon, J.A. (2001). Contact and Boundaries: Locating the social psychology of intergroup relations. *Theory and Psychology, 11,* 587-608.

Dixon, J.A. & Reicher, S. (1997). Intergroup contact and desegregation in the new South Africa. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 36,*361-381.

Dutton, S.E., Singer, J.A., & Devlin, A.S. (1998). Racial identity of children in integrated predominately White and Black schools. *South African Journal of Psychology, 138*(1), 41-53.

Duckitt, J. & Mphuthing, T. (1998). Political power and race relations in South Africa: African attitudes before and after the transition. *Political Psychology, 19(4),* 809-831.

Eller, A. & Abrams, D. (2004). Come together: longitudinal comparison of Pettigrew's reformulated intergroup contact model and the common intergroup identity model in Anglo-French and Mexican American context. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 34,*229-254.

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

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

Freeman, M. (2001). Linking self and social structure: A psychological perspective on social identity in Sri Lanka. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 32 (3),* 291-308.

Gaertner, S.L., Mann, J., Murrell, A., & Dovidio, J.F. (1989). Reducing intergroup bias: The benefits of recategorization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57,239*-249.

Galinsky, A.D. & Moskowitz, G.B. (2000). Perspective-taking: decreasing stereotype expression, stereotype accessibility and in-group favouritism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78(4),* 708-724.

Gerard, H.B. (1983). School desegregation: the social science role. *American Psychologist, 38,*867-877.

Hamberger, J. & Hewstone, M. (1997). Inter-ethnic contact as a predictor of prejudice: Test of a model in four West European nations. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 15,339*-359.

Harber, C. (1998). Desegregation, racial conflict and education for democracy in the new South Africa: A case study of institutional change. *International Review of Education, 44*(516), 569-582.

Hewstone, M. & Brown, R. (1986). *Contact and conflict in intergroup encounters.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Hewstone, M. & Islam, M. R. (1993). Dimensions of contact as predictors of intergroup anxiety, perceived out-group variability and outgroup attitude: an integrated model. *Personality, Social Psychological Bulletin, 19,* 700-710.

Hinkle, S. & Brown, R. (1990). Intergroup comparison and social identity: Some links and lacunae. In D.Abrams & M.Hogg (Eds.), S*ocial Identity Theory: Constructive and critical advances* (pp48-70)**.** Harvester Wheasheaf: Hemel Hempsted.

Holtman, Z. (2002). Prejudice, contact and attitude change in South Africa: A study of integrated schools in the Western C ape. M. A thesis, University of Cape Town, Cape Town.

Howell, D.C. (2002*). Fundamental Statistics for the behavioural sciences.* (4th Eds). Belmount: Wadsworth Imprint.

Hyers, L.I. & Swim, J.K. (1998). A comparison of the experiences of dominant and minority group members during intergroup encounters. *Group processes and Intergroup Relations, 1,143-163.*

Islam, M.R. & Hewstone, M. (1993). Dimensions of contact as predictors of intergroup anxiety, perceived outgroup variability, and outgroup attitude: An integrative model. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 19,700*-710.

Johnson, D.W. & Johnson, R.T. (1984). Relationship between Black and White students in intergroup cooperation and competition. *Journal of Social Psychology, 125*(4) 421-428.

Judd, C.M., Smith, E.R., & Kidder, L.H. (1991). *Research methods in social relations.* (6th Eds) Fortworth: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers.

Kenworthy, J.B., Turner, R.N., & Hewstone, M. (2004). *Intergroup contact: When does it work and why?* University of Oxford, United Kingdom.

Kerlinger, F.N. (1986). *Foundation of behavioural research* (3rd ed.). Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College**.**

Lacy, W.B., Mason, E.J., & Middleton, E. (1983). Fostering constructive intergroup contact in desegregated schools suggestions for future research. *Journal of Negro Educatio, 5,* (2), 130-141.

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

Luiz, D. & Krige, P. (1985). The effect of social contact between South African white and coloured adolescents' girls: A follow-up study. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 125,407-408.*

Miller, N., Brewer, M., & Edward, K. (1985). Cooperative interaction in desegregated setting: a laboratory analogue. *Journal of Social Issues, 44*, 63-79.

Miller, N. & Brewer, H.B. (1984). The Social Psychology of desegregation: An introduction. In N. Miller & M.B. Brewer (Eds.), *Group in contact: The psychology of desegregation (*pp.1-8). London: Academic Press.

Muianga, L. (2005). The effects of racial identity on contact and prejudice- the experience of students at the University of Cape Town. Unpublished Masters Dissertation, University of Cape Town, South Africa.

Mynhardt, J.C. (1982). Etniese houding in n kontaksituasie. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Africa, Pretoria.

Mynhardt, J.C. & Du Toit, N. (1991). Contact and change. In D.Foster &J.Louw-Potgieter (Eds.), *Social Psychology in South Africa* (pp12-23). Johannesburg.SA: Lexicon.

Nesdale, S. & Todd, F. (1998). Integration and contact hypothesis. *Journal of Applied Social Studies, 26*(13), 1196-1217.

Oskamp, S. (2000). *Reducing prejudice and discrimination: Social psychological perspective.* New York: Erlbaum.

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

Pettigrew, T.F. (1969). Racially separate or together? *Journal of Social Issues, 25(1)* 43-79.

Pettigrew, T.F. (1997). Generalized intergroup contact effects on prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23(2), 173-185.*

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

Pettigrew, T.F. & Tropp, L. (2000). Does intergroup contact reduce prejudice? Recent meta-analytic finding. In S.Oskamp (Eds.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination: Social psychological pespective* (pp93-114). New York: Erlbaum.

Pettigrew, T.F. & Tropp, L.R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90(5),* 751-783.

Pillay, J. (2004). Experiences of learners from informal settlements. *South African Journal of Education, 24(1)* 5-9.

Plant, E.A. & Devine, P.G. (2003). The antecedents and implications of interracial anxiety. *Personality ad Social Psychology Bulletin, 29,*790-801.

Rose, T.L. (1981). Cognitive and Dyadic Processes in intergroup contact. In D.L.Hamilton (Eds.), *Cognitive processes in stereotyping and intergroup behaviour.* (pp259-303). Hilldale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Schofield, J.W. (1997). School desegregation 40 years after Brown v. Board of Education: Looking forward and looking backward: In D.Johnson (Eds) *minority and girls in school: effects on achievement and performance* (pp1-36). London: Sage Publication.

Schofield, J.W. (2001). Review: Inside desegregated schools: understanding how and why they influence students. *American Journal of Education, 109(3),* 383-390.

Shelton, J.N. (2003). Interpersonal concerns in social encounters between majority and minority group members. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations,* 6, 171-185.

Sherif, M. (1966). *In common predicament.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Sigelman, L., Bledsoe, T., Welch, S., & Combs, M.W. (1996). Making contact? Black- White social interaction in an urban setting. *American Journal of Sociology, 101,1306-1332.*

Slavin, R.E. & Cooper, R. (1999**).** Improving intergroup relations: Lessons learned from cooperative learning programs. *Journal of Social Issues, 55(4),* 647-663.

Smith, T. & Stone, C. (1999). Identities and racial attitudes of South African and American Adolescents: A cross-cultural examination. *South African Journal of Psychology, 29,* 23-29.

Smith, T., Stone, C., & Naidoo, A. (2003). Racial attitudes among South African Youth adults: A four-year follow-up study. *South African Journal of Psychology, 33(1),* 39-43.

Soudien, C. (2004). Constituting the class: An analysis of the process of integration in South African schools. In L. Chisholm (Eds.), *in changing class, education and social change in post-Apartheid South Africa. (*pp89-114), Cape Town: HSRC Press.

Stephan, W.G. (1978). School desegregation: An evaluation of predictions made in Brown v. Board of Education. *Psychological Bulletin, 85,*217-238.

Stephan, W.G. & Finlay, K. (1999). The role of empathy in improving intergroup relations. *Journal of Social Issues, 55(4)* 729-743.

Stephan, W. & Rosenfield, D. (1978). *Effects of desegregation of racial attitudes.* Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 115, 65-71.

Stephan, W.G. & Stephan, C.W. (1985). Intergroup anxiety. *Journal of Socia Issues, 41, 57-175l*

Stephan, C.W. & Stephan, W.G. (1992). Reducing intercultural anxiety through intercultural contact. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations. 16,* 89-106.

Sujee, M. (2004). Decaciliasation of Gauteng schools- a quantitative analysis. In M, Nkomo, C. McKinney & L. Chisholm (Eds.), *Reflections on school integration (pp43-59).* Cape Town: HSRC Press.

Vally, S. & Dalamba, Y. (1999*). Racism, 'racial integration' and desegregation in South African public secondary schools.* A report on a study by the South African Human Rights Commission (SAHRC).

Van Dick, R., Wagner, U., Pettigrew, T.F., Petzel, T., Smith-Castro, V., & Jackson, J.S. (2004). *The contact hypothesis revisited: The role of perceived importance.* Retrieved March 12, 2007, from Friedrich Ebert Foundation Web site: http://www.uni-margurg.de.

Voci, A. & Hewstone, M. (2003). Intergroup contact and prejudice towards immigration in Italy: the mediational role of anxiety and moderational role of group salience. *Group Process and Intergroup Relations, 6*, 37—54.

Vorauer, J.D., Main, K.J., & O'Connell, G.B. (1998). How do individuals expect to be viewed by members of lower status group? Content and implications of meta-stereotypes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *75(4*), 917-937.

Wilhelm, N. (1994). Interracial contact and racial perceptions amongst black and white adolescents. Unpublished Masters Dissertation, University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

William, E., Ernest, B. & Lacy, M. (1983). Fostering constructive intergroup contact in desegregated schools. *Journal of Negro Education, 52, (2*), 130-141.

Wright, S.C., Aron, A., McLaughlin-Volpe, T., Ropp, S.A. (1997). The extended contact effect: knowledge of cross-group friendship and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73(1), 73-90.*

Zanna, M.P. (1994). On the nature of prejudice. *Canadian Psychology, 35, 11-*23.