

https://dspace.org/

The impact of direct and indirect friendships on intergroup relations.

Maano, Tsholofelo Cecilia

2010-08-12
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/8402

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

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 1ntroduction

Intergroup relations form a sizeable focus of research in social psychology. Within this research the intergroup contact hypothesis first developed and tested by Allport (1954) proposes that contact between members of different groups can reduce negative or prejudiced intergroup relations. There is generally strong evidence that supports the contact hypothesis. In addition to the initial conditions required for effective contact, Pettigrew (1997) proposed that friendship across group lines has special importance as it involves long-term contact rather than brief first encounters. Further research on these direct friendships has shown that they do indeed lead to the reduction of prejudice although direct friendships are not always possible in real life. This has led to recent developments in this area of research which focus on the extended contact effect, which essentially assumes that extended or vicarious friendships could provide an important means to improving interracial relations (Wright, Aron, Mc-Volpe & Ropp, 1997).

1.2 Rationale of the study

Despite the recent attention that the extended contact hypothesis has received from social psychologists, there are only a handful of published studies that have attempted to test it. The aim of the present study is therefore to contribute to the literature on the extended contact effect by exploring whether indirect interracial or extended friendships do in fact reduce prejudice or produce positive intergroup relations. This is a particularly important question given the demographic changes that have characterised South Africa's transition from institutionalized race relations to a constitutional democracy over the last 15 years. Internationally, recent research has focused on cross–group friendship as a strategy for improving inter-group attitudes (Phinney, Ferguson & Tate 1997, Van Dick, Wagner, Pettigrew, Christ, Wolf, Petzel, 2004, Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). As a pathway for reducing prejudice, extended friendship is relatively new in the study of intergroup relations.

The current research is thus relevant to the ongoing study of intergroup relations because very little is known about the impact of extended friendships on racial attitudes or prejudices in South Africa, a country that has been plagued by a history of discrimination, racism and segregation.

Political and social changes in the country have brought about the opportunity for Blacks and Whites to interact at school, in neighbourhoods, the workplace, and other social settings. These intergroup interactions provide a platform for the formation of friendships among these groups, according to research (Pettigrew, 2007; Wright et al., 1997) and thereby the reduction of prejudice. The current study therefore, aims to test the hypothesis put forth by Wright et al. (1997) that direct and indirect friendship predicts low prejudice. At the same time, this study aims to contribute to the growing literature on the importance of intergroup friendship in reducing prejudice.

1.3 Aim

The aim of this study is to contribute to the research on the extended contact hypothesis by exploring whether perceptions of what constitutes friendship affects the degree to which cross-racial friendship reduces prejudice towards the out group (Paolini, Hewstone, Cairns & Voci, 2004) in a sample of South African students.

1.4 Chapter outline

The next chapter provides a detailed review of the literature on racial attitudes and how these attitudes affect intergroup contact. The discussion also focuses on different theories of prejudice and how these theories suggest that prejudice can be reduced, with special emphasis on the contact hypothesis generally and the extended contact hypothesis specifically. Together, these theoretical constructs inform the overall theoretical framework of the present study.

Chapter 3 provides an outline of the methodology. The discussion will focus on the research design, description of the sample and the procedure used during the collection of the data. The measure used to collect these data will also be discussed as well as the tests used to analyze the data.

The results of the analyses are presented in Chapter 4. The results of the study are discussed in relation to the literature in the area of intergroup relations, particularly the extended contact theory. The focus will be on how direct and indirect friendship can be used as strategies to reduce prejudices.

The discussion will elaborate on the findings of the research in relation to the current knowledge base on intergroup relations with a focus on how indirect friendship can help reduce anxiety associated with intergroup contact or the anticipation of anxiety when one is presented with direct contact with members of the out-group. The final chapter discusses the implications of the study and concludes by highlighting a number of limitations to the project and how these may be addressed in future research concerning the extended contact hypothesis.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Racial prejudice, contact, and desegregation in post-apartheid South Africa

South African history has been characterised by discrimination against and segregation of different race groups. The segregation involved living in segregated areas and studying in similarly segregated schools, thus limiting or in some cases prohibiting interracial contact. With the dawn of the democratic government came the desegregation and integration of different 'race' groups, allowing people not only to live together but to marry outside of their racial group and to study in the same schools. Much as the country is more integrated than it has ever been, the improvement of intergroup relations still presents a challenge. This may be attributed to the fact that integration does not necessarily equal contact or that direct contact does not always produce positive intergroup relations. A central area of concern in contact theory has been the extent to which a specific positive intergroup experience generalises to broader attitudes (Ortiz & Harwood, 2007). Hewstone and Brown (1986) also argue that just because one has a positive contact with a member of an out-group does not mean that his or her perceptions, evaluation, and behaviours towards that group as a whole will improve. The extended contact hypothesis however proposes that extended contact could yield a widespread reduction in prejudice without all the people involved being in direct out-group friendships (Wright et al., 1997). This could be due to the fact that in interracial friendships, group membership is more salient to the observer than to the friends themselves, which assists in the generalisation of favourable effects to the out-group as a whole (Brown & Hewstone, 2005).

In order to have an understanding of how people become prejudices against out- group members the section below is going to give a discussion of related terms will follow These includes stereotype, discrimination , racism and so forth.

2.2 Definition of terms

2.2.1 Prejudice

According to Brehm & Kassin (1996) prejudice is a negative attitude or feeling towards persons based on their membership of a certain group.

These negative feelings are based on selective sorting of information based on the person's few memories, mixed with hearsay, leading to overgeneralisation of the characteristics of the out-group. Moreover, in most cases, the person does not have first-hand experience on which to base his or her judgment. Allport (1954) suggests that prejudice is rooted in four main components namely projection, frustration, hatred and aggression toward members of the out-group. The out-group is seen as the "other" or "them" and the in-group as "us." This binary view is fuelled by fear and anxiety. Lastly, Allport (1954) insists that projection of undesirable personality traits to others is the root of prejudice.

2.2.2 Discrimination

Discrimination refers to the negative behaviour directed towards people based on characteristics such as race or gender. While prejudice is an attitude or feeling, discrimination is prejudice put into action (Baron & Byrne, 1997). According to the South African Human Rights Commission Interim report of the inquiry into racism in the media (1999, p. 9) cited in Stangor (2000), "Discrimination includes any conduct based on the distinction made on grounds of natural or social categories, which have no relation either to individual capacities or merit or to the concrete behaviour of the individual person".

2.2.3 Stereotypes

Baron & Byrne (1997) define stereotypes as generalised unreliable beliefs to the effect that all members of a specific social group share certain traits or characteristics. In other words, these beliefs do not recognise individual differences within a group. These beliefs are cognitive frameworks that strongly influence the processing of incoming social information. Brown (1995) defines a stereotype as a shared conception of the character of a group.

To better explain the concept of stereotype Hewstone & Giles (1986) identified three essential aspects of stereotyping. These include firstly, that other individuals are categorised, usually on the basis of 'easily' identifiable characteristics such as race and/or gender.

Secondly, stereotyping involves a set of attributes ascribed to all members of that category. Essentially, individuals belonging to a stereotyped group are assumed to be similar to each other and different from other groups. Thirdly, these attributes are ascribed to any individual member of that category or group.

Brigham (1993) holds that a stereotype involves systematic bias, which is the tendency to attribute negative characteristics to out-group members. Secondly, stereotyping involves a lack of perceived variability as all out-group members are assumed to be similar to each other. Consequently, stereotyping involves a lack of differentiation between out-group members as the person who holds the stereotype does not distinguish between the out-group members even when they differ from each other in a relevant characteristic.

2.2.4 Racism

Racism is a belief that one category of people is superior to another. Racism is seen as an ideological construction used to exploit people economically based on their race (Mynhardt & du Toit, 1991). Although racism is a historical, political, and economic phenomenon, there are also psychological issues concerning individual development of perceptions and beliefs about others based on motives for discrimination. Social psychology has focused on how the abovementioned terms influence attitudes and behaviour. Much of the research on intergroup contact or interaction has concentrated on exploring the drivers and possibilities of changing attitudes about out-group members (Tropp, 2003, Dividio, Gaertner, Kawakami, 2003, Turner, Hewstone & Voci, (2007). This focus informs the main discussion in the next section.

2.3 Attitudes and attitudinal change

According to Allport (1935, p. 810) cited in Triansdis (1971) an attitude refers to ‘a mental and neural state of readiness, organized through experiences, exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual’s response to all objects and situations to which it is exposed or related to’. Baron & Byrne (1997) on the other hand define attitudes as associations between attitude objects (virtually any aspect of the social world) and the evaluation of those objects. Attitudes research is therefore premised on the idea that people have enduring sets of evaluations of the world, which encourage them to act in

certain ways (Wetherell, 1996). An attitude can also be defined as an idea charged with emotions, which predisposes a class of action to a particular class of social situation (Triansdis, 1971). This definition suggests that attitudes have three components namely a cognitive component – some category used by humans in thinking that may also be referred to as a consciously held belief or opinion; an affective component – that is, an emotion which charges the idea and lastly, a behaviour component or predisposition to action informed by the cognitive and affective components.

In keeping with this definition, psychologists define intergroup attitudes as encompassing all three components. Firstly, the cognitive component includes racial awareness, beliefs about racial differences and a particular ideology concerning appropriate race relations. Secondly, the affective component includes positive and negative feelings towards other groups and towards interracial associations. Thirdly the behavioural component involves predispositions to behave in certain ways to an out-group (St John, 1975).

Duckitt (1992) cited in Wilhelm (1994) rejects this model stating that the interrelationship between the three dimensions is neither clear nor consistent. Instead, he proposes that stereotyped beliefs lead to a prejudiced attitude, which evokes behavioural intentions, which in turn lead to discriminatory behaviour. Attitude formations and their relationship to action are therefore complex and contested. Attitudes seem to be the integral part of how prejudice behaviour is displayed towards members of the out-group. Social psychology has focused on changing attitudes in order to facilitate change in behaviour. The current study seeks to examine how attitudes of in-group members are positively changed towards the out- group members when they direct or extended interracial friends

2.3.1 Theories of attitude formation

2.3.1.1 Functionalist theory

Katz (1960) proposes a functionalist theory of attitudes. He argues that people hold certain attitudes because these help them to achieve certain goals, to adjust in a complex world and because these allow them to express their fundamental values. Attitudes help people to interpret the world in which they live and process new information.

They also provide a way of gaining and maintaining social identity. Attitudes may also express some aspects of an individual's personality. Attitudes may therefore be classified under four functions namely:

A knowledge function: Katz (1960) argues that attitudes provide a meaningful, structured environment. They supply us with standards of evaluation as we seek some degree of order, clarity, and stability in our personal frame of reference. An attitude therefore serves the function of giving meaning to our experiences.

An instrumental function: We develop attitudes, which are favourable to things that assist and reward us. This implies that attitudes are linked to social acceptability. For example, in a political election, the unemployed are likely to favour the policy of the party that promises to provide employment or welfare benefits.

A value-expressive function: This involves expressing attitudes that give pleasure to the person and they reveal our basic values, which in turn reinforce our self-image. For example, if a person's self- image is based on a certain religion then that image will be reinforced by adopting the beliefs and values of that particular religion.

Ego-defensive function: According to Katz (1960) some of the attitudes we hold serve to protect us from acknowledging basic truths about ourselves or the harsh reality of life. Attitudes protect one's self esteem by helping them avoid unpleasant truths about themselves. They therefore serve as a defense mechanism. For example, a person who feels inferior may develop a 'superior' attitude.

2.3.1.2 Social Learning Theory

Baron and Byrne (1997) describe some ways in which we may socially learn attitudes. According to this theory we learn our attitudes from others. In essence many of our views are acquired in situations where we interact with others or by merely observing their behaviour and such learning occurs through three key processes namely classical, instrumental conditioning, and observational learning. Classical conditioning implies that we learn attitudes by associating responses to certain stimuli.

Instrumental conditioning refers to the fact that attitudes that are followed by positive consequences are reinforced and are more likely to be repeated whereas we try to avoid attitudes that bring about negative consequences. For example, people like to be around those who agree with their opinions as this reinforces their membership to these people. Theories of observational learning propose that we acquire new forms of behaviour or attitudes through observing others; that in essence, we learn by imitating or modeling the behaviours of others. Pettigrew (1969) therefore argues that people are prejudiced because they grow up in prejudiced environments where they learn prejudice from their significant others.

Change in attitudes takes place in a number of ways. These include cognitive and behaviour modification both of which provide new information using contact situations that provide the opportunity for contact with the attitude object. Attitude change however, begins with the attitude object, which may range from a person, through to a group or any other social phenomenon.

Based on the above it could be said that racial prejudice comprises negative attitudes toward people because of the group that they belong to. These feelings and attitudes are shaped by cognitive frameworks known as stereotypes, which are then translated into behaviours through discrimination. Attitudes are formed by different processes such as learning through observation, conditioning and through reinforcement and punishment. Our attitudes are also formed by the function that they serve in assisting us to meaningfully organize the environment in which we live. In order to understand how individuals act and develop relationships with others, including members of other races, it is essential to review at the processes that facilitate and affect these 'raced' relationships. The following section looks at theories that explain interracial relations, examines research findings about interracial relationships, and concludes by highlighting techniques used to reduce racial prejudice.

2.4 Theories of interracial relations

Several selected social psychology theories argue that people's situations and social experiences influence their attitudes and beliefs (De la Rey, 1991). There are two primary schools of thought that examine the relationship between the individual and society in

social psychology. The first is an individualistic approach that places the individual at the center, with the basic assumption that individual thought and behaviour are the starting point from which all social activity can be explained (De la Rey, 1991). The second is loosely termed the socio-centered approach, which emphasizes the role of social interaction (systems, groups, and institutions) in forging 'individual' psychology.

This approach maintains that social processes transform the individual's thought and behaviours (De la Rey, 1991). The Authoritarian Personality theory may be located firmly in the individualistic school while the Realistic Conflict theory and Social Identity Theory are best located in the socio-centered approach.

2.4.1 Authoritarian Personality Theory

Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswick, Levinson, & Sanford (1950) after an extensive investigation into the causes of anti-semitism came to the conclusion that prejudice can be linked to a personality type, which they referred to as the authoritarian personality. They developed a personality measure to rate distinct attitudes and beliefs. These included excessive respect for authority, aggression against nonconformity and unwillingness to engage in self-analysis or reflection.

These above mentioned beliefs and attitudes render the individual susceptible to prejudice. People with authoritarian personalities are prejudiced because it serves two primary personality 'needs' (Farley, Steeh, Krysan, Jackson & Reeves, 1994). The first need is scapegoating, which refers to a person, or group against whom an individual displaces feelings of anger or frustration that cannot be expressed towards the source of the individual's feeling. The person therefore takes out their frustrations on ethnic or religious minority groups. The second is the need to project. Projection involves a process by which a person denies or minimizes personal shortcomings by exaggerating the extent to which the same shortcomings occur in others. This person therefore tends to exaggerate the faults of the minorities. An experiment conducted by Williams (1964) cited in Mynhardt and du Toit (1991) found that authoritarian people were inclined to make less contact with members of out-groups. Consequently, their potential for friendship forming is very limited.

The basic criticism of this theory is that it is too simplistic in its explanation of prejudice since it assumes that racial prejudice is the result of individuals having the same personality characteristics (De la Rey, 1991). It also does not take into account a number of socio-cultural factors that influence human relations.

2.4.2 Realistic Conflict Theory

This theory is underpinned by a strongly environmentalist approach, arguing that the immediate situation causes or brings about the psychological states involved in intergroup aggression and discrimination (Wetherell, 1996). Important proponents of this theory Sherif, Harvey, White & Hood (1961) argue that groups become prejudiced towards one another because they are in conflict over real, tangible material resources.

Stereotypes and prejudice are therefore seen as a result of people's effort to retain power in conditions of real conflict over limited resources. This theory holds that a situation characterised by competition and conflict creates prejudice and discrimination. It means that if two groups are in competition for scarce resources, they threaten each other. This creates hostility between them and thus produces mutual negativity. Sherif and his collaborators carried out an experiment with boys aged 10 to 12 years designed to show that if you randomly assigned people in groups and placed the groups in conflict, the people are likely to become prejudiced towards out-group in favour of in-group members (Sherif et.al., 1961).

The experiment carried out by Sherif et al. (1961) involved four phases. In the first phase (spontaneous friendship formation) the boys were allowed to form spontaneous interpersonal relationships. In the second phase (in-group formation) they were then divided into two separate groups in which friends were put in different groups. In this phase, the groups were allowed to engage in their own activities. In the third phase (intergroup competition) the researcher introduced intergroup competition. The groups were engaged in activities and made to compete for scarce resources. In the last phase (intergroup cooperation) a superordinate goal was introduced to try and resolve the conflict created by competition.

A superordinate goal is defined as a goal that neither group could attain alone but is attainable by working together (DeRidder & Tripathi, 1992).

Based on these experiments, Sherif et al. (1961) made two propositions regarding how conflict develops between groups. Firstly, they suggested that in the composition of the group, different roles and hierarchies emerge as well as norms governing group behaviour which in turn lead each group to develop a hierarchical internal structure. Secondly, when individuals become members of a group, their original friendship choices would change to favour members of their new group (De la Rey, 1991). This implies that conflict would produce loyalty to the members of the in-group and hostility to what is perceived as the out-group. Each group sees the other as the 'enemy' and this is likely to lead to the development of negative stereotypes and attitudes. It can be said that competition between groups for scarce material resources results in intergroup hostility. It can therefore be inferred that only the introduction of cooperation between the groups using superordinate goals ensures that the groups will work together, and that hostile relations can be reduced. Sussman & Weil (1963) cited in DeRidder & Tripathi (1992) replicated experiments conducted by Sherif et al. (1961) with diabetic children and found that competing for scarce resources led to negative intergroup attitudes and behaviour.

Although Realistic Conflict Theory has contributed valuably to research in race relations, it is not without its limitations. One such notable limitation is its vagueness as to whether the negative interdependence which it assumes to underlie prejudice need always be based on real conflict over concrete things such as land, money and so forth or can be due to intangible things such as prestige. A second criticism is that conflict of interest may not necessarily be responsible for in-group favouritism and competition (Turner, 1981 cited in Brown, 1995).

2.4.3 Social Identity Theory

Tajfel & Turner (1979) developed the Social Identity Theory (SIT) based on a variety of cognitive processes that underlie social categorization, which states that people use social categories or groups in order to understand the world. These cognitive processes involve functions such as organising information, guiding behaviour, and identifying stimuli.

Social identity involves the process whereby the individual becomes part of a social group and the group becomes part of the individual's self-concept. The person's group membership and social category are seen to constitute his/her social identity. The central view of this theory is that people have a need and are thus motivated to strive for a positive self-concept and self-image. A positive self-image is based on the approval of the group that a person belongs to (Sears, Peplau & Taylor, 1991; DeRidder & Tripathi, 1992; de la Rey, 1991).

SIT implies that an individual will experience a positive self-esteem if the group that they belong to can be compared favourably to the out-group and experience a negative self-image if an intergroup comparison reflects negatively when compared to the other group. Individual identity is therefore based on the identity of the group and in turn a person behaves according to the characteristics of the group identity. According to this theory, what happens to the group affects the individual and his/her behaviour.

Researchers such as Brown (1995) pointed out some of the problems pertaining to this theory. Firstly, the central idea of this theory is that self-esteem is connected to intergroup discrimination. This connection can take two forms. In the first instance, it could be that people show discrimination in order to raise their self-esteem simply because a positive self-esteem is preferred to a negative or neutral one. Alternatively, it could be that prior low self-esteem may arise from belonging to a low status or stigmatised group. This causes intergroup discrimination in order to bolster or sustain one's self-esteem. The causal relationships implied by the theory are therefore too reductive in accounting for the complexity of the relationship between the individual and the group.

Secondly, SIT theory anticipates that biased intergroup evaluations and decisions are motivated by social identity concerns and as such one may then expect to find a positive correlation between the strength of people's group identification and their levels of in-group bias. Research has found this prediction to be inconclusive. The processes proposed by SIT may not be operating in all groups.

One of the main strategies of intergroup contact that has received a lot of attention is the Contact Hypothesis proposed by Gordon Allport (1954).

In studying interracial interactions, the focus has generally been on strategies that can be used to reduce prejudice in order to improve race relations among racially diverse groups. Further discussion of the contact hypothesis is necessary as the current study locates itself firmly within the area of intergroup contact theory.

2.4.4 Intergroup Contact or Contact Hypothesis Theory

The contact hypothesis holds that increasing contact among groups reduces prejudice and discrimination. It is believed that one reason prejudice exists is that group members have inaccurate and oversimplified stereotypes about other groups and that increasing contact between groups will improve the accuracy of the information groups hold about each other (Allport,1954). Interracial contact can take many different forms such as observation of one another, acquaintances working together and friendship (Feld & Carter, 1998).

In formulating the contact hypothesis, Allport (1954) insisted that prejudice might be reduced by equal status contact between majority and minority groups in pursuit of common goals. The contact hypothesis informs an overarching contact theory that is based on the premise that intergroup contact will lead to a change in mutual attitudes and relations of the interacting members. Underlying this assumption is that contact among individuals of diverse groups creates an opportunity for mutual acquaintance, enhances understanding and acceptance among the interacting group members, and consequently reduces intergroup prejudice and tension.

Intergroup Contact Theory insists that generalisation or stereotyping of the other group occurs in the absence of adequate knowledge at a personal level, and a lack of equal status contact. This is thought to lead to mistrust and suspicion between races (Allport, 1954). It is however, important to recognise that contact between groups can also serve to heighten intergroup tensions and increase prejudice and suspicion unless certain conditions are adhered to in the process (Amir, 1969; Cook, 1988; Johnson & Johnson, 1981; Scofield, 1983, Stephan & Brigham, 1985; Feld & Carter, 1999). These conditions are equal status, institutional support, cooperation, and acquaintance potential. Further detail on these conditions is provided in the sections below.

2.4.4.1 Equal status

It is important that the two groups should perceive and expect equal status. Equal status is also referred to as situational equal status (Pettigrew, 1998). None of the groups should be afforded special or lesser preference regardless of their background. Every member should be treated in the same manner. This is an important issue in any contact programme that aims to reduce prejudice. Many prejudiced stereotypes of out-groups are said to comprise beliefs about their inferior ability to perform various tasks. Evidence suggests that where inequalities such as class or academic ability exist within the contact situation, there is a strong possibility that prejudice may be reinforced (Pettigrew, 1998). Evidence for this was also found in a study by Spangenberg & Nel (1983). They found that racial attitudes of white academics working together with Coloured colleagues in equal-status contact showed less social distance than those held by white academics working in a non-contact environment.

2.4.4.2 Institutional support

Intergroup contact requires institutional support in the form of authorities, law, or custom. According to Brehm & Kassin (1996) racial attitudes are profoundly influenced by what others say or do. A supportive environment is thus crucial to this criterion to ensure that members of the group can deal with whatever issue arises from their contact. This support involves the process of developing strategies that address issues pertinent to intergroup relationships. Research on institutional support has focused mainly on the role of teachers in facilitating intergroup relations in schools. Scofield (1983) postulates that teachers can make a very important contribution towards programmes designed to reduce intergroup prejudice by creating a culture where students respect each other's rights. Epstein (1985) further suggests that teachers who favour this process are more likely to organize their classroom to meet outcomes such as cooperation and equal status interactions. The study by Gomez & Huici (2008) on the effect of vicarious intergroup contact and the support of an authority figure on the improvement of out-group and meta stereotype evaluation showed that the positive effects of vicarious intergroup contact increased significantly when it was supported by an authority figure.

2.4.4.3 Working towards a common goal (co-operation)

The groups should always be working towards a common goal to reduce prejudice through contact. This should involve intergroup co-operation, which implies that contact has to be in a co-operative rather than competitive environment. This criterion requires that there should not be any competition between the group members. Accordingly, working towards a common goal promotes interdependency. In so far as members of different groups are dependent on each other for the achievement of some jointly desired objective, they have instrumental reasons to develop friendlier relationships with each other (Brown, 1995). A study conducted by Slavin & Madden (1979) found that students who participated in sports in desegregated high schools were much more likely to have out-group friends and positive racial attitudes than those who did not participate in integrated sports teams.

Another means to co-operation is the jigsaw puzzle method developed by Aronson. The method provides daily opportunities for intense interpersonal contact among students of different race groups (Lindzey, & Aronson, 1985). Ziegler's (1981) study showed that there were more cross-ethnic friendships (both casual and close friendships) in Jigsaw classes of European and West Indian immigrants and Anglo Canadians in Toronto than in the control group. Cook (1985) conducted a study which showed that the use of co-operative learning techniques facilitates an interaction that encouraged friendly interracial behaviour and promoted cross-racial respect between those individuals who were present in the desegregated setting.

2.4.4.4 Acquaintance potential

For interracial contact to be successful it has to be of sufficient frequency, duration and closeness to permit the development of meaningful relationships between members of the groups concerned (Brown, 1995). Furthermore, for attitudes and behaviour to change between interacting members, there is a need for contact to be more than superficial or casual.

Acquaintance therefore provides the group with the opportunity to get to know each other and serves as a forum to challenge some negative stereotypes about other groups different from one's own.

In addition to these criteria, Baron & Byrne (1997) add that contact between groups must be informal so that they can get to know one another as individuals. The group must also interact in ways that permit disconfirmation of negative stereotyped beliefs about each other.

Also important is the fact that the group members must view each other as participants of the respective group. This is particularly important to ensure that the group members do not revert to the divisive idea of "them" and "us" that is so evident in prejudice. Research based on the conditions put forth by Allport (1954) including the criteria above has produced inconsistent results. The section below examines research that has been conducted using the Contact Hypothesis in a number of settings.

The Contact Hypothesis Theory has been used to conduct research in different settings including schools and other integrated or integrating contexts. It has also been used to address different social issues. A study conducted by Zuel and Humphrey (1971) on the integration of black residents in suburban neighbourhoods showed that white participants had significant positive relationships with their Black neighbours. Similar results were found when Ford (1973) conducted a study in which he interviewed Black and White housewives in racially segregated and desegregated neighbourhoods to determine the extent to which engaging in equal status interracial contact was related to racially tolerant attitudes. He found that housewives who engaged in interracial neighbouring tended to be less prejudiced than women who did little or no interracial neighbouring. Herek & Glunt (1993) and Herek & Capitanio's (1996) research on attitudes towards homosexuality found that interpersonal contact with gay men or lesbians was strongly associated with positive attitudes towards gay men generally and that those who reported having a close friend who disclosed his or her homosexuality to them held more positive attitudes towards gay people in general than the other respondents.

A review of research conducted by St John (1975) on racial attitudes and behaviour in school suggests that desegregation sometimes reduces prejudice and promotes interracial friendship but may at times produce the opposite effects.

Wittig & Grant (1998) tested Allport's (1954) conditions by examining the ways in which different levels of social contact enhanced comfort in talking about racial issues, strengthened the belief in the equal worth of all groups, and increased openness to making friends across racial boundaries. The researchers found that under experimental settings that replicated the ideal conditions outlined above, prejudice was reduced. Nelson (1989) found support for this theory in that organizations whose members had strong ties with members of other groups were characterised by low levels of prejudice.

Research examining the contact hypothesis in relation to mental illness has shown inconsistent results. Callaghan, Sui Shang, Suk Yu, Wai Chung & Kwan (1997) conducted a study testing the attitudes of Chinese student nurses in Hong Kong towards patients with mental illnesses. Their findings showed that even prior contact with patients with mental illness did not support the contact hypothesis in that it did not affect the students' attitudes to mental illness. Other studies that yielded no effect on attitudes about mental illness when operationalised under the criteria required of the contact hypothesis include Amir, 1969; Weller & Grune, 1988; Murphy, Black, Duffy & Keisan 1993. Other studies have however reported positive attitudes towards people with mental illness under contact conditions (Nosse, 1993; Ogendengbe, 1993; Penn, Guynan & Spaulding, 1994).

Research has also shown that contact does not always produce positive results for attitude change. A study conducted by Riordan (1978), which examined the effects of contact between black and white teenagers who had participated in tolerance training, showed an insignificant decrease in the interracial attitudes of Black teenagers and a significant decrease among White teenagers. Similarly, Parson (1985) cited in Combs & Griffith (2007) reported no improved attitudes between Black and White parents and students who had interracial interaction.

In addition to the optimal conditions for reducing prejudice put forth by Allport (1954), Pettigrew (1998) added that intergroup friendship should also be the focus of intergroup

relations research because it involves all conditions for optimal intergroup contact. This is also consistent with Amir's (1969) suggestion that contact needs to be intimate to have long-term effects on racial attitudes. This extension on the conventional conditions has come to be known as the extended contact hypothesis.

2.5 The Extended Contact Hypothesis

As shown above, there is extensive supporting evidence that shows that contact can reduce negative attitudes. However, contact theory implies that in order to achieve positive intergroup attitudes there has to be direct intergroup contact. Direct intergroup contact has however been shown to produce discomfort and anxiety hence the introduction of the extended contact theory.

Stephan & Stephan (1985) suggest that intergroup anxiety stems from the anticipation of negative consequences during contact, such as embarrassment, rejection, discrimination or misunderstanding, and may therefore be exacerbated by minimal prior contact with the out-group and perceived large status differential or numerical differences between the in-group and the out-group. These authors also point out that intergroup anxiety is associated with a number of negative outcomes that may harm the impact of contact, including information processing biases such as a narrowed focus of attention and simplified, expectancy-confirming cognitive processing, which may lead to the avoidance of contact and polarized group judgments.

The extended contact hypothesis however, proposes that knowing that an in-group member has a close relationship with an out-group member can lead to more positive intergroup attitude (Wright et al., 1997). This suggests that one does not have to have direct contact with the member of the out-group to view the out-group favourably. One possibility for such contact is through extended friendships.

2.5.1 The Extended Contact Hypothesis in extended intergroup friendships

Researchers such as Stephan & Brigham (1985) and Pettigrew & Tropp (2000) have shown that direct intergroup contact produces anxiety and that anxiety is the main factor that reduces intergroup contact.

Similarly, Paolini et al. (2004) found that high anxiety may suppress the positive effects of contact. People are also likely to feel anxious at the mere anticipation of intergroup relations in the future.

Wright et al. (1997) suggest that observing an in-group out- group friendship involving others should not evoke the interaction anxiety and other negative emotions for the observer that actual participation in intergroup contact might. Pettigrew (1998) also proposed that intergroup friendships are important with regard to forming positive intergroup attitudes.

The extended contact theory proposes that the mere knowledge of an in-group member having an out-group friend can increase positive out-group evaluation (Wright et. al., 2007). According to Gomez and Huici (2008) being exposed to extended experiences influences attitudes, stereotypes, and behaviour for members of different social groups. They also point out that extended contact improves out-group and meta-stereotype evaluation as compared with no contact. Meta- stereotypes refer to beliefs shared by members of a group about how members of other groups perceive them. They are usually negative or worse than the in-group stereotypes and may determine intergroup relations more than the out-group stereotypes. Strategies that are used to improve out-group evaluation also modify meta-stereotypes (Gomez, Huici, & Morales, 2004 cited in Gomez & Huici, 2008).

2.5.2 Evaluations of the Extended Contact Hypothesis

Wright et al. (1997) conducted four studies to investigate the extended contact hypothesis. In Study 1 and 2 they found that respondents who had knowledge of a cross-ethnic friendship showed lower levels of prejudice towards that out-group than those who were unaware of such interracial friendship. This showed that indirect interracial friendship had a positive effect on intergroup attitudes.

In the laboratory environment (Study 3) Wright et al. (1997) also found that by introducing laboratory-created interracial friendships there was a reduction in negative out-group attitudes.

In their fourth study, they found that observation of an interaction between interracial friends led to more positive evaluations of the out-group by the participants. Other studies have also shown positive results when investigating the extended contact effect. Liebkind and Mc Alister (1999) conducted field experiment studies in Finnish schools using peer modeling and group discussions with printed stories of in-group members engaged in close friendship with members of the out-group as examples of successful intergroup contact. They found that tolerance could be improved or maintained through peer modeling of positive intergroup contact.

Cameron and Rutland (2006) conducted a study that involved implementing a six week long intervention program with children aged five to ten years in British schools. It consisted of them being read stories that featured disabled and non- disabled children in a friendship context, which was then followed by a discussion. They found that extended contact led to increased positive attitudes towards the disabled.

Similarly, Paolini et al. (2004) conducted two surveys of Catholics and Protestants in Northern Ireland to test their prejudice towards a religious out-group, direct and indirect interracial friendship, intergroup anxiety, and perceived out-group variability. The results showed that both direct and extended contact were associated with reduced prejudice towards the religious out-group, increased out-group variability, and reduced anxiety.

In their study involving White British children aimed at improving intergroup attitudes towards refugees, Cameron, Rutland, Brown & Douch (2006) had stories read to 5-11 year old children about other British children having a positive interaction with a refugee child. They found that children who received the intervention had significantly positive attitudes towards refugee children.

Gomez and Huici (2008) conducted a study in which participants were required to watch a video of a joint training session of both the in-group and out-group teams performing two exercises. The video was not presented for the participants in the no contact condition. The study showed that extended intergroup contact improved out-group evaluation when compared to the no contact condition.

Gomez (2004) cited in Gomez and Huici (2008) conducted studies, which showed that intergroup extended contact improved out-group attitudes as compared to an extended situation where two groups appeared separately. Thus the proposed extended contact operates on three assumed conditions or underlying mechanisms.

These are the positive in-group exemplar, the positive out-group exemplar, and inclusion of other in the self (Wright et al., 1997). A discussion of these mechanisms follows below.

2.5.2.1 The in-group exemplar

The in-group exemplar refers to when a specific in-group member involved in the interracial interaction is viewed as a positive exemplar of the entire in-group (Wright et al., 1997). Since the in-group exemplar is seen as interchangeable with the self, he or she is therefore able to provide information about the group's consensus about the nature and contents of in-group norms in the relevant social context (Haslam, McGarthy & Turner, 1996; Terry & Hogg, 1996 cited in Wright et al., 1997). The member can therefore provide information on how the entire in-group can be expected to respond while interacting with out-group members. Thus, the observer must identify with the individual in the interaction as a representative in-group member whose behaviours are then seen as the norms of his/her group in order for the actions of this person to influence the observer's attitudes. Comfortable interaction by the in-group friend may therefore serve to reduce fears and negative expectations in the observer, resulting in a more positive impression of the out-group (Wright et al., 1997).

2.5.2.2 The positive out-group exemplar

The member of the out-group also provides information about the out-group. Research on the extended contact effect has also focused on group salience. When social identities are salient, an out-group member who is observed interacting with an in-group member may provide information about the nature of relevant intergroup relations and about the attitudes and norms of the relevant out-group (Wright in press cited in Wright et al.,

1997). In order for positive attitudes to be generalised the out-group member has to be seen as representative of the whole out-group

According to Hewstone & Brown (1986) group membership representativeness in intergroup encounters makes it possible to generalize from a specific experience to more general attitudes. If an out-group member is not seen as representative of his/her group, then contact is considered interpersonal and the effects will not be generalised to the out-group. The out-group member may thus be treated as an exception. When the person is viewed as representative of the group, then treating them as an exception, or ignoring group membership becomes more difficult and the specific encounter is more likely to be generalised (Ortiz & Harwood, 2007).

2.5.2.3 Inclusion of other in the self

The self-concept of an in-group member is based on integrating the group into the self. The individual therefore treats the group as part of the self while the out-group is seen as part of the environment outside of the self. This is said to change when an in-group member who is seen as part of the self is known to have an out-group member as part of the self. Thus an out-group friend who also serves as the extension of the out-group as a whole becomes part of the self. The self therefore begins to respond to members of the out-group more positively, similar to the way they would treat themselves because the out-group are now seen as part of the self (Wright et al., 1997). In support of this premise, a study conducted by the same author showed that observing a friendly interracial interaction between a typical in-group member and a typical out-group member resulted in more inclusion of the out-group in the self, lower intergroup anxiety and more positive intergroup attitudes than observing the same friendly interactions between atypical in-group and/or atypical out-group members.

Having evaluated the existing theoretical precursors and studies grounding the extended contact hypothesis as a context within which to understand the present study, the next chapter describes the methods selected for this project.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

This chapter provides a detailed description of the participants, data collection procedures, measures and forms of data analysis used in response to the primary research aim which is to explore whether knowledge of an in-group member's friendship with out-group members reduces prejudice towards the out-group (Paolini et al., 2004) in a sample of South African students. To this end, the study first examined how the amount of contact with members of the out-group affects intergroup attitudes; secondly it explored the relationship between direct friendship and intergroup attitudes and lastly it attempted to measure how extended friendship (that is the knowledge of friends who have friends of the other race) affects intergroup attitudes.

3.1 Research Design.

A cross-sectional survey design formed the backbone of the study. A survey is used to provide quantitative information about the social world in order to explain or explore features of people and the social world (Neuman, 1997). The study used a survey because it is appropriate for asking many people about their beliefs, opinions, or attitudes. The present study asked students to answer self-report questions about their attitudes about intergroup relations. The research is of a quantitative nature. Neuman (1997) define quantitative research as the numerical representation and manipulation of observation for the purpose of describing and explaining the phenomena that those observations reflect.

3.2 Sampling

The current study is based on data collected from a class of first year Health Science students enrolled in a Psychology class at a University in Johannesburg. Permission was received from the course coordinators to conduct the research in this class.

A convenience sample of 229 first year students participated in the study. The sample comprised of 93 (40.6%) Blacks, 94 (41.0%) Whites, 36 (15.7%) Indians and 6 (2.6%) Coloured students. Of the total number of students, 59 (25.8%) were male and 170 (74.2%) were female.

The respondents' ages ranged from 18- 25, with a mean of 18 years. In the Black sample 27 (29.0%)participants were males and 66 (71.0%) females whereas there were 24 (25.5%) males and 70 (74.5%) females in the White sample, 5 (13.9%) males and 31 (86.1%) females in the Indian one and the Coloured sample comprised 3 males and 3 females. The comparative analysis was only conducted on data on the White and Black students because there were too few Indian and Coloured participants for any meaningful inclusion of these data in this analysis.

3.3 Procedure

The participants were seen in their tutorial groups of the first year Psychology class. The researcher introduced herself to the students and asked whether they would like to participate in a study about intergroup relations. The participants were informed that participation in the study was voluntary and anonymous, and that their responses would be treated confidentially. Questionnaires were handed out to the participants. They completed them individually and handed them back to the researcher. The researcher was available to provide assistance to the respondents when required.

3.4 Data collection instrument and measures

Data collection was conducted using a self-reporting questionnaire. The questionnaire included four demographic questions, which requested the respondents to indicate their age, gender, year of study and race. The scales used in the current research study were adapted from Turner et al., (2007). Each scale was measured on a Likert type scale. The questionnaire comprised of scales that measured the following variables:

3.4.1 Amount of cross-race contact

The respondents were asked to indicate how often they had contact with members of the out-group in various venues, such as their residential area, own home, religious events

and during lectures. They had rate their answers on a Likert type scale 1= Never, 2= Seldom, 3= Sometimes, 4= Often and 5 = Very Often. The eight items were averaged to give a single score.

3.4.2 Affective prejudice

The respondents were asked to indicate their general feeling about the out-group. Affective prejudice was measured on a five point scale on the following six pairs of adjectives 1= warm and 5= cold, 1= negative and 5= positive, 1=friendly and 5= hostile, 1= suspicious and 5= trusting, 1= respect and 5= Disrespect and 1= Admiration and 5 = Disgust. The scores on the second and fourth item were reversed before the scale was averaged, so that a high overall score indicated negative feelings about the out-group and a low score indicated positive feelings.

3.4.3 Social distance

On this scale the respondents were asked to rate their willingness to allow members from the out group into their study group, street as neighbours, home as personal friends and in close kinship by marriage. Social distance was measure on a similar Likert type scale : 1= any, 2= most, 3= some, 4= few and 5 = no. The scores on the items were averaged, with a high final score indicating a desire for greater social distance from the out-group.

3.4.4 Intergroup anxiety

Here the respondents were asked to indicate how they would feel mixing with members from the out-group. Intergroup anxiety was also measured on a Likert type scale on the following five pairs of adjectives 0= happy and 4= unhappy, 0= comfortable and 4= uncomfortable, 0= positive and 4= negative, 0= relaxed and 4= anxious, 0= keen and 4= reluctant. The scores on the items were averaged, with a high score indicating high anxiety.

3.4.5 Number of direct and extended (i.e. friends who have friends of a different race) friends of different race.

The respondents were asked to estimate the number of close friends they had who belonged to the out-group and the number of their same race friends who had friends who

belonged to the out-group. Both items were rated on the following Likert type scale : 0= 0 1=1, 2=2-5, 3= 5-10 and 4 = more than 10 friends.

3.4.6 Meaning of friendship

The respondents were asked to define friendship based on eight statements. These statements asked them what they would call someone they share details of their lives with, their aspirations or dreams, who supports them emotionally, someone they say hello to when they see them, someone they spend their spare time with or time with at work, someone they live near to or they see at lectures. They indicated their responses based on this scale: 1= someone I know in passing, 2= Acquaintance, 3= Friend and 4= Intimate friend.

3.5 Data Analysis

Descriptive and inferential tests were run on the data. These included correlation tests**.** The purpose of a correlation analysis is to determine the degree to which two (or more) variables vary from each other and or go together. Correlation does not suggest a cause-effect relationship but only the degree of parallelism between the variables, the cause of which may be unknown. The Pearson product-moment correlation (r) was used to analyze the data in the current study in order to determine the relationship between the scales used specifically the amount of contact, social distance, affective prejudice, and intergroup anxiety. (Newman, 1997) Pearson's correlation was used because the questions asked are both of an interval and ratio nature except for the two friendship questions, which are ordinal in nature.

3.6 Ethical procedures

The ethics committee for the medical and humanities faculty approved the current study. In order to assure confidentiality and anonymity the participants were requested not to put any personal or identifying details on the questionnaire. The data were kept safe after collection and subsequently destroyed after the analysis.

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

Key findings of the study revealed that the greater the amount of contact one has with members of the out-group, the lower the prejudice; the more friends of the other race people have, the lower the prejudice and thirdly, that the more indirect friends (friends who have friends of the other race) people have, the lower the prejudice. Further details on all of the analyses are provided below.

Table 1: Tests of reliability and normality

	Cronbach Alpha	Skewness	Kurtosis	Meaning of high scores
Amount of contact	0.729	0.117	-0.294	More contact
Affective prejudice	0.864	0.090	-0.271	Greater prejudice
Social distance	0.789	0.303	-0.552	Greater social distance (more prejudice)
Intergroup Anxiety	0.927	0.308	-0.502	Greater anxiety

Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients were calculated for each scale. These are presented in Table 1 above. All the Cronbach alpha coefficients were found to be acceptable for these research scales. The scales were then tested for normality. For all the scales, skewness and kurtosis were between -0.1 and +1.0. This indicated that the distributions of the scales were sufficiently close to a normal distribution.

4.1 Relationship between the variables

In order to test the hypothesis that more intergroup contact and friendship is related to lower prejudice, a correlation analysis using Pearson's Correlation Coefficient was conducted for all the scales. Although the friendship scales are technically ordinal, the skewness and kurtosis of their distribution are within the acceptable range for normality and therefore the Pearson's Correlation Coefficient is acceptable. The analysis was first computed for the whole sample. Secondly, separate analyses were done for the Black and White respondents and then the correlation coefficients were compared to test for differences between the two race groups.

4.2 Whole Sample

Table 2: Correlations between the variables for the whole sample (N = 229)

	Contact	Prejudice	Social Distance	Anxiety
Contact	1.00	-0.4245	-0.2733	-0.2616
Direct Friends	-0.5237	-0.3288	-0.2225	-0.2861
Extended Friends	-0.4370	-0.2772	-0.1947	-0.2066

Table 2 above shows the relationship among the five tested measures. The results show that the amount of contact is significantly negatively correlated to prejudice, social distance and intergroup. The number of inter-racial friends is also significantly negatively correlated to prejudice, social distance and intergroup. This proves the first set of hypotheses of the study that the more contact the lower the prejudice ($r= -0.4245$; $p< .0001$), the lower the social distance ($r=-0.2733$; $p<.0001$) and the lower the intergroup anxiety($r= -0.2616$; $p< .0001$).The results also indicate that the respondents who had direct friendship with members of the out-group had lower prejudice ($r = -0.3288$; $p< .0001$), lower desired social distance ($r= -0.2225$; $p< .0007$) and less anxiety about future interaction with the out-group ($r= -0.2861$; $p< .0001$). The results for extended friendships also show that the more friends they had who had out-group friends, the lower their prejudice ($r = -0.2772$; $p< .0001$), the lower the desired social distance ($r = - 0.1947$; $p < .0032$) and the less anxious they felt about interacting with members of the out-group ($r = -0.2066$; $p< .0017$).

4.3 Comparing Black And White Respondents

Table 3: Comparing Correlations for Black and White Respondents, N = 93

	PREJUDICE		SOCIAL DISTANCE		ANXIETY	
RACE	**Blacks**	**Whites**	**Blacks**	**Whites**	**Blacks**	**Whites**
CONTACT	-0.4055	-0.3289	-0.1987	-0.3266	-0.2276	-0.2621
FISHER Z	0.585		2.099		0.249	
DIRECT FRIENDSHIP	-0.3675	-0.1315	-0.2372	-0.15	-0.2588	-0.1656
FISHER Z	1.724		0.590		0.664	
EXTENDED FRIENDSHIP	-0.3139	-0.0534	-0.1816	-0.1628	-0.1185	-0.2491
FISHER Z	1.818		0.101		0.899	

The results for the Black sample as shown in Table 3 indicate that the more contact the respondents had the lower the prejudice ($r= -0.4055$; $p<.0001$), the lower the desired social distance ($r= -0.1987$; $p < .0562$) and the lower the anxiety ($r= -0.2276$; $p < .0282$). Pearson correlation was also done to test the relationship between direct and extended friendship to social distance and anxiety as shown in the above table. The results indicate that Black respondents who had direct friendship had lower prejudice ($r= -.3675$; $p < .0003$), the lower the desired social distance ($r= - 0.2372$; $p < .0228$) and felt less anxious about future interaction with Whites ($r= -0.2588$; $p < .0127$). The same results were true for extended friendships. The more Black friends they had who had White friends the lower their prejudice ($r = -0.3139$; $p < .0023$), the lower the desired social distance ($r = -0.1816$; $p < .0832$) and the less anxious they felt about interacting with Whites ($r = -0.1185$; $p < .2607$).

Similarly the more contact the White respondents had as shown in Table 3 the lower their prejudice ($r= -03289$; $p < .0012$), the lower the desired social distance ($r=-0.3266$; $p < .0013$) the lower the intergroup anxiety ($r= -0.2621$; $p < .0107$). The results also indicate that White respondents who had direct friendship had lower prejudice ($r = -.01315$; $p < .2064$) the lower the desired social distance ($r= - 0.15$; $p < .1491$) and less anxiety

about future interaction with Blacks (r= -0.1656; p< .1108). The results for extended friendships also show that the more White friends they had who had Black friends, the lower their prejudice (r = -0.0534; p< .6090) the lower the desired social distance (r = -0.1628; p < .1169) and the less anxious they felt about interacting with Blacks (r = -0.2491; p < .0155).

In order to test for differences between the Black and the White samples, the correlation coefficients were compared using Fisher's Z. The correlation between contact and prejudice (Z= 0.585; p >.05) showed no significant difference between the two groups. The correlation between contact and social distance (Z= 2.099; p <. 05) is significantly stronger for the White respondents than for the black respondents. The correlation between contact and anxiety (Z= 0.249, p >.05) also did not show a significant difference. There were no significant differences between the Black and White respondents' correlations of direct friendship with prejudice (Z= 1.724 p >.05), social distance (Z= 0.590; p >.05) and anxiety (Z= 0.664; p >.05). The results for indirect friendship also showed no significant difference between the Black and White respondents concerning prejudice (Z= 1.818; p >.05), social distance (Z= 0.101; p >.05) and anxiety (Z= 0.899; p >.05). The results therefore show that Black and the White respondents who have both direct and indirect out-group friends are less prejudiced. They show lower desired social distance and feel less anxious about interacting with the out-group.

4.4 The Friendship Scale analysis for Black and White Respondents

The friendship scale was analyzed to determine if there were differences in the way respondents defined friendship. The respondents' responses to each statement were calculated using percentages in relation to the frequency of the response to each of the four proposed labels namely someone I know in passing, acquaintance, friend, and intimate friend. The Black and White students did not differ in their perception of friendship except for Definitions 3 (Someone you say hello to when you see), and 8 (Someone you see at lectures), which showed differences in the pattern of responses between the two races. These two different perceptions of friendship will now be analyzed in Tables 4 and 5

Table 4: Comparing Blacks' and Whites' Frequency Procedure for "Someone you say hello to when you see them."

Race	**Someone you say hello to**			
	Someone I know in passing	Acquaintance	Friend	Total
Blacks	66 70.97%	20 21.51%	7 7.53%	93
Whites	51 54.26%	39 41.49%	4 4.26%	94
Total	117	59	11	187

As shown on Table 4 above, most students in the sample saw this definition as indicating a person known in passing or acquaintance. Table 4 shows that there was a difference in the pattern of responses ($\chi^2 = 8.855$; $p<.05$) between the races, as more Blacks said this is someone they know in passing while more Whites called this person an acquaintance.

Table 5: Comparing Blacks' and Whites' Frequencies for "Someone you see at lectures."

Someone you see at lectures					
Race	Someone I know in passing	Acquaintance	Friend	Intimate Friend	**Total (N)**
Blacks	45 48.39%	34 36.56%	12 12.90%	2 2.15	93
Whites	31 32.98%	35 37.23%	26 27.66%	2 2.13%	94
Total	76	69	38	4	187

Table 5 indicates that 48% of the Black Respondents define this person as someone known in passing, 37% as an acquaintance, 13% as a friend, and 2% as an intimate friend. The analysis was redone excluding column 4 to remove the cells with expected frequencies less than 5. The results indicate that there was a difference in the pattern of responses between the races (χ^2= 7.746; p<. 05). More Blacks define this person as someone known in passing while more Whites define such a person as an acquaintance as shown in the above table.

The responses to the eight friendship statements were subjected to a Principal Components Analysis to investigate whether the definitions constituted different factors. The screen test indicated that there are 3 main factors, which explain 54.6% of the variance. After varimax rotation, and using a cut-off point of 0.5 for significant loading, the definitions divided into three distinct factors (See Table 6). These factors were labeled as friend, proximity (relationship) and acquaintance. The factor, "friend" included someone who they share details of their lives with, their dreams, spend spare time with and supports them emotionally. The factor "proximity" (relationship) included someone they live near to or they see at lectures. The factor, "acquaintance" included someone they say hello to and someone they spend time with at work.

Table 6: Factor Loadings for the Friendship Scale

Definitions	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
	Friendship	Proximity	Acquaintance
1. You share details of your life with	0.5979	-*	-
2. You share your aspirations (dreams) with	0.5693	-	-
3. You say hello to when you see them	-	-	0.5867
4. You spend your spare time with	0.6389	-	-
5. You spend time at work with	-	-	0.7715
6. Supports you emotionally	0.6751	-	-
7. You live near to	-	0.8056	-
8. You see at lectures	-	0.8126	-
Variance explained by each factor % of total variance explained	1.6217 20.3%	1.4920 18.7%	1.2509 15.6%

*Factor loadings of under 0.50 are excluded.

The spread of responses to the definitions on each of the factors were considered. There was very little variability in responses to the definitions within the friendship and acquaintance factors. There was strong agreement in the friend factor definitions and the acquaintance factor definitions across all the respondents. The proximity factor- definitions 7 and 8- were the only ones that evidenced sufficient variability with a sizeable proportion of the respondents considering the two definitions as indicating each of the range from "Someone I know in passing" to "Intimate friend". Hence, it was decided to use the proximity factor as the index of different perceptions of friendships.

4.5 The effect of different perceptions of friendship

To investigate whether different perceptions of friendship influenced the relationship between contact, friendship, extended friendship at inter-racial attitudes, the respondents' scores on the proximity factor were partialed out of correlations.

Table7: Comparing the correlations before and after the proximity factor is partialed out using the whole sample.

	PREJUDICE		SOCIAL DISTANCE		ANXIETY	
	R	**R***	**R**	**R***	**R**	**R***
CONTACT	-0.4245	-0.3955	-0.2733	-0.2444	-0.2616	-0.27663
Fisher Z	0.34		0.31		-0.15	
DIRECT FRIENDS	-0.3288	-0.3236	-0.2225	-0.1988	-0.2861	-0.25566
Fisher Z	0.06		0.20		0.31	
EXTENDED FRIENDS	-0.2772	-0.26182	0.1947	-0.17185	-0.2066	-0.20108
Fisher Z	0.15		0.25		0.05	

R=zero-order correlation coefficient
R* = correlation coefficient with proximity factor partialed out

Table 7 shows the comparisons between the zero-order correlation and the correlation with the proximity factor partialed out. The Fisher's test for difference between correlations indicates that there are no differences between these correlation coefficients. Thus, it appears that respondents' perceptions of what constitutes friendship do not affect the extent to which prejudice, social distance and anxiety are reduced by the amount of cross-race contact the respondent has, the number of cross-race friends, or knowing in-group members who have cross-race friends.

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

The purpose of the present study was to test the effect of direct and extended friendship with respect to amount of contact, social distance and intergroup anxiety. This research contributes to the growing research on the use of both direct and extended friendship as a tool to improve intergroup relations. The study predicted that first, the greater the amount of contact, the lower the prejudice; second, that the more friends of the other race the respondents have, the lower the prejudice and last, that the more indirect or extended friends (friends who have friends of the other race) the respondents have, the lower their prejudice. The results supported all three predictions.

5.1 The effect of contact on prejudice

Generally the results provide consistent support regarding the importance of contact in reducing prejudice, which suggests that more contact with the out-group relates negatively to prejudice. The results of the present study show that the greater the amount of contact the participants have, the lower the prejudice, the lower the social distance and the lower the intergroup anxiety. Similar results were reported in a study conducted by Wilder and Thomas (1980) that found that intergroup prejudice decreased with increased out-group contact. Hewstone and Voci, Hewstone & Brown (1986) also reported similar results when they found that high quality intergroup contact related negatively to prejudice. Hewstone, Cairns, Voci, Hamberger & Niens (2006) conducted a survey that showed that contact was positively related to attitudes towards Christian denominations mixing and in their second survey contact was positively related to out-group attitudes. Pettigrew and Tropp's (2006) meta-analysis also showed that greater intergroup contact generally is associated with lower intergroup prejudice.

The current study reported no significant difference between the Black respondents (minority group) and the White respondents (majority group) on contact and prejudice. This is inconsistent with Pettigrew and Tropp's (2000) findings that the negative relationship between contact and prejudice was significantly smaller among a stigmatised or minority group than among a dominant or majority group.

5.2 The effect of direct and extended friendship on prejudice

The current study shows that participants who have both direct and extended friends with the out-group members showed less prejudice towards the out-group. The results confirm the assertion by Pettigrew et al. (2007) that direct and indirect contact is highly interconnected in reducing prejudice. Friendship can provide extensive contact in multiple social contexts with access to interracial networks and opportunities for self-disclosure. Pettigrew (1997) suggested that out-group friendships are powerful instigators of positive intergroup attitudes. Researchers such as Phinney, Ferguson & Tate (1993) have repeatedly found that friendship negatively and substantially relates to prejudice. Similar findings were reported by Pettigrew and Tropp (2000), Aboud, Mendelson and Purdy (2003). Powers and Ellison (1995) in their study of interracial contact and Black racial attitudes found that close interracial friendships led to more positive racial attitudes among Black Americans.

The current data support the idea that positive attitudes can be generalised to the out-group when they observe friendly cross- group interaction which may be because in the extended contact effect the in-group and out-group member can serve as exemplar. The results also support the idea proposed by Wright et al. (1997) that knowledge and observation of a cross- group friendship produces positive intergroup attitudes that can be generalised to the entire out-group.

The results of the present study showed that participants who had both direct and extended friend reported lower prejudice against the out-group. The results are consistent with a study conducted by Pettigrew, Christ, Ulrich and Stellmacher (2007), which showed that participants with both direct and indirect intergroup friendships were the least prejudiced of all the groups against Muslims and foreigners. Hodson, Harry and Mitchell's (2009) study proved that participants with only a single direct friend or a couple of indirect friends showed lower prejudice. Similar results were reported by Tam et al. (2009) when they found that higher levels of extended contact had more positive attitudes towards the out-group. Herek and Capitanio (1997) in a study about the effect of direct and indirect contact on stigma towards people with AIDS found that extended contact produced a higher reduction in prejudice when compared to direct contact.

Similarly, Pettigrew et al. (2007) also reported that among the respondents who had no foreign friends, those who reported having German friends with foreign friends were significantly less prejudiced against Muslims and foreigners. Respondents with only foreign friends were reported to only be slightly less anti foreigners and anti Muslim than those with just indirect contact through in-group friends.

5.3 Effect of intergroup friendship on intergroup anxiety

Intergroup relation research has also focused on processes underlying the effect of contact and emphasis has been on reducing intergroup anxiety. This is because anxiety is seen as an important factor that undermines intergroup attitudes. People will commonly experience anxiety in the context of intergroup interaction.

There are several reasons why anxiety is likely to arise in intergroup contact situations. These include general uncertainty about unfamiliar situations, negative stereotypic expectancies about the out-group and concerns about acting inappropriately or appearing to be prejudiced (Devine, Evett & Vasquez- Susan 1996). A study by Levin, Laar & Sidanius (2003) showed that higher levels of intergroup anxiety during the first year of college predicted lower incidences of intergroup friendships two and three years later.

The respondents in the present study were also asked how they would feel if they were to interact with members of the out-group. The results showed that having direct friends reduced prejudice and decreased anxiety associated with contact with the out-group. The findings of the current were consistent with Tropp's (2003) in that group members with a great proportion of out-group friends reported feeling less anxious when asked to imagine future cross- group interaction. She however argues that when assessing imagined anxiety rather than anxiety in an actual intergroup context the percentage of out-group friends is not significantly related to either reported hostility or anxiety to anticipated interaction.

The results of the current study are also consistent with the general findings that intergroup contact reduces anxiety and that reduced anxiety serves as an important mediator of reduced prejudice through contact (Pettigrew, 1998; Voci & Hewstone, 2003, Stephan & Stephan, 1992, Stephan, Stephan & Gudykunst, 1999, Islam & Hewstone, 1993).

Interracial friendship provides examples of successful and pleasant interaction with out-group members and is expected to improve out-group judgement by reducing intergroup anxiety (Paolin et al., 2004).

The findings of the present study shows that contact with the out-group through extended friendship reduces people's anxiety to interact and may lead to positive interaction with the out-group members in the future. The results concur with Wright et al. (1997) study. Similar results were reported in a study conducted by Paolini et al. (2004), which proved that having out-group friends reduces the negative expectation of interaction with other out-group members. Stephan et al. (2002) also provided evidence to support this hypothesis.

The results may be because when the out-group member sees his or her friends interact with the out-group, they may develop feelings of interconnectedness with the out-group. This is likely to lead to more positive attitudes towards the out-group. The in-group observers might feel less interaction anxiety when they look forward to interaction with an out-group member.

5.4 The effect of contact on social distance

Bogardus (1926) defines social distance as people's willingness to participate in social contact of varying degrees of closeness with members of diverse social groups. Marger (1994) cited in Weaver (2007) refers to social distance as an indicator of how acceptable or objectionable various ethnic groups are in society. The respondents were asked to rate their willingness to allow members from the out-group in their study group, street, neighbours, and homes as personal friends and in close kinship by marriage. The findings of the present study show that White respondents scored significantly higher than Black respondents. The findings are inconsistent with findings from a study conducted by Dickinson, Holifield, Holifield and Creer (2000) among fourth to sixth grade students in an urban magnet school which found that Black students, especially females, were less willing to interact across racial lines than White students.

Similarly, Brigham (1993) also showed that African Americans typically endorsed greater social distance and expressed more negative affect to those outside their racial

group than their White counterparts. The present study shows that White respondents may not be willing to accept Blacks in certain types of contact such as through marriage as neighbours or in their homes.

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION

6.1 Summary

The extended contact effect suggests that reducing prejudice between different groups does not necessarily require each person having to be in direct contact with the out-group (Wright et al., 1997). The current study focuses on how direct and indirect friendships affect prejudice and intergroup anxiety. The data collected for both the Black and White participants supported the prediction that the greater the amount of contact one has with members of a different race, the lower the prejudice and secondly, that the more friends of the other race people have, the lower their prejudice toward that particular race. Thirdly, it also emerged that the more indirect friends (friends who have friends of the other race) people have the lower their prejudice. Generally, the study consistently supports the growing body of evidence that both direct and indirect friendship lowers prejudice. It also shows that having in-group friends who have out-group friends reduces intergroup anxiety about future encounters with the out-group. The research implies that increasing contact between diverse groups does reduce prejudice and may improve intergroup attitudes.

6.2 Limitations of the study

The present study is not without limitations. The first limitation of the current study is the uneven gender distribution of the sample. The researcher did not foresee the high percentage of females in the first year Psychology class. This limitation does not however nullify the contribution of these results as it only means that the sample is therefore skewed towards the female population. Researchers such as Shirakawa (1999) and Pope-Davis & Ottavi (1994) have used gender imbalanced samples. Using gender as a variable in the study does not affect the data.

The second limitation of the study is the sample size. The size of the sample was small and therefore the study cannot claim that the data are representative of the attitudes of Black and White students.

Collecting data using a questionnaire also has its limitation because subjects may have given responses they thought were desirable or socially acceptable. This is however unlikely because the questionnaire was anonymous.

Despite the limitations described above, the current findings substantially coincide with the idea that extended contact produces positive intergroup relations.

6.3. Recommendations

The current study offers some encouragement for the future of intergroup relations in South Africa. It may also have further implications not only for intergroup relations but also for addressing some social issues especially in South Africa because it points to the possibility that the simple knowledge that one's friend has a friend in the out-group is a significant contributor to the reduction of prejudice held about the out-group, leading to positive attitude change. The current study can be replicated in other settings to change attitudes and prejudice towards social issues such as HIV/AIDS, disability, foreigners, and homosexuality. Secondly, further research could also be done to explore conditions, which would make extended contact ineffective in changing prejudicial attitudes as the main focus has been on strategies that can be used to effectively change attitudes. In addition, research has also focused on intergroup anxiety as one of the mechanisms involved in intergroup relations. However, the focus has mainly been on how participants would feel in an imagined interaction with the out-group. Further research should be undertaken to assess anxiety during the actual intergroup interaction in order to identify conditions that would assist in diminishing this apparent factor's involvement in undermining optimal contact conditions.

REFERENCE LIST

Aboud, F. E., Mendelson, M. J., & Purdy, K. T. (2003). Cross-race peer relations and friendship quality. *International Journal of Behavioural Development, 27*, 165–173.

Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswick, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). *The Authoritarian Personality*. NY: Harper.

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

Amir, Y. (1969). Contact hypothesis in ethnic relations. *Psychological Bulletin, 71*, 319-342.

Baker, R. (1995). *Los dos mundos: Rural Mexican Americans, another American.* Utah: Utah University Press. (Eric Document Reproduction Services No ED 365 417).

Baron, R., & Byrne, D. (1997). *Social Psychology*. B: Allyn and Bacon.

Bogardus, E. S. (1926). Social Distance in the City. *Proceedings and Publications of the American Sociological Society* 20, 40-46.

Brehm, S.S., & Kassin, S. M. (1996). *Social Psychology*. B: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Brigham, J. C. (1993). College students' racial attitudes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 23*, 1933-1967.

Brown, R. (1995). *Prejudice: It's Social Psychology*. NY: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Brown, R. J., & Hewstone, M. (2005). An integrative theory of intergroup contact. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 37*, 255–343.

Callaghan, P., Siu Shan, C., Suk Yu L., Wai Chung L., & Kwan T. L. (1997). Attitudes towards mental illness: Testing the contact hypothesis among Chinese student nurses in Hon Kong. *Journal of Advance Nursing, 26,* 33-40.

Cameron, L., Rutland, A., Brown, R., & Douch, R. (2006). Changing Children's Intergroup Attitudes Toward Refugees: Testing Different Models of Extended Contact. *Child Development, 77*(5), 1208 – 1219.

Cameron, L., & Rutland, A. (2006). Extended contact through story reading in school: Reducing children's prejudice toward the disabled. *Journal of Social Issues, 62,* 469–488.

Combs, G., & Griffith, J. (2007). An Examination of Interracial Contact: The Influence of Cross-Race Interpersonal Efficacy and Affect Regulation. *Human Resource Development Review, 6* (3), 222-244.

Comeau, J., & Wright, S. (2008). "Direct and Extended Contact in a Multi-Ethnic Context" *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology*, Classical Chinese Garden, Portland, Oregon.

Cook, S. W. (1985). Experiment on Social issues: The Case of School Desegregation. *American Psychologist, 4* (4), 452-460.

De la Rey, C. (1991). Intergroup relations: theories and positions. In Foster, D., & Louw-Potgieter, J. (Eds.) (27-53). *Social psychology in South Africa*. Johannesburg: Lexicon.

DeRidder, R., & Tripathi, R. C. (Eds) (1992). *Norm Violation and Intergroup Relation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Devine, P. G., Evett, S. R., & Vasquez-Suson, K. A. (1996). Exploring the interpersonal dynamics of intergroup contact. In R. Sorrentino & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation and cognition: Vol. 3. The interpersonal context* (423–464). NY: Guilford.

DeVries, D. L., & Edwards, K. J. (1974). Student teams and learning games: Their effects on cross-race and cross-sex interactions. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 66,* 741-749.

Dickinson, G. B., Holifield, M.L., Holifield, G., & Creer, D. (2000). Elementary magnet school students interracial contact choices. *Journal of Educational Research, 96,* 391-394.

Dividio, J. F., Gaertner, L., & Kawakami, K. (2003). Intergroup contact: The past, the present, and the future. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 6,* 5-21.

Epstein, J. L. (1985). After the bus arrives: Resegregation in segregated schools. *Journal of Social Issues, 41*, 23-43.

Feld, S. L., & Carter, W. C. (1998). When Desegregation Reduce Interracial Contact: A Class size Paradox for Weak Ties. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 103(5), 1165-1186.

Farley, R., Steeh, C., Krysan, M., Jackson, T., & Reeves, K. (1994). Stereotypes and Segregation: Neighborhoods in the Detroit Area. *American Journal of Sociology, 100,* 750-780.

Ford, W.S. (1973). Interracial Public Housing in a Border City: Another Look at the Contact Hypothesis. *The American Journal of Sociology, 78*(6), 1426-1447.

Gomez, A., & Huici, C. (2008). Vicarious Intergroup Contact and the Role of Authorities in Prejudice Reduction. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology, 11*(1), 103-114.

Hamberger, J., & Hewstone, M. (1997). Inter-ethnic contact as a predictor of blatant and subtle prejudice: Test of a model in four West European countries. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 36,* 173–190.

Herek, G. M., & Glunt, E.K. (1993). Interpersonal contact and heterosexual attitudes towards gay men: Results from a national survey. *Journal of Sex Research, 30,* 239-244.

Herek, G. M., & Capitanio, J. P. (1996). Some of my best friends: Intergroup contact, concealable stigma, and heterosexual attitudes towards gay men and lesbians. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22,* 412-424.

Herek, G. M., & Capitaino, J. P. (1997). AIDS stigma and contact with people with AIDS: Effects of direct and vicarious contact. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 27*, 1-36.

Hewstone, M., & Brown, R. (1986). *Contact and Conflict in Intergroup Encounters*. NY: Basil Blackwell.

Hewstone, M., & Brown, R. (1986). "Contact is Not Enough: An Intergroup Perspective on the 'Contact Hypothesis.'" In M. Hewstone and R. Brown (Eds.), *Contact and Conflict in Intergroup Encounters* (pp. 1-44). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Hewstone, M., Cairns, E., Voci, A., Hamburger J. & Niens, U. (2006) Intergroup contact, forgiveness, and experience of "the troubles" in Northern Ireland. *Journal of Social Issues, 62*(1), 99–120.

Hofman, J .E., & Zak, I. (1969). Interpersonal Contact and Attitude Change in Cross-cultural Situation. *The Journal of Social Psychology,78,* 165-171.

Hodson, G., Harry, H., & Mitchell, A. (2009). Independent benefits of contact and friendship on attitudes toward homosexuals among authoritarians and highly identified heterosexuals. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 39*, 509–525.

Hyers, L.L., & Swim, J.K. (1998). A comparison of the experience of dominant and minority group members during an intergroup encounter. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relation, 1*, 143-163.

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

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1981). Effects of Cooperative and individualistic Learning Experiences on Interethnic Interaction. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 73*(3), 444-449.

Katz, P. (1960). The functional approach to the study of attitude. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 24*, 163-204.

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

Liebkind, K., & Mc Alister, A. (1999). Extended contact through peer modeling to promote tolerance in Finland. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 29*, 765-780.

Lindzey, G., & Aronson, E. (1985). *Handbook of Social Psychology: Special Fields and application.* (Third Edition) Volume II. NY: Random House.

Murphy, B.M., Black, P., Duffy, M., & Kieran J. (1993). Attitudes towards the mentally ill in Ireland. *Irish Journal of Psychological Medicine, 10*(2), 75–79.

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

Mynhardt, J. C., & du Toit, A. (1991). Contact and change. In Foster, D., & Louw-Potgieter, J. (Eds.). *Social Psychology in South Africa, 273-311.* Johannesburg: Lexicon.

Nelson, R.E. (1989). The strength of strong ties: Social networks and intergroup conflict in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal, 32*(2), 377-401.

Neuman, W. (1997). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. B: Allyn and Bacon.

Nosse, L.J. (1993) Effect of direct contact on students' ratings of adults with impairments. *College Student Journal, 27*(3), 396–400.

Ortiz, M., & Harwood, J. (2007). A Social Cognitive Theory Approach to The Effects Of Mediated Intergroup Contact On Intergroup Attitudes. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 61*, 277–284.

Ogedengbe R.O. (1993). Prior contacts and perceptions of previously mentally disturbed patients. *International Journal of Nursing of Studies, 30*(3), 247–259.

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

Penn D.L., Guynan K., Daily T., & Spaulding, W.D. (1994). Dispelling the stigma of schizophrenia: What sort of information is best?. *Schizophrenia Bulletin, 20*(3), 567–578.

Pettigrew, T.F, (1969).Racially separate or together. *Journal of Social issues, 25*(1), 43-69.

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

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

Pettigrew, T.F., & Tropp, L.R. (2000). Does intergroup contact reduce prejudice? Recent meta-analytic findings. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination: Social psychological perspectives* (93-114). NJ: 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.

Pettigrew, T. F., Christ, O., Wagner, U., & Stellmacher, J. (2007). Direct and indirect intergroup contact effects on prejudice: A normative interpretation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relationships, 31*, 411–425.

Phinney, J.S., Ferguson D.L., & Tate, J.D. (1997). Intergroup attitudes among ethnic minority adolescents: A causal model. *Child Development, 68*, 955–969.

Pope-Davis, D.B., & Ottavi, T.M. (1994). The relationship between racism and racial identity among White Americans: A replication and extension. *Journal of Counselling and Development, 72*(3), 293-297.

Powers, D.A., & Ellison, C.G. (1995). Interracial contact and Black racial attitudes: The contact hypothesis and selectivity bias. *Social Force, 74*, 205–226.

Riordan, C. (1978). Equal-status interracial contact: A review and revision of the concept. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 2*, 161-185.

Scofield, J. W. (1983). Promoting positive peer relations in desegregated schools. *Educational Policy, 7*, 297-317.

Sears, D. O., Peplau, L. A., & Taylor, S. E. (1991). *Social Psychology* (Seventh Ed). NJ: Prentice Hall.

Shirakawa, F. (1999). *The relationship between racial prejudice to gender, racial identity, and parental bonding.* Unpublished master's thesis. Ca: Humboldt State University.

Sherif, M., Harvey, J., White, B. J., Hood, W. R., & Sherif, C. W. (1961). *Intergroup conflict and cooperation: The Robbers Cave experiment*. No: University of Oklahoma Book Exchange.

Slavin, R. E., & Madden, N. A. (1979). School Practices that improve race relations. *American Educational Research Journal, 16*(2), 169-180.

Spangenberg, N., & Nel, E.M. (1983). Effects of status contact on ethnic attitudes. *Journal of Social Psychology*, *121*, 173-180.

Stangor, C. (2000). *Stereotypes and Prejudice: Key Readings in Social Psychology*. Philadelphia: Psychology Press Taylor & Francis Group.

St John, N. H. (1975). *School Desegregation Outcome for Children*. NY: John Wiley & Sons.

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

Stephan, W. G., & Brigham, J. C. (Eds.). (1985b). Intergroup contact. *Journal of Social Issues, 41*(3), 147-175.

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

Stephan, W.G., Stephan, C.W., & Gudykunst, W.B. (1999). Anxiety in intergroup relations: A comparison of anxiety/uncertainty management theory and integrated threat theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 23*, 613–628.

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

St John, N. H. (1975). *School Desegregation Outcome for Children*. NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In Austin, W. G. & Worchel, S. (Eds.), The social *psychology of intergroup relations* (33-47). Monterey: Brooks/Cole.

Tam, T., Hewstone, M., Kenworthy, J., & Cairns, E. (2009). Intergroup Trust in Northern Ireland. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 35, 45- 59.

Triansdis, H. C. (1971). *Attitude and Attitude Change*. USA: John Wiley & Sons.

Tropp, L.R. (2003). The Psychological Impact of Prejudice: Implications for Intergroup Contact. *Group Processes Intergroup Relations, 6*(2), 131- 149.

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

Tropp, L.R., & Pettigrew T.F. (2005). Differential relationships between intergroup contact and affective and cognitive dimensions of prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31*(8), 1145–1158.

Turner, R.N., Hewstone, M., & Voci, A. (2007). Reducing explicit and implicit out-group prejudice via direct and extended contact: The mediating role of self- disclosure and intergroup anxiety. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 93, 369*-388.

Van Dick, R., Wagner, U., Pettigrew, T.F., Christ, O., Wolf, C., & Petzel, T. (2004). The role of perceived importance in intergroup contact. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 16,* 651-653.

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

Wagner, U., Van Dick, R., Pettigrew T.F., & Christ, O. (2003). Ethnic prejudice in East- and West Germany: The explanatory power of intergroup contact. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 6*, 23–37.

Weaver C. N. (2007). The effect of contact on the prejudice between Hispanics and Non Hispanics Whites in the United States. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioural Sciences, 29*(2), 254- 274.

Weller L., & Grunes S. (1988). Does contact with the mentally ill affect nurses' attitudes to mental illness?. *British Journal of Medical and Social Psychology, 64*(5), 349–360.

Wetherell, M. (Ed). (1996). *Identities, Groups and Social Issues*. London: Sage Publication.

Wilhelm, M. (1994). *Interracial Contact and Racial Perceptions Among Black and White Adolescents*. Johannesburg: Wits University Press.

Wittig, M. A., & Grant- Thompson S. (1998). The utility of Allport's conditions of intergroup contact for predicting perceptions of improved racial attitudes and beliefs. (Contact Hypothesis). *Journal of Social Issues, 54*(4), 795-812.

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

Zeul, C.R., & Humphrey, C.R. (1971). The Integration of Black Residents in Suburban Neighborhoods: A Reexamination of the Contact Hypothesis. *Social Problems, 18*(4), 462-474.

Ziegler, S. (1981). The effectiveness of cooperative learning teams for increasing cross ethnic friendship: Additional Evidence. *Human Organization, 40*, 264-268.

APPENDIX A

Research Questionnaire for White Students

Information for Participants

I am conducting a research study that seeks to investigate the relationship between people from White and Black population groups. This research is part of my Masters Degree in Psychology. I would be very grateful if you participated in this study. Your participation involves completing this questionnaire, which will take approximately 10 minutes. There is no right or wrong answer, so please answer all the questions as honestly as you can. You are not required to put your name on the questionnaires, so your responses will be completely anonymous.

Thank you for your help.

Tsholofelo Maano

072 107 5086

Demographic Information

Age						
Gender	M	F				
Academic year	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	Postgraduate	
Race	Black(African)	White	Coloured	Indian		

1. How often do you have contact with Black people in the following situations? Please select the appropriate number by making a cross on the box beneath the number that corresponds with your answer

Statements	Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Often	Very Often
	1	2	3	4	5
With Black people in your residential area?		`			
With Black people in your own home?					
With Black people at homes of other people?					
With Black people at their home?					
With Black people at religious events?					
With Black People at social events?					
Do you sit next to Black students during lectures?					
Do you have friendly conversations with Black people?					

2. I feel the following way towards Black people in general. Please circle the number that best represents your feeling

Warm	1	2	3	4	5	Cold
Negative	1	2	3	4	5	Positive
Friendly	1	2	3	4	5	Hostile
Suspicious	1	2	3	4	5	Trusting
Respectful	1	2	3	4	5	Disrespectful
Admiration	1	2	3	4	5	Disgust

3. Please make a cross in the box beneath the word which expresses or most closely expresses your feelings in relation to the statement.

My first feeling is to willingly allow	Any	Most	Some	Few	No
	1	2	3	4	5
Black people in my work/ study group					
Black people to live on my street as neighbours					
Black guests at my home					
Black people to be my personal friends					
Black people in close kinship by marriage					

4. Estimate the number of friends you have that belong to the Black population group. Make a cross on the block that corresponds to your response

0	1	2-5	5-10	more than 10

5. Estimate the number of friends belonging to your White group who have friends from the Black population group. Make a cross on the block that corresponds to your response.

0	1	2-5	5-10	more than 10

6. Try to imagine how you would feel in the following situations. It does not matter whether you personally have very little or no contact with members from the Black population group.

How would you feel mixing socially with complete strangers who are members of the Black population group?

	0	1	2	3	4	
Happy						Unhappy
Comfortable						Uncomfortable
Positive						Negative
Relaxed						Anxious
Keen						Reluctant

7. Please make a cross on the box beneath the most appropriate response to the following statement

What would you call someone who:	1	2	3	4
	Someone I know in passing	Acquaintance	Friend	Intimate Friend
You share details of your life with				
You share your aspirations (dreams) with				
You say hello to when you see				
You spend your spare time with				
You spend time at work with				
Supports you emotionally				
You live near to				
You see at lectures				

Research Questionnaire for Black Students

Information for Participants

I am conducting a research study that seeks to investigate the relationship between people from Black and White population groups. This research is part of my Masters Degree in Psychology. I would be very grateful if you participated in this study. Your participation involves completing this questionnaire, which will take approximately 10 minutes. There is no right or wrong answer, so please answer all the questions as honestly as you can. You are not required to put your name on the questionnaires, so your responses will be completely anonymous.

Thank you for your help.

Tsholofelo Maano
072 107 5086

Demographic Information

Age					
Gender	M	F			
Academic year	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	Postgraduate
Race	Black(African)	White	Coloured	Indian	

How often do you have contact with White people in the following situations? Please select the appropriate number by making a cross in the box beneath the number that corresponds to your answer

Statements	Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Often	Very Often
	1	2	3	4	5
a) With White people in your residential area?		`			
b) With White people in your own home?					
c) With White people at homes of other people?					
d) With White people at their home?					
e) With White people at religious events?					
f) With White People at social events?					
g) Do you sit next to White students during lectures?					
h) Do you have friendly conversations with White people?					

2. I feel the following way towards White people in general. Please circle the number that best represents your feeling

a)	Warm	1	2	3	4	5	Cold
b)	Negative	1	2	3	4	5	Positive
c)	Friendly	1	2	3	4	5	Hostile
d)	Suspicious	1	2	3	4	5	Trusting
e)	Respect	1	2	3	4	5	Disrespect
f)	Admiration	1	2	3	4	5	Disgust

3. Please make a cross in the box beneath the word which expresses or most closely expresses your feelings in relation to the statement

My first feeling is to willingly allow…

My first feeling is to willingly allow	Any	Most	Some	Few	No
	1	2	3	4	5
White people in my work/ study group					
White people to live on my street as neighbours					
White guests at my home					
White people to be my personal friends					
White people in close kinship by marriage					

4. Estimate the number of friends you have that belong to the White population group. Make a cross on the block that corresponds to your response

0	1	2-5	5-10	more than 10

5. Estimate the number of friends belonging to your Black group who have friends from the White population group. Make a cross on the block that corresponds to your response.

0	1	2-5	5-10	more than 10

6. Try to imagine how you would feel in the following situations. It does not matter whether you personally have very little or no contact with members from the White population group.

How would you feel mixing socially with complete strangers who are members of the White population group?

	0	1	2	3	4	
Happy						Unhappy
Comfortable						Uncomfortable
Positive						Negative
Relaxed						Anxious
Keen						Reluctant

7. Please make a cross on the box beneath the most appropriate response to the following statement

What would you call someone who:	1	2	3	4
	Someone I know in passing	Acquaintance	Friend	Intimate Friend
You share details of your life with				
You share your aspirations (dreams) with				
You say hello to when you see				
You spend your spare time with				
You spend time at work with				
Supports you emotionally				
You live near to				
You see at lectures				