

Constructions and explanations of patterns of racialised social interactions among post-apartheid adolescents

Anastasia Clare Keizan

0212358G

Research Report

Submitted in partial fulfilment for the degree of Master of Arts in Community-Based
Counselling Psychology (MACC) at
The University of the Witwatersrand in 2009

Supervisor: Prof. Norman Duncan

DECLARATION

I, Anastasia Clare Keizan, declare that this research report is my own work. Each significant contribution to, and quotation in, this report from the work, or works, of other people has been acknowledged through citation and reference.

Anastasia Clare Keizan

ABSTRACT

This research report explores patterns of social integration and segregation and their constructed meanings for post-apartheid adolescents. The research was conducted in two phases. The first phase of the research involved naturalistic observation of the patterns of social integration and segregation, primarily on the basis of 'race', occurring among a group of post-apartheid adolescents during 'free' time at a desegregated co-educational private high school. While both integration and segregation were observed, a dominant pattern of social self-segregation on the basis of 'race' was noted. Integration primarily occurred around sports. 'White' female learners were seen to be most likely to self-segregate, while 'black', 'Indian' and 'coloured' learners were frequently seen to be racially integrated with each other. The second phase of the research involved a focus group discussion with eight adolescents at a different desegregated co-educational private high school. In the focus group discussion the adolescents confirmed the racialised nature of the dominant pattern of social self-segregation at the school in which observations were conducted (as reflected to them in photographs) as well as in their own social experiences. This research report highlights and attempts to explain these patterns and then goes on to discuss and analyse the numerous ways in which the adolescents explained and made sense of these patterns. Explanations and justifications for self-segregation were full of contradictions and included the racialisation of interests, the naturalisation of segregation, homophily, socialisation, and the avoidance of conflict or threat. The use of psychological defenses and positive self-presentation strategies, as well as the numerous contradictions noted in their explanations, highlighted the highly complex affective nature of the topic and the ideological dilemmas that seemed to characterise their social experiences and everyday realities.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to extend my appreciation to the following people for all the support, guidance, and input that they provided throughout this research -without these people this research would not have been possible.

Firstly thank you to my supervisor, Norman Duncan, for all the support and guidance that you provided. Thank you for giving up your time and energy, and for sharing your expertise with me. It was an honour to work with such a brilliant intellectual, whose knowledge and passion for the subject continues to inspire me.

Thank you to all the staff, lecturers and all my colleagues in the WITS Psychology Department who provided support and advice throughout the year.

A very big thank you to the school principals, for allowing me to conduct my research at their institutions. Thank you to the teachers for being so accommodating.

Thank you to my family for all their support and encouragement, especially to my mother for her interest in the topic and belief in the valuable contribution of research.

To Gary, thank you for your unconditional love and support through the toughest years of my life.

Lastly, to all the adolescents who contributed so openly and honestly, thank you for allowing me into your worlds. You make me believe in South Africa's bright future.

DEDICATION

To all those bravely struggling to make sense of and engage with the contradictions and dilemmas that come with living in post-apartheid South Africa

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page Number</u>
1. Introduction	1
2. Literature Review	4
2.1. Introduction	4
2.2. 'Race', racism and racialised discourses	4
2.3. Historical context of racism, segregation and desegregation	8
2.3.1. The history of segregation in South Africa	8
2.3.2. Desegregation in South Africa	11
2.4. The psychology of 'race' and segregation	17
2.5. Self-segregation	20
2.6. Patterns of self-segregation or integration and meaning	23
3. Methodology	28
3.1. Introduction	28
3.2. Participants	28
3.3. Methods of data collection	29
3.3.1. Naturalistic observation	29
3.3.2. Focus groups	31
3.4. Procedure	33
3.5. Methods of data analysis	36
3.5.1. Phase one	36
3.5.2. Phase two	39
3.6. Ethical considerations	41
3.7. Issues of reflexivity	42
4. Findings and Analysis of Observational Data	45
4.1. Introduction	45
4.2. The subjectivity of racial categories	45
4.3. 'White' segregation and the integration of 'black', 'Indian' and 'coloured' learners	47

4.4. Macro-level patterns mirrored in micro-ecological processes	50
4.5. Sports: a racial integrator or just another form of illusory contact?	51
4.6. The nature of the space and the potential for flexibility of interactions	53
4.7. Meaningful interactions or casual encounters	54
4.8. Conclusion	55
5. Findings and Analysis of Focus Group Data	56
5.1. Introduction	56
5.2. Patterns of integration and segregation	57
5.2.1. The dominance of social self-segregation on the basis of 'race'	57
5.2.2. The unquestioned integration of 'non-whites' and some isolated incidents of racial integration	62
5.2.3. Gender integration	66
5.3. Participants' explanations for patterns of integration and segregation	67
5.3.1. Racialised interests and the rationalization of segregation	67
5.3.2. Segregation as natural and socially acceptable	70
5.3.3. Homophily and the desire to 'fit in'	72
5.3.4. Influences on patterns of self-segregation	75
5.3.4.1. Parental influences	76
5.3.4.2. School influences	78
5.3.5. The impact of sport and team activities on patterns of integration and segregation	80
5.3.6. Intergroup anxiety and the avoidance of conflict	82
5.3.7. BEE and economic threat	86
5.3.8. Intra-psycho processes and the use of positive self-presentation strategies	89
5.3.8.1. Wit, displacement and avoidance	90
5.3.8.2. Distancing, denial and positive self-presentation	93
5.3.8.3. Social identity and abjection	96
6. Integration and Conclusion	99
7. Reference List	107

8. Appendices		113
Appendix 1:	Letter Requesting Permission from the School for Part One of the Research	113
Appendix 2:	Letter Requesting Permission from the School for Part Two of the Research	114
Appendix 3:	Information sheet for parent/guardian of potential participant	115
Appendix 4:	Information sheet for potential participants	117
Appendix 5:	Consent form to participate	118
Appendix 6:	Consent form to record	119
Appendix 7:	Assent form to participate	120
Appendix 8:	Assent form to record	121
Appendix 9:	Researchers descriptions of patterns of integration and segregation observed in phase one of the research	122
Appendix 10:	Semi-Structured Focus Group Schedule	129
Appendix 11:	Confidentiality agreement for focus group participants	131
Appendix 12:	Photographs used in the focus group discussion	132

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In the context of South Africa's socio-political history of forced segregation and discrimination on the basis of 'race', and more recent political changes, exploring and attempting to understand patterns of interaction and contact are vital to understanding social change in post-apartheid South Africa. The laws and structures enforcing segregation fell with the demise of apartheid and evidence of some social change can be seen in the way a range of institutional and recreational spaces are visibly shared by people of all different racial groups. However, South Africa remains an unequal society that is still largely spatially segregated on the basis of 'race' in terms of the distribution of housing and the structuring of communities (Foster, 2005). On a social and micro level too, segregation in South Africa seems to be thriving in a number of unofficial forms in social spaces (Dixon & Durrheim, 2003). Unofficial segregation is the "informal" pattern of self-segregation observed in desegregated societies (Dixon & Durrheim, 2003; Dixon, Tredoux & Clack, 2005).

At the outset this research sought to explore whether, on a micro-level, unofficial segregation on the basis of 'race' persists among post-apartheid adolescents, who have spent most of their formative years in a desegregated society. It is postulated that the patterns of social interactions explored in this study and the meanings attached to them, may be a useful indicator of real or imagined social change in terms of racial integration in post-apartheid South Africa. Dixon, Tredoux and Clack (2005) suggest that researchers have overlooked segregation as a changing, subtle and multi-faceted index of social change. Much of the previous observational research on spatial practices in South Africa has been essentially descriptive (Foster, 2005; Marx & Feltham-King, 2006). This study sought to go beyond description by investigating and analysing how the peers of those involved in these spatial practices observe, understand and make sense of these social practices, in their everyday lived realities. Foster (2005) identifies the need for research of a qualitative nature that looks at "spaces of interactions in schools and the meaning of cross racial encounters" (p. 500). An exploration of patterns of integration

and segregation and the meanings that adolescents attach to these patterns could form the basis for an understanding and explanation of why unofficial and “informal” self-segregation remains a part of South African society.

The aim of this research was consequently two-fold. Firstly, the researcher set out to observe and hypothesise about patterns of social integration and segregation, primarily on the basis of ‘race’, occurring among post-apartheid adolescents in a social space at an educational institution. In the first part of the research the researcher aimed to investigate if, as found in past research (for example Dixon & Durrheim, 2003), patterns of racialised self-segregation persisted among a ‘new’ generation of South Africans, despite the racial desegregation of institutions and social spaces. The second aim of this research was to explore how adolescents, like those who engaged in the social patterns observed, understood and made sense of these patterns that they too often engaged in on a day-to-day basis. The researcher aimed to analyse and deconstruct the meanings of these patterns provided by the adolescents with the hope of gaining some insight into why these patterns occur. This research report outlines how these aims were met, with a consideration of the historical and empirical context, and the findings and conclusions reached.

In order to provide a historical, theoretical and empirical context for this study, the report starts with a brief literature review in Chapter two. This chapter firstly looks at the history of segregation and desegregation, primarily in the South African context and specifically within the educational system. Past relevant research, both local and international, is then critically reviewed with some discussion on theoretical models drawn on by other researchers. Chapter three provides an outline of the methods used to collect and analyse the research data. A rationale for the choice of methods used is provided in the context of some of the limitations of past research. A discussion of some potential ethical issues as well as reflexivity is also covered in Chapter three. The following chapter goes on to describe the findings of the first phase of the research, which involved naturalistic observation of patterns of integration and segregation. The patterns observed by the researcher are highlighted and some basic hypotheses regarding

these patterns are offered. The findings of the second phase of the research, which involved a focus group discussion, is then discussed and analysed in Chapter five. Firstly, the patterns of integration and segregation observed by the focus group participants are outlined, and how they confirm or differ from the patterns observed by the researcher is briefly discussed. Secondly, Chapter five is primarily made up of a discussion and analysis of the explanations and meanings given by the focus group participants to the dominant social patterns they observed and experience. Lastly, an integration of the findings is then provided in Chapter six. Chapter six also includes a discussion of some of the limitations and challenges of this research and some suggestions for future research are made.

While this research report is hopefully clear and comprehensive, it is important to note that it is by no means exhaustive. Much could be added and a multitude of different interpretations could be provided. While the findings outlined may overlap with some of the findings in past research, some new insights and explanations have been offered in this report. The primary contribution of this research lies in the fact that it has gone beyond description and attempts are made to explore meaning, not only from the perspective of the researcher, but also from the perspective of the adolescents involved in the spatial practices identified and examined. This research report, with all its contradictions and issues of personal reflexivity, highlight the lived dilemmas experienced by researchers, research participants and all South Africans attempting to make sense of the highly complex social practices they engage in or observe on a daily basis.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction

A range of social psychological research has been done on racial segregation, desegregation and integration. Most research in this area has been primarily descriptive, and while a range of theoretical frameworks have been used to explain patterns of racial segregation and integration, very little research has explored the meanings of these patterns for the individuals among whom they occur. This review examines literature on 'race', racism, segregation, desegregation, contact and racialised discourses in an attempt to situate this study within a broader historical, theoretical and empirical framework.

2.2. 'Race', racism and racialised discourses

Central to this study is the concept of 'race', a contested and socially constructed concept that has and will continue to change over time. While there are various understandings of 'race' (Wetherell, 1996), in an attempt to acknowledge the complex and dynamic nature of the concept and its history, this study will depart from the view of 'race' as "a social rather than a natural phenomenon, a process which gives significance to superficial physical differences, but where the construction of group divisions depends on... economic, political and cultural processes" (Wetherell, 1996, p.184). Marx and Feltham-King (2006) explain that much of the recent South African research on segregation fails to include a discussion on the concept of 'race', which is central to the study of segregation in South Africa. A reflexive approach to the concept of 'race' throughout this research is necessary due to the "reifying potential of all forms of research practice that involve the concept of 'race'" (Dixon & Tredoux, 2006, p.461).

Richards (1997) highlights the complexity and paradox of research on 'race', which involves a constant battle to integrate the importance and value of both denying and affirming differences. While research on 'race' necessitates the use of 'race' related language, this form of language is constantly changing and in many ways reflect and perpetuate racialised discourses. One of the biggest challenges of this research report has

been choosing the ‘right’ words to use. While a constant effort has been made to use terms that are not denigratory and are generally accepted in current literature and by colleagues and society at large at this particular point in history, it is acknowledged that the nature of this research means that the racialised discourses that this research report seeks to question and transcend may at the same time be reproduced. This in itself reflects the highly contradictory nature of research on, as well as lived experiences of, ‘race’ and racism. In light of these contradictions it should be highlighted at the outset that while this research makes use of racial categories and racialised terms, these categories and terms are by no means well-defined or discrete, and the researcher does not advocate the use of these racial categories in everyday life. Constant reflexivity has been practiced to guard against biological validation and acceptance of the socially constructed concept of ‘race’ and it is hoped that this is reflected in this research report.

A number of concepts that are relevant to this research need to be discussed and defined at this point to provide a background of research and ongoing debates in studies of ‘race’. Key concepts such as racism, non-racism and anti-racism are all notions that in some way “defend, naturalise, reify, and rationalise or challenge, expose and upset existing relations of power” (Ansell, 2004, p.22). A critical discussion of these concepts is necessary to situate this research into broader theoretical debates and practical applications within the field of ‘race’ relations. It is vital to highlight that power relations are central to all issues of ‘race’, on both a theoretical and practical level, and that all of the concepts discussed below were in some way developed with a particular goal in mind and a specific interest at stake (Ansell, 2004).

Racism is an ideology that is constantly being reproduced and perpetuated to maintain relations of domination and oppression (Foster, 2005). Pillay and Collings (2004), in discussing the different forms racism can take, distinguish between two forms of racism. An older and ‘cruder’ form of racism, which they refer to as old-fashioned racism, involves a clear rejection of and hostility towards minority groups. More ‘modern’ forms of racism, which are thought to be more subtle, involve a rejection of minority groups and of the recent gains made by those groups that appear to be based less on mere dislike and

more on values and ideologies (Pillay & Collings, 2004). More ‘modern’ forms of racism are often couched in and concealed by academic or intellectual language, which often requires a more discursive study. And while there is little doubt that manifestations of racism have changed over time, it is arguable that these manifestations have always been based on some form of value or ideology and that the feelings of dislike are persistent in modern forms of racism.

In apartheid and pre- and post-apartheid South Africa the manifestations of and values underlying racism have, and continue to be, constantly redefined and restructured. According to Foster (2006) racism is an ideology “that enables people of one skin colour to dominate those of a different colour through varying forms” (p. 26). Segregation is just one form through which this domination occurs. A number of approaches and ideologies, which will now be briefly outlined, have been proposed and instituted in various settings in an attempt to combat racism as an ideology

Non-racialism was an integral goal of the anti-apartheid movement and while it is currently inscribed in the South African Constitution as an ideal, in practice it is a highly contested and ambiguous ideal (Ansell, 2004). Based on the belief that any notion of ‘race’ perpetuates racism, non-racialism argues for a rejection of notions of racial differences and an emphasis rather on the similarities between people. However, Ansell (2004) explains that it is argued that this ‘ideal’ ignores issues of power and very real inequality that has occurred on the basis of ‘race’. In this way “benign and race-neutral meanings” (p. 23) are mobilised to entrench and preserve unequal relations on the basis of ‘race’.

As opposed to non-racialism as an ideal, anti-racialism, which also rejects notions of racial difference, acknowledges that ‘race’ does affect our lives. Anti-racists argue for an acknowledgement of racial difference so that racist ideologies and practices can be challenged and confronted, and inequalities that occurred on the basis of ‘race’ can be redressed. In this way anti-racism emphasizes the power-dimension of racism and looks at how macro-level factors influence people’s lives. This research could consequently be

seen to be taking an anti-racist approach, in that power relations and racialised difference within and among people are acknowledged with the intention of exploring and challenging racist ideologies. According to Carrim (1998), a critical anti-racism requires an exploration of the way people experience their realities on a micro-level and a focus on identifying how racism adapts and changes over time and context.

To avoid the reification of 'race' and the perpetuation of racism as an ideology, a critical approach to the concept of 'race' is taken throughout this study in that knowledge production, differences, and racial diversity specifically, are understood as being linked to broader social issues of power and control (Swartz & Rohleder, 2008). A constant effort will be made to scrutinise the impact of power relations on the findings. Consideration of the socially and subjectively constructed nature of the concept of 'race', and the purpose of those constructed understandings for the people they serve, is acknowledged at the outset.

Calhoun (1995) explains that critical social theory "exists largely to facilitate a constructive engagement with the social world that starts from the presumption that existing arrangements –including currently affirmed identities and differences –do not exhaust the range of possibilities" (p. xiv). He also highlights the need for critical theorists to acknowledge how their view of the human condition is often shaped by Western intellectual tradition. While a critical approach is taken in this research report, to establish a critical engagement with the topic at hand, the researcher at the outset does not claim that the views taken are by any means universal. Indeed, they are most certainly influenced by the researcher's socialisation in the Western intellectual tradition.

Ideological thinking in this arena is almost inevitable, and complete objectivity can not be guaranteed. This, Noble (2000) argues, is not a problem of facts, but rather one of values. It is not possible to step back from society and comment on it completely objectively, as "we are inextricably part of it, permeated by it through our loyalties and prejudices, our livelihood and our sense of personal identity" (Noble, 2000, p.13). A well-known sociologist, Max Weber, distinguishes between methods of explanation that are value-

free and those that are value-relevant (Noble, 2000). This research is value-relevant in that the researcher's feelings and commitments make this study of personal value and importance. While this research cannot be value-free, constant reflexivity has been practiced to acknowledge the potential impact of these personal values, feelings and commitments on the findings of this study.

2.3. Historical context of racism, segregation and desegregation

The importance of understanding this study within the socio-political history of segregation in South Africa and against the background of the ideology that guided (or misguided) this history lies in a remark by Dixon and Durrheim (2003) in their study on "informal" segregation in which they claim, "it would be misguided to pretend that the past does not continue to define the present... within the less favourable contexts of post-apartheid society" (p. 20).

2.3.1. The history of segregation in South Africa

Dixon and Durrheim (2003) describe racial segregation as a "multifaceted phenomenon whose analysis extends beyond the disciplinary frontiers of social psychology, entailing the study of wider historical, economic, political, legal and institutional processes" (p.2). The importance of studying segregation within context is nowhere more obvious than in the context of South Africa's complex socio-political history; a history characterized by discrimination and forced segregation on the basis of 'race'. The ideological and political concept of segregation goes back to before the beginning of the twentieth century (Dubow, 1989). Segregation in South Africa, which began as an abstract social theory, was first officially described and discussed in the 1903-5 South African Native Affairs Commission (SANAC), which advocated a policy of 'territorial separation' and is thought to have laid the foundation for the later legitimization of racial division and labour repression (Dubow, 1989). Contrary to popular belief, the first theorists and advocates of segregationist ideas were English- rather than Afrikaans-speaking, and many were considered liberals.

Dubow (1989), in his book, *Racial Segregation and the Origins of Apartheid in South Africa, 1919-36*, explains how segregation was initially not just a disguised rationalization of 'white' domination but was viewed as a 'just' and 'pragmatic' policy to not only preserve 'white' supremacy but also to facilitate the development of Africans along 'separate lines'. Some theorists even advocated segregation to protect African society from the harshness of industrialism. On an ideological level, Dubow (1989) explains, liberal segregationists portrayed segregation as "a compromise between the polar opposites of 'identity' and 'assimilation' on the one hand, and 'repression' or 'subordination' on the other hand" (p.7). This "laid the ground for its emergence as a hegemonic ideology within white South Africa" (p.9), and the result was a flexible segregationist discourse. The flexibility and deliberate ambiguity of segregationist ideology was one of its greatest 'strengths', as it appealed to many different interests within the dominant classes.

During the 1920s and 1930s segregation developed further into a consensus ideology as fears began to emerge among 'whites' about the emergence of a politically-conscious African proletariat (Dubow, 1989). Just prior to this, the meaning of the word 'race', which had previously referred to the categorical differences between English- and Afrikaans-speakers in South Africa, began to be applied to relations between 'whites' and 'blacks'. Around this time, Smuts' Native Affairs Act of 1920 became the first step in the implementation of political segregation. In 1936, General Hertzog's Native Bills completed the nationwide division of land, which had first been proposed in the 1913 Land Act. Segregationist policies, by facilitating cheap labour and enforcing social discipline and control, became instrumental in establishing the social conditions for the development of capitalism in South Africa. Dubow (1989) argues that in this way segregation "had at least as much to do with the ideological legitimisation of white domination as with the requirements of capital accumulation" (p. 3).

While apartheid, which emerged as the form of government in 1948, was not merely an extension of segregation, on an ideological level racial segregation certainly laid the foundation for the development of apartheid. Dubow (1989) highlights the clear

differences between segregationist and apartheid discourses. He explains that while segregationist ideology acknowledged cultural relativism and was based on flexibility and ambiguity, apartheid rigidified cultural differences and was “unremitting in its zeal and logic” (p.178). It is the apartheid system that officially formalised and entrenched forced racial segregation in South Africa both physically and ideologically.

The development and justification of racial segregation during the apartheid era was based on the idea of a moral obligation to keep different ‘races’ separate in order to reduce conflict and keep the peace (Durrheim, 2005). However, this policy of ‘separate development’ ensured racial inequality, the restriction of social, political and economic rights, the violation of human rights, and high levels of ideological and physical control by the state (Kallaway, 2002). While formal segregation and apartheid could, and often are, viewed primarily in terms of the material division of social space, they also entail an ideological, symbolic and experiential dimension (Dixon et al., 2005). Foster (1991) explains that woven into the ideology of apartheid was the idea that segregation was the best way to avoid racial conflict. This was aimed at an extreme reduction of racial contact, which resulted in separation on multiple levels of interaction.

On a concrete and physical level “apartheid was a large-scale endeavour at spatial engineering... the total regulation of bodies and space at the micro-sphere of human interaction” (Foster, 2005, p.495). The physical dimensions of segregation could be seen in the form of segregated schooling, group areas, visible infrastructural barriers, and buffer zones to divide different racial areas (Dixon et al., 2005). Particularly relevant to this research is the segregation of education under apartheid. While the schooling of the ‘black’ majority in South Africa had always been separated from schooling of the ‘white’ minority, the Eiselen Report of 1951 and the Bantu Education Act of 1953 took education out of the hands of the mission churches and placed it under direct state control (Kallaway, 2002). Kallaway (2002) explains that the separateness of apartheid education, which was characterised by different curricula for different racial groups and extreme inequity in funding, has come to be seen as one of the most extreme cases of institutional educational injustice in the history of the twentieth century.

2.3.2. Desegregation in South Africa

Desegregation in the context of this study means bringing historically separated groups together (Carrim, 1998). Despite formal desegregation in South Africa and internationally, many of the physical dimensions of segregation are still visible in the spatial distribution and racial division of residential areas, schools and communities today. Research done in the USA has found that segregation remains pervasive, with Americans of different ‘races’ continuing “to live in different areas, attend different schools and circulate in different social networks” (cited in Dixon & Durrheim, 2003, p.2). Studies on federal programmes in the USA to reduce housing segregation have found that newly integrated neighbourhoods generally tend to eventually “resegregate” (Carr, 1998), emphasising the complexity of segregation.

Christopher (2005), in an article on the desegregation of South African towns and cities between 1996 and 2001, highlights how patterns of desegregation have been group and place-specific. He explains that in this way, the experiences of different groups and in different regions across the country have been vastly diverse. However, he points out that for the most part urban areas across South Africa continue to remain highly segregated (Christopher, 2005). Hook and Vrdoljak (2006) discuss how ‘gated communities’ in South Africa epitomise a new ‘separate development’ in which new forms of social and economic segregation have been created. Segregation in these settings is more along economic than racial lines. However, the way in which the apartheid system made resources and opportunities available on the basis of ‘race’ means that economic arrangements still largely mirror racial ones, resulting in privileged ‘white’ minority communities continuing to segregate from poor ‘black’ majority communities (Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006). Despite the formal desegregation of the education system in South Africa, due to the way in which apartheid resulted in economic inequality on the basis ‘race’, the same pattern is generally also seen in education. Expensive private schools are still dominated by ‘white’ learners while under-resourced government schools continue to be dominated by the ‘black’ majority.

In this way, while desegregation has happened theoretically in a variety of contexts in South Africa and globally, it is questionable whether this has resulted in actual desegregation in these contexts or any actual integration in terms of lived experiences. This part of the review will focus specifically on research on the desegregation of schools, the potential benefits of desegregation in these settings and the observed impact of this desegregation on the micro-level of interactions.

Support for the desegregation of schools has been provided by a number of studies that show the positive impact of racial integration and social contact on ‘race’ attitudes (Allport, 1954; Luiz & Krige, 1981, Russell, 1961, in Holtman, Louw, Tredoux & Carney, 2005; Prestwich, Kenworthy, Wilson & Kwan-Tat, 2008). Holtman, Louw, Tredoux and Carney (2005), in their study of prejudice and social contact in desegregated schools ten years after apartheid, found that higher levels of demographic integration within schools was directly related to positive ‘race’ attitudes. While this study was limited in that it relied heavily on quantitative self-report measures of both contact and attitudes, and in that it failed to explore the meanings of contact for the participants, it provides useful support for the desegregation of schools. Allport’s (1954) contact theory which argues that desegregation and increased contact improve racial attitudes will be elaborated on further in this research report.

In terms of formal desegregation in South Africa, Durrheim (2005) explains that this has generally occurred in the form of ‘black’ people moving into areas and spaces that were historically reserved for ‘white’ people. The desegregation of South African schools followed a similar pattern. From the late 1970s and early 1980s the ‘open-schools’ movement began inside the Catholic Church, influenced by Black Consciousness and against the wishes of the apartheid government (Soudien, 2007). However, while the church agreed to open some previously ‘white’ only schools, it did so for a limited number of ‘children of colour’ and it continued to “position white people as the bearers of preferred knowledge and black people, by contrast, as the embodiment of inferior understandings of the world” (Soudien, 2007, p.443). Highly relevant to this study,

Soudien (2007) argues that this kind of ‘knowing’ continues to influence the type of contact that takes place between ‘white’ and ‘black’ within the education system.

Later, more formal desegregation of the education system, started in the early 1990s and was specifically aimed at de-racialising, through restructuring and ultimately redefining the educational system (Carrim, 1998). However, this process did not happen evenly or ideally. Soudien (2007) discusses how this phase of integration took direction from multiculturalism, which was informed by conservative approaches, lacked sensitivity about South Africa’s racial history, and while hidden under language of tolerance was “essentially animated by old colonial-style narratives of white paternalism” (p. 446). Apart from the problematic assumptions and lack of contestation of ‘white’ dominance that characterised this desegregation, the unevenness of change across schools and areas is noticeable in South African schools today. While the official desegregation of schools theoretically increased the opportunity for racial integration and inter-group contact, in reality the desegregation of the system has not been uniform. Dawes and Finchilescu (2002) explain that “the trend has been for upward mobility towards schools and neighbourhoods with better resources” (p.151). Tihanyi (2007) points out how former ‘white’ schools have limited integration by raising fees and how only a relatively small group of schools are attended by more than one racial group. According to her, the majority of former ‘black’ schools in South Africa remain almost exclusively attended by ‘black’ learners.

Apart from economic factors, it could be argued that the way in which the apartheid system attached greater value and worth to all things ‘white’ impacted at a conscious or unconscious level the decision by previously disadvantaged racial groups to move into previously ‘white’-only areas and schools. Very few ‘white’ South Africans have moved into previously ‘black’-only areas or schools, regardless of the economic status of those areas or resources available to those schools. All this seems to have resulted in some desegregation of the previously ‘white’-only schools but little or no desegregation of the ‘black’ schools. Even at the formerly ‘white’ schools where desegregation has occurred, ‘black’ student populations remain the minority, and according to Dolby (2001) much of

the research on the desegregation of schooling in South Africa has been done at these schools. According to Soudien (2007) integration in education after democracy was characterised by ambivalence and a loss of political control by ‘white’ people. This has resulted in the cultural dominance of earlier periods having to find “new forms of expression and new justifications” (p. 450).

These patterns of desegregation of schools in South Africa point to a need to look at racial heterogeneity at the schools in which research is being conducted, particularly in terms of the potential impact of the racial minority and majority on patterns of integration and segregation. Moody (2001) explains that in terms of the distribution of ‘race’ within social settings, ‘race’ is most salient when diversity is in the middle ranges. This is attributed to the fact that increased heterogeneity results in the minority groups potentially threatening the majority. This attribution is based on research on the impact of ethnic threat and competition on ‘race’ relations and points to the potential pattern of higher friendship and social segregation in schools where heterogeneity is moderately high (Moody, 2001). He notes however that when heterogeneity levels are at their highest friendship segregation declines. Cowan (2005) in her study on inter-racial interactions on a university campus, also observed that inter-racial contact is higher in more heterogeneous environments. Soudien (2007) attributes patterns of segregation in South Africa to similar factors related to threat and competition. He explains how in South Africa due to historical power relations and the production of knowledge and assumptions in education, ‘black’ children attending previously ‘white’-only schools have been obliged to give up their cultural practices in favour of the ‘white’ dominant group. However when this white cultural dominance is perceived to be threatened or challenged in any way, such as by an increase in the number of ‘black’ learners or educators, what has been noticed is a withdrawal by ‘white’ parents (and parents of ‘colour’ who agree with their ‘white’ counterparts) of their children from those schools (Fiske & Ladd, 2004, cited in Soudien, 2007).

Empirically however, these findings linking heterogeneity and segregation patterns are not always consistent and Moody (2001) found that different patterns of integration and

segregation have been observed in schools that are very similarly heterogeneous. He discusses a number of potential explanations for these different patterns, which are in line with ideal circumstances suggested in the contact hypothesis, which will be elaborated on later in this report. School organisation, such as academic tracking and extra-curricula activities, are highlighted as some of the factors that potentially racially divide students or encourage integration. This is potentially significant to this research as it raises questions about whether greater desegregation increases or decreases actual integration and contact on a micro-level.

According to Dixon and Durrheim (2003), some research done on desegregated schools shows how “racial division may be reinstated through practices of micro-segregation that counteract institutional pressures towards integration” (p.3). Schofield (1986) reiterates this point by suggesting that racial segregation in informal settings, such as the playground, may undermine the benefits of racial integration that is being applied in the classroom (cited in Dixon et al., 2005). There is clearly a need to look at how desegregated spaces are being used in terms of racial interactions as these patterns of usage may be maintaining patterns of exclusion and racially-based power dynamics (Durrheim, 2005). It is also important to note that different contexts –the classroom, the school corridor, the sports field or the playground- “can yield complex and shifting alliances and points of tension” (Rattansi, 1992, p. 27), and that racialised discourses are always expressed in context. Goldberg (1998) argues for a consideration of context when looking at issues of ‘race’ due to the highly ‘parasitic’ nature of racism, which changes and adapts to the cultural and intellectual circumstances of the place and point in time. In terms of patterns of inter-racial contact, people respond differently, often contradictorily, in different contexts, due to a complex mix of factors (Richards, 1997). Factors such as the flexibility and contradictory nature of issues related to ‘race’, as well as individuals’ group position or experience in the racial ‘order’ in different contexts may contribute to decisions, conscious or unconscious to integrate or segregate.

The point made in much of the literature on the desegregation of schools (e.g. Carrim, 1998; Moody, 2001) is that desegregation does not necessarily result in integration.

While the process of desegregation, which involved allowing different 'race' groups into the same places and spaces, was aimed at changing society, according to Durrheim (2005) it is not enough to bring about transformation. As with the formal desegregation of public spaces in South Africa, the desegregation of educational institutions did not necessarily deracialise them, and Carrim (1998) suggests that this is because they failed to "address the complexities and specificities of 'race' and racism on the microlevel of the school, as experienced by people themselves" (p.318). Moody's (2001) study, discussed above, highlights the fact that while schools may be formally integrated, if students continue to interact primarily with students of their own 'race' their lived experience of school is that of racial division not integration. According to the Brown versus Board of Education (1954), an American Supreme Court ruling that formally ended racial segregation in schools across the United States of America, "a setting is integrated when race is not salient for social relations" (cited in Moody, 2001, p.682).

While the apartheid system of segregation was made visible in the form of group areas, infrastructural dividers, and segregated schooling and services, it appears that the less visible ideological component of segregation continues to impact on society. According to Christopher (2005) apartheid policies and laws forcing division and segregation have formed the basis for social relations and patterns of interaction in contemporary South African society (cited in Dixon & Durrheim, 2003), and the education system seems to be no exception to this.

Looking at patterns of social relations in terms of 'race', this study will consequently aim to provide insight into levels of actual racial integration or division that are occurring socially within a school setting, particularly in terms of lived experiences. There is no doubt that "the question of how race works in the school environment is an important one with issues surrounding race and schooling intersecting with other social relations" (Hammond Stroughton & Sivertson, 2005, p.278). The way in which social relations and discourses play themselves out in the spatial dimensions of actual interactions will be a focus of this study.

2.4. The psychology of ‘race’ and segregation

On a theoretical level, this study will not depart from a specific theory or understanding of contact and segregation, so as not to presuppose any discourses and potentially lead or limit the findings. However, a range of theoretical models will be drawn on and will serve to situate existing literature within a theoretical framework, as well as to highlight the fact that no one theory can adequately explain the complexity of the social interactions and meanings that will be observed and analysed in this study. According to Foster (2006) the problem of individual-social dualism, which is a “tendency to understand human actions either in terms of individual processes or in terms of societal or group-based ideological processes” (p. 25), is that it fails to capture the complex interaction of both individual and social factors in inter-group relations. Along a similar line Hook (2006a) argues for a consideration of both social and intra-psychic factors in order to attempt to understand the psychical density and affective depth of issues related to ‘race’ and racism. Social psychological theory and empirical research relevant to this study (e.g. Foster, 2006; Hook, 2006a) highlight the need to consider individual processes as well as social ideological processes that contribute to patterns and constructions of social interactions, and this review will consequently attempt to account for both individual and social factors that potentially impact on patterns of integration and segregation and on adolescents’ constructions of these patterns.

A range of studies reviewed in this chapter highlight intra-personal factors in explaining patterns of social interactions between racially diverse groups. While some draw on cognitive processes others draw on psychodynamic processes in explaining inter-group relations. An example of a cognitive approach is Tajfel’s (1981) well-known article *Cognitive aspects of prejudice*, in which he argues that the principles of cognition can provide insight into the psychological nature of prejudice. Through categorization, assimilation and coherence, Tajfel (1981) proposes that individuals construct and accept prejudgments and stereotypes in order to cognitively make sense of their world. He consequently “takes an aspect of human behaviour that appears to be inherently irrational but argues that this irrationality should be understood in terms of a psychological perspective that is based on the assumption of human rationality” (Billig, 2002, p. 175).

A study by Moody (2001) on patterns of friendship segregation within racially integrated American schools draws on another cognitive theory, namely Allport's (1954) theory of contact, which will be elaborated on further in this review. What is highlighted by these theories is the importance of cognition in the development of prejudice and consequent inter-group relations. There is consequently a need to look theoretically at adolescent cognitive development in terms of both its potential impact on patterns of interactions and on the meanings adolescents attach to these patterns.

Cognitively, as theoretically proposed by Piaget (in Cockcroft, 2002), adolescents are able to think abstractly, critically, and are able to make use of logical reasoning. Piaget's theory of cognitive development provides useful guidelines into the thinking abilities of adolescents. According to Piaget individuals twelve years and older are thought to be in the formal operational stage of cognitive development, in which metacognitive skills and second-order processes increase (Cockcroft, 2002). A limitation of Piaget's theory is that it pays very little attention to the social structures that inform adolescents' reality or how their interactions with others contribute to their cognitive development (Rogoff, 1990). Piaget's focus on the individual is thus "a limited version of social impact on the individual's cognitive development... it does not reach a collective perspective on the social context of cognitive development" (Rogoff, 1990, p.150).

A more contextual and constructivist theory of development is Robert Kegan's post-modern conceptions of development, which looks at the interaction of social forces and psychological capacities and their effect on the individuality of people. Based on his theory, the stage of cognitive development that the adolescent falls into is described in terms of a second-order of consciousness (Tinberg & Weisberger, 1998) and the adolescent is thought to be moving towards abstract, generalized, reflective, connotative, and insightful thinking (Young, 1997). From about ten years old, an individual begins to apply the principle of durable categories, which is characterised by the individual adopting a set of unique preferences and abilities that are enduring and are different to others (Tinberg & Weisberger, 1998). This stage is followed by the cross-categorical

knowing stage in which the individual develops an ability to be more *objective* about the world and not merely *subject* to an idea, emotion, or the external world. However, according to Kegan (1994, cited in Tinberg & Weisberger, 1998) an adolescent is cognitively still unable to objectify or take perspective on his beliefs and actions. This is important to consider when one analyses adolescents' understandings and opinions on their own social actions and beliefs about these actions.

Other internal factors that drive people to associate in the way they do include internal motivational sources and psychodynamic processes. Hook (2006b), in explaining Homi Bhabha's novel understanding of racial stereotypes, explains that a dissatisfaction with a purely cognitive approach to stereotyping led Bhabha to use psychoanalysis to theorise about the role of fantasy, anxiety and desire, and the "powerful unconscious investments at play in the use of stereotypes" (p.302). Psychodynamically, it is proposed that through the use of stereotypes and defences, such as substitution, displacement, disavowal and condensation, multiple axes of differences are incorporated into the 'other' and the racist achieves a greater sense of control and mastery over an anxiety-provoking environment of difference (Hook, 2006b). Through psychodynamic processes, such as disavowal, Straker (2004) argues that many people inadvertently enact racism through subtle acts while trying to avoid it. In terms of intra-personal psychodynamic factors, the way in which adolescents make use of and construct social spaces could be understood as a defensive means of alleviating anxiety around the world of castrating difference. The value of looking at internal factors that drive people to associate in the way they do is aptly summed up by Straker (2004), who explains that "it is only by owning that racism and exclusion is within, that we will be enabled to successfully combat it without" (p.29).

Based on psychodynamic understandings of development, another important aspect of adolescent development to consider is identity formation, which according to Erikson is both a psychological and social process. While identity *per se* will not be looked at in this study, it is important to note that adolescent identities are constructed relationally, and their social interactions and discourses are not only used to define themselves, but also strongly influence their behaviour (Hammond Stroughton & Sivertson, 2005). The

relevance of this to this particular study is that the patterns of interactions observed could be a reflection of how the adolescents are defining themselves and are likely to be influenced by their understanding and discourses around social interactions -the very discourses which this study aims to explore. Hook and Vrdoljak (2006), in discussing Dixon and Durrhein's (2000) notion of a 'grounds of identity', explain how space can be analysed as a discourse –“a discursive resource of identity” (p. 237) to understand how subjects position and locate themselves, and construct a sense of personal and social identity through the way in which they make sense of their connectivity to places and actions within these spaces. Dixon et al. (2005) explain that systems of micro-segregation observed in research on inter-racial contact and segregation contribute to how individuals experience relations with others, consequently “helping to constitute the meaning of our social identities and interactions” (p.406). This also suggests that patterns of segregation contribute to the development of social identities, which form an integral part of adolescent development.

In terms of the use of adolescents as participants in this study, Dawes and Finchilescu (2002) explain that there are very few studies of racial orientation (in terms of own-group and out-group preference) among South African adolescents, and almost no psychological research on how adolescents have adjusted to democracy in Africa. However, much of the research on inter-racial contact has been conducted with university students, many of whom are in late adolescence. Much of the research reviewed gives us insight into patterns of interactions among adolescents or young adults. However, very little research has been done on the meaning of inter-racial contact and segregation for this population group. Research by Dolby (2001) suggests that 'race' among South African youth is being renegotiated and rearticulated in a new context, and is constituted through everyday practices, the everyday practices which this study hopes to observe and explore.

2.5. Self-segregation

The above discussion has focused on broader aspects of segregation and desegregation, and has been useful in providing a socio-historical and theoretical context within which to

understand the micro-level patterns that will be looked at in this study. One of the major limitations of previous research on segregation is the focus on broad institutional patterns alone. Dixon et al. (2005) point out that, in the area of contact and desegregation, “the spatial dimensions of face-to-face relations between groups have been under-researched by social psychologists” (p. 406). Their review of a range of literature reveals the often illusory nature of contact and highlights the need for new methods of data collection and analysis that can capture the dynamic and transient nature of interactions and patterns of segregation, particularly within everyday life spaces. Carrim (1998) too argues for the need to consider the actual lived ways in which people experience their realities on the micro level, particularly to inform interventions aimed at deracializing educational institutions in South Africa. Dixon et al. (2005) refer to this as the micro-ecology of segregation, which is the spatial structure that establishes and perpetuates racial boundaries in situations where interaction is not only possible, but imminent.

Highly relevant to this study is the distinction between formal and “informal” segregation discussed in much of the literature on inter-group contact and segregation. As discussed above, formal and compulsory segregation was dictated in policies and enforced by law, and has been formally put to an end in most societies. “Informal” or New Segregation is the pattern of unofficial self-segregation being observed in desegregated societies (Dixon & Durrheim, 2003; Dixon et al., 2005). A number of recent South African studies on contact and segregation (e.g. Dixon & Durrheim, 2003; Tredoux, Dixon, Underwood, Nunez & Finchilescu, 2005) have found “informal” segregation to be pervasive in South African society.

Dixon and Durrheim (2003) in their observational study of inter-racial contact on a public beach in South Africa found that despite the absence of legal policies forcing segregation, people of different ‘races’ continue to informally segregate themselves on the basis of ‘race’, a phenomenon which they term “informal” segregation. They describe this pattern as part of a “systematic process through which racial divisions are being reproduced” (p.19). While this pattern of segregation is clearly unofficial, when one considers how rigid and in some way ‘thought out’ these patterns can be, the accuracy of the term

“informal” segregation becomes questionable. In this report this trend towards what Dixon and Durrheim (2003) refer to as “informal” segregation is re-termed social self-segregation.

Tredoux, Dixon, Underwood, Nunez and Finchilescu (2005), in their study of inter-group contact in a public space on a university campus in Cape Town, found similar results to that of Dixon and Durrheim (2003), in that while seating patterns were less segregated when the space was full, students generally tended to ‘self-segregate’ in terms of seating choice when the space was relatively empty. They found “different race groups preferring to occupy different areas within an accessible public space” (Tredoux et al., 2005, p.429). While the approach taken in this study is extremely novel it lacks a discussion or consideration of the very human aspect of social patterns of segregation. Racial categories too are portrayed as distinct and clear-cut, which seems to have been necessitated by their quantitative method. It is argued that while their method is complex they over-simplify the very complex social and psychological aspects of ‘race’ and social segregation. So while the study makes an extremely important contribution in terms of the method it proposes, the usefulness of the findings is limited to the mere observation that segregation persists. Very little attempt is made to account for this persistent pattern of segregation and the attempts they do make, as they rightly point out, lack supportive evidence.

In terms of a pattern of persistent social segregation, international research shows a similar pattern of ‘racial separateness’, despite society being more diverse than ever (Cowan, 2005). Clack, Dixon and Tredoux (2005), in their study of a multi-ethnic cafeteria on a university campus in the north-west of England, observed that ethnic segregation occurred at the level of interactional groups as well as in the form of broader patterns of racial grouping. Some American research has also revealed such extensive segregation that it has been termed ‘hyper-segregation’ (Massey & Denton, 1989, 1993, cited in Dixon et al., 2005).

In terms of the study of micro-segregation from a social constructionist perspective, Foster (2005) argues for a consideration of space, in terms of both the material and discursive aspects of its uses. The value of analysing space as a discourse is also discussed by Hook and Vrdoljak (2006), who explain that space, like language, “through its various constructions, characteristic meanings, and practices – is likewise a dimension of political activity amenable to deconstructive analyses” (p. 236). This will be discussed further in the following chapter, but supports the idea that the way in which adolescents make use of and construct their spaces of social interactions, whether in an integrated or segregated way, has the potential to reveal discourses and meaning around ‘race’.

2.6. Patterns of self-segregation or integration and meaning

Contact, according to Allport (1954), can be defined and measured in terms of three primary features: quantitative aspects, status aspects and social atmosphere. The problem with much of the contact literature is that the quantitative aspect of contact is too often the primary focus. Contact is consequently reduced to a quantitative figure or list of types of contact (Durrheim & Dixon, 2005a). Quantifying and objectifying contact is problematic because it neglects the contextual aspect of contact, the contested nature of its meaning, the reasons why contact often does not improve attitudes, and it overlooks how social constructions of contact and its meaning for participants are contributing to ideologies of ‘race’.

Contact may take on a wide range of meanings in everyday life and may be reflected in an array of social practices (Durrheim & Dixon, 2005a). It can be seen in terms of both physical and linguistic dimensions and can vary in terms of how superficial or meaningful it is. Contact as a phenomenon in the literature is not often directly observed and analysed (Dixon et al., 2005), often resulting in the neglect of its more qualitative dimensions. Durrheim and Dixon (2005a) observed that while groups may appear to be integrated within a shared space, this may be hiding the reality of very little actual cross-racial interactions. The value of studying contact in research on ‘race’ lies in findings, such as those by Holtman et al. (2005), that inter-racial contact may be a significant predictor of ‘race’ attitudes.

According to Allport's (1954) contact theory, three characteristics explain why inter-racial mixing and contact leads to friendship in some settings and conflict in others. These characteristics are the status equality of the individuals, their cooperative interdependence, and the overt support for inter-racial mixing from recognized authorities. Moody (2001) discusses these characteristics in terms of how they play themselves out in a school setting. He explains that if status is strongly correlated to 'race', stereotypes about group differences will be magnified and segregation is likely to be observed; if an inter-racial group is working towards a common goal (such as in the case of a sports team) it is more likely that inter-racial friendship and integration will be observed; and if teachers, coaches and administrators support inter-racial contact by integrating classes and activities social racial integration is more likely to occur (Moody, 2001).

This study will observe contact in terms of physical interactions or lack thereof, and will critically interpret these patterns of interactions to postulate their observed meanings. Tatum (1997, cited in Hammond Stroughton & Sivertson, 2005) suggests that missing from public discourse is a psychological understanding of cross-racial interactions. The meanings of the interactions and patterns of segregation will also be explored from the perspective of the participants. Durrheim and Dixon (2005a) state that "unless we recover how contact is evaluated from the perspective of the participants involved, we are not able to understand the nature and consequences of negative contact experiences" (p. 34). The expressed meanings of the patterns of interactions and segregation by participants in this study will be interpreted using primarily a thematic content analysis and will be looked at in terms of both the content expressed, and the language used to articulate it. Some discursive analysis will also be done with participants' focus group discussions to uncover and analyse in greater depth the more hidden ideologies behind the expressed meanings of inter-racial interactions and patterns of segregation. Potter and Wetherell (1987) explain that people use language to construct ideologies and versions of the world.

According to Lea (1996) a discursive paradigm has not been used often enough in research on 'race' in the South African context. Connolly (2001) also advocates a detailed qualitative analysis of the meaning of interactions for participants. While the studies and theories touched on in this review have hypothesized about the meaning of inter-racial contact, integration and segregation for individuals and specific groups, very few of these studies actually looked at the meaning for participants involved. While some of these potential meanings will be discussed here, as previously mentioned, this study will not depart from a specific theory or understanding of contact and segregation, so as not to presuppose any discourses, which could potentially lead or limit the findings.

The meaning of contact for different people can be expressed in "seemingly inconsequential variations in our 'proxemic' alignments to others" which reveal a lot about "highly complex relations of threat and security, distance and solidarity, respect and disdain, as well as culturally specific assumptions about what constitutes 'proper' spacing" (Dixon et al., 2005, p.406). A wide range of explanations for patterns of inter-racial contact and segregation have been cited in the literature. The concept of the invasion-succession sequence, also known as 'white flight', has been used in some of the contact literature to explain continued self-segregation (Dixon & Durrheim, 2003). This phenomenon can be explained as the moving out of 'white' people as 'black' people progressively enter an area. The cyclical process of invasion-succession reveals a lot about inter-group relations in that it discloses "a shared evaluation of meaning of racial proximity and interaction" (Dixon & Durrheim, 2003, p.4).

Fitzpatrick and Hwang (1992) suggest that large socio-economic differences between racial groups may suppress and discourage inter-racial contact (cited in Cowan, 2005). Large inequalities, which are highly evident in South African society, appear to "bedevil the opportunities for warm, open, equal encounters of face-to-face voluntary variety" (Foster, 2005, p.499). As discussed above, the way in which apartheid resulted in economic lines mirroring racial lines in South Africa, economic differences on the basis of 'race' is likely to be contributing further to self-segregation and a lack of integration.

Carrim (1998) discusses the way in which segregation is justified and given meaning through multiculturalism. He explains how adolescents in his study cite cultural differences as a reason for remaining racially self-segregated. These participants emphasize cultural differences between racial groups and ignore cultural differences within racialized groups, and in this way certain forms of multiculturalism play themselves out as reconstructed forms of racism in desegregated schools. Antiracists critique multiculturalism as an educational movement as it emphasises attitudes and prejudice but neglects institutionalized racist practices in schools (Rattansi, 1992). Rattansi (1992) explores the way in which multiculturalism holds a flawed and fixed view of prejudice and stereotypes, as it fails to acknowledge common forms of ambivalence around discourses of 'race', which are often expressed in the form of disavowals.

Finchilescu (2005) suggests that meta-stereotypes and anxieties may help explain the pervasive nature of racial segregation. Meta-stereotypes are the stereotypes that members of a group believe that another group holds about them. They often result in a range of unpleasant emotions and behaviours, such as intergroup anxiety when there is contact or expected contact with the out-group. Behaviourally this, along with ethnocentrism and prejudice, results in the avoidance of contact between members of different groups and continued self-segregation (Finchilescu, 2005). Another commonly cited explanation for self-segregation is the concept of homophily, which suggests that people prefer to interact and develop friendships with people who are similar to themselves on multiple dimensions (Finchilescu, 2005; Moody, 2001). While Finchilescu's (2005) study provides a number of useful explanations for continued segregation, no attempt is made to prove or explore her claims empirically, and very few suggestions are made as to how she feels future research could go about doing this.

In terms of explanations, Foster (2005) suggests what he refers to as a 'relational model' to explain the micro-ecology of contact and patterns of integration and segregation. In this model, he suggests that we move away from intra-personal explanations and towards a focus on relational patterns between people, groups, ideologies, spaces, time-sequences

and juxtaposed positions. By using this model of explanation, he suggests that we look at the way in which reality is constructed between people –not just through language, but by looking at the “materiality of bodies-space-time in interaction” (p. 502).

Theory aside, the need for qualitative research exploring the meaning of racial interactions and segregation for South Africans is vital if we are to understand and change patterns of interacting. Dixon and Durrheim (2003) identify the need to research the meanings of racial ecology in more depth. If we are to understand how and why pervasive self-segregation continues to characterise patterns of social relations in South Africa, fifteen years after the demise of formal segregation, we need to explore the meaning of these patterns for ordinary South Africans. It is vital to attempt to understand the meaning of ‘race’ in contemporary South Africa, “to hear the voices and their interpretations of lived experiences” (Foster, 2005, p.503). Only through an exploration of the everyday experiences of ordinary South Africans can we begin to explore the extraordinary opportunities for social change.

CHAPTER 3

METHODS

3.1. Introduction

This section of the report will look at the methods of data collection and analysis that were used to meet the aims of this study. The decision to make use of these specific methods was driven by some of the limitations of previous research and gaps discussed in the literature review and will be discussed further in this chapter. A critical discussion of some of the potential challenges these methods have posed has also been included.

3.2. Participants

Participants in this study were a group of adolescents between the ages of thirteen and eighteen years. The decision to recruit participants from this age group was based on a number of factors. Firstly, individuals in this age group have grown up and lived most of their formative years in a post-apartheid environment, allowing for an investigation of the meaning of 'race' and racial interactions in a supposedly racially integrated post-apartheid group. Secondly, compared with younger children, adolescents display a relatively advanced use of language, allowing for greater individual expression on the part of the participants and an analysis of linguistic variations in the construction of meaning on the part of the researcher. Thirdly, cognitively, as theoretically proposed by Piaget and as discussed in Chapter two, adolescents are also able to think abstractly, critically, and are able to make use of logical reasoning. When one considers that issues of 'race', social interactions and their constructed meanings are abstract concepts, discussions on these topics would require a certain level of both abstract and reflective thinking.

Participants were taken from two private desegregated, co-educational high schools in Gauteng, and the participants varied in terms of gender, 'race', ethnicity and (debatably) class. It was hoped that diversity along these lines would potentially impact on the meanings that adolescents attach to their social interactions and segregation and allow for a discussion of various possible explanations of racial segregation. This consequently

allowed for a more holistic understanding of interactions and “the way in which relations of power work together to arrange race, class and gender relations” (Spelman, 2001, cited in Marx & Feltham-King, 2006, p. 455). The diversity of participants also allowed for greater variations in individuals’ expressions and understanding of racial interactions and attitudes, as each participant had a myriad of factors impacting on their individually and socially constructed meaning systems.

3.3. Methods of Data Collection

This study is made up of two parts, each of which was done at a different school. The first part of the study was characterised by naturalistic observations and the second part of the research involved a focus group discussion. Both methods are qualitative in nature, as this research was aimed at exploring and discussing on a deeper level the quality of patterns of inter-racial social interactions and the implicit and explicit meaning of these interactions for adolescents. The decision to use qualitative methods was based on much of the literature discussed above that argues for the use of qualitative methods in studying ‘race’ and social interactions (Connolly, 2000; Durrheim & Dixon, 2004; Lea, 1996; Marx & Feltham-King, 2006). This will be elaborated further in relation to the specific methods of data collection used. The need to conduct two separate phases, and consequently two different methods of collection and analysis stem from the limitations of past research in this field and specifically from the work of Durrheim and Dixon (2005b) who explain that “we need to investigate the way in which ‘race relations’ are constructed both in language and in located bodily practices, emphasizing how people describe and account for the racialised features of social life that they participate in” (p. 459).

3.3.1. Naturalistic Observation

The first part of this study was aimed at exploring spaces of interaction and patterns of integration and segregation. Naturalistic observation was used to directly observe adolescents’ interactions in their natural environment in a ‘free’ space at school. While it is questionable whether the playground at a school could be considered a completely ‘natural’ space, due to formal and informal restrictions placed on learners in a school

environment, one could argue that the playground during free unsupervised time is the closest to a natural setting as possible within the school environment. Observations were made regarding patterns of integration and segregation, preferences in play and socialising, and specific incidences of physical and social contact, including the context and observed purpose of interactions. Some of the possible impacts of externally enforced restrictions on the learners' behaviour were also critically noted and discussed in the analysis. Naturalistic observation as a research method allowed for the collection of descriptive data and images and this formed the basis for discussions in which the described data was co-interpreted in the second phase of the study. One of the greatest advantages of naturalistic observation is that it allows the researcher to carefully study a group in their natural setting without intervening, and ideally, without the group knowing that they are being observed, so that the researcher influences the behaviour and flow of events as little as possible (Flick, 1998). The fact that the participants are unaware that they are being observed means that they are more natural and less likely to be 'performing' for the researcher, reducing the halo effect.

The problem with much of the past research on inter-racial contact is that it does not examine contact in the natural setting in which it occurs (Tredoux et al., 2005). This method of data collection allows for a very realistic reflection of actual patterns of interaction in a natural environment. However, there are ethical concerns of observing people without their knowledge or consent. In much of the previous observational research reviewed here (for example Dixon & Durrheim, 2003), the researchers have observed people in public spaces without their consent. To avoid losing the natural behaviour and patterns of interactions, consent for the observations was not requested from the adolescents but was rather requested from the principal of the school. This decision was based on the idea that if the observed participants become aware that they were being observed, they may have become less natural and adjusted their behaviour to please the observer. This is particularly problematic with adolescents, due to the development of adolescent 'egocentrism' (Elkind, 1967), and specifically the imaginary audience. This is the adolescents' belief that they are always the focus of attention, which is based on their cognitive state of self-consciousness and self-centredness.

Recent studies on inter-racial interactions that have made use of observational methods to study patterns of integration and segregation have made use of innovative techniques, such as aerial photography and mapping and coding exercises (Dixon & Durrheim, 2003; Tredoux et al., 2005) to capture spatial and temporal coordinates. A study by Cowan (2005) made use of naturalistic observation and coding to study inter-racial interactions at six Universities in California, and found that a limitation of this method was that it did not allow for an exploration of the depth and intimacy of the contact observed. Indeed, the primary limitation of previous observational research in this area is that it has been primarily descriptive and has not been used adequately to draw out explanations of the observed patterns (Marx & Feltham-King, 2006). The observed patterns of integration and segregation in this study were photographed, not for the purpose of preserving the exact observations, but rather for use by the researcher when analysing and interpreting the observed patterns and for use in the focus group discussions to elicit conversations, interpretations and explanations on the meaning of these patterns for the adolescents. A second observer was also used in this phase of the research to reduce the subjectivity of the observations made.

3.3.2. Focus Groups

The second part of this study was done through the use of a semi-structured focus group. Collins (2004) describes a focus group as a small group of people “that has a focused discussion on a particular issue in which all group members are encouraged to participate and openly share their feelings and ideas” (p.3-9). One focus group discussion of approximately ninety minutes was conducted for the purpose of this study. Only one focus group discussion was conducted as per the design of the study. The focus group discussion was conducted at a different school to the one where the observations were done in order to protect the identity of the observed learners as photos from the observations were used in discussions. To ensure confidentiality and anonymity, the faces in the photos were blurred to hide the identity of the observed participants.

While the naturalistic observation method was used to describe the spaces and patterns of interactions observed by the researcher, the focus group discussion allowed the researcher to go beyond description. This was done by reflecting a range of patterns observed to the participants of the focus groups and then allowing them to co-interpret the observations and to discuss how they made meaning of these and other patterns of integration and segregation. In this way this method elicited explanatory data.

The focus group was conducted by the researcher and a second fieldworker who played the role of observer. The second fieldworker was the same person who co-observed in phase one of the study. Focus groups have been found to be particularly useful in getting participants' interpretations of results (Flick, 1998). The focus group in this study was used to get the participants' interpretations of the data collected through naturalistic observations. The photos taken in the first phase of the study showing patterns of integration and segregation among adolescents were used to reflect the data collected to the participants and to stimulate discussion on their own practices of racial interactions as well as discussion on the meanings they attach to their own and others' patterns of interaction. The primary aim was to investigate the participants' understanding of patterns of integration and segregation and the meanings they attach to personal and external racial interactions -explicitly in the content they express and implicitly through the language they use. According to Carr (1998), understanding how people perceive segregation and integration is vital in understanding how best integration can be achieved. A focus group method elicited interview type data, which Tredoux et al. (2005) found in their observational study "may have served to enrich our understanding of contact and segregation processes" (p.430). Dixon and Durrheim (2003) also found that interview data added qualitative richness to their observational study.

One of the greatest strengths of focus groups is that they generate discussion and consequently "reveal both the meanings that people read into the discussion topic and how they negotiate those meanings" (Lunt & Livingstone, 1996, cited in Flick, 1998, p.124). Focus groups can also potentially provide in-depth data by using group interactions to generate diversity and difference (Flick, 1998), which often stimulates

debate, arguments and critical dialogue through the provision of a space in which the participants can share their individual ideas and thoughts, and at the same time stimulate discussion between participants (Welman & Kruger, 2001). Hammond Stroughton and Sivertson (2005) explain that focus groups allow participants to build upon each other's responses and to deepen discussion and understanding, which was found to occur in this study. They found that in their study it was an effective way of exploring how adolescents see themselves and the "discourses with which they position themselves and others in the social landscape" (Hammond Stroughton & Sivertson, 2005, p. 280), and recommend the use of focus groups for deconstructing adolescents' perceptions and experiences with regard to interpersonal relations. From a discourse analysis perspective, both the interviewer and interviewee are seen to be constructing their own versions of social reality in their use of language, which has been carefully noted in analysis. The interviewer is consequently seen as an active participant and not just a neutral observer in the process (Potter & Wetherell, 1992, cited in Lea, 1996). The focus group discussion was based on a semi-structured schedule, which allowed for flexibility and at the same time ensured that the data obtained was relevant to the research.

3.4. Procedure

The procedure followed for this research involved a number of consecutive steps. Considering that the institutions where the research was conducted were private schools, permission was obtained directly from the head of the school and not the Gauteng Department of Education. Letters requesting permission to conduct research at the schools was sent to the principals of both institutions (see Appendices 1 and 2). It is important to note at this point that taking participants from private schools, particularly faith-based schools, may have affected the findings in that many of these schools have been desegregated for far longer than most government schools and may hold values that encourage racial integration. Holtman et al. (2005), in reviewing past literature, explain that racially integrated schools in South Africa were mostly church-based, "with social policies that fostered racial tolerance" (p.475).

The first part of the study, which entails naturalistic observations, was done prior to conducting the focus group discussions. In terms of the demographics of the school at which the observations were done, the school was relatively small, with a total of roughly 100 students in the high school. Of these 100 students 57 percent were male and 43 percent were female. In terms of 'race', the students were classified according to the 'population group' categories provided by the Department of Education, which included 'black African', 'coloured', 'Indian', 'white' and 'other'. The students' population group, based on the instruction of the Department of Education, was determined by their families' own perception of their population groups and not the racial classification system used in the past. Thirty-two percent of the high school students were 'black African', nine percent were 'coloured', four percent were 'Indian', fifty-three percent were 'white', and two percent were classified as 'other'. The school can consequently be seen to be fairly integrated, with a moderately high heterogeneity in terms of 'race'. However 'white' students made up the majority and the percentage of different population groups represented at the school were by no means representative of the South African population.

A total of five observation sessions of twenty minutes each were carried out during the students' lunch break over five consecutive days. Observations were done by two observers simultaneously to manage the impact of personal subjectivity. The second observer had been trained in objectivity in her personal studies of media ethics and the ethical importance of objectivity in reporting. The second observer was also briefed on the specifics of this study and the importance of objectivity in data collection and analysis.

Photos of the space observed were taken periodically by both observers to capture the broad patterns of interactions and specific incidents of inter-racial interactions. Karlson (2002), in her study on apartheid school spaces, examined photographs of school settings and educational phenomena taken during the apartheid era, and suggests that the analysis of visual images may raise new questions about the type of conditions and incidents

occurring at a particular point in history. When compared to other photos from different points in time it may also point to the nature of changes occurring in society.

The data collected through observations in the form of notes and photographs was discussed between the observers to reduce the impact of subjectivity and bias, and to identify patterns and discrepancies. The patterns of interactions and segregation observed were then analysed and interpreted by the researcher. In this process, the researcher developed possible explanations for the patterns of integration and segregation observed. These explanations were guided by a range of theoretical understandings of inter-group relations. These explanations in isolation could be seen as problematic. Marx and Feltham-King (2006) critique a study by Schrieff, Tredoux, Dixon, and Finchilescu (2005), in which spatial identities and friendship patterns are hypothesised to explain observations, as the explanations “are clearly beyond what their methods permit” (p.456). However, the second part of this study, in which adolescents’ explanations were elicited, was used to enhance the hypothetical explanations, and in some cases support and in other cases refute them.

The second part of the research involved a focus group with a total of eight participants, which was conducted at the second racially integrated co-educational private school. Fifteen participants for the focus group discussion were selected, with assistance from the principal, from a class list, with an effort being made to sample for diversity in terms of ‘race’, gender and ethnicity. Information sheets and consent forms were then sent home to the parents of selected students (see Appendices 3, 5 and 6). More students than were required were selected at the beginning so that any adolescent who was not given parental consent to participate or who did not give his/her assent would not be included in the study. Information sheets and assent forms were also given to potential participants to read and sign (see Appendices 4, 7 and 8). A total of ten consent forms were returned, however only eight participants arrived on time to participate in the focus group discussion. Table 1 gives a breakdown of the demographic details of the eight focus group participants.

Participant	‘Race’*	Gender	Age	Grade
Participant 1	White	Male	Sixteen	Eleven
Participant 2	Black	Female	Sixteen	Eleven
Participant 3	White	Male	Sixteen	Eleven
Participant 4	White	Male	Sixteen	Eleven
Participant 5	White	Male	Sixteen	Eleven
Participant 6	White	Female	Sixteen	Eleven
Participant 7	Black	Male	Sixteen	Eleven
Participant 8	Black	Male	Seventeen	Eleven

Table 1: Focus Group participants (* As per apartheid classification system criteria)

The focus group discussion took place during school hours in a private and familiar room at the school and lasted approximately ninety minutes. Participants were requested to sign a confidentiality agreement prior to the start of the discussion (see Appendix 11). Participants were given a fifteen-minute break after forty minutes of discussion, and snacks and drinks were provided in this time, as the discussion occurred during tea time. It was also hoped that eating and drinking would increase the informality of the session. The focus group discussion was recorded using two tape recorders, and notes were taken simultaneously by the co-facilitator.

3.5. Methods of Data Analysis

As outlined above, there were two parts to the collection of data, namely the collection of observational data and then the collection of focus group data. The data collected was analysed broadly within the same analytical framework. The first phase of data analysis –that of the analysis of the observational data- was done before the focus groups were conducted. The two phases in the analysis of the data will now be discussed.

3.5.1. Phase One

The observational data was analysed and reported on descriptively in terms of the qualitative incidence of inter-racial interactions, the observed practice, purpose and meaningfulness of these interactions, how they unfolded, and the overall patterns of

integration or segregation observed. This is in line with Dixon and Durrheim's (2003) recommendations that attention is paid to different forms of "informal" segregation that are contributing to inter-group relations in everyday life, so that activities, practices and social organisations that are contributing to their reproduction can be exposed.

A qualitative interpretation, using Thompson's (1990) 'depth-hermeneutics' approach as an overarching theory, was used. The 'depth-hermeneutics' framework is made up of three levels of analyses. The first level is an analysis of the socio-historical context of discourse production, which requires the researcher to outline the macro- and micro-level socio-historical terrain in which the symbolic forms are situated. The second level involves an analysis of the social actor's interpretations of the context of discourse production. At this level, there "needs to be a specific analysis of the symbolic forms which... reflect the social actors' understanding of this terrain" (Stevens, 1998, p. 207). In this phase, the participants' actions and use of space was understood as the symbolic form. Positioning was consequently seen and interpreted as a discursive act. This is based on the idea that everyday actions and material arrangements, like language, are forms through which discourses are realised and power is exercised. The value of analysing how space is used on a micro level lies in Soja's (1989) concept of spatiality, which views space as socially constructed and entwined with socio-political relations of meaning, power and ideology (cited in Hook & Vrdoljak, 2006).

The third and final level of analysis requires the researcher to interpret and reinterpret the social actors' symbolic forms. It is important to note that in this process of data analysis the three levels are constantly interacting and influencing each other, resulting in the continuous interpretation and reinterpretation of the data (Stevens, 1998). This method allowed for the researcher to not only provide descriptions of the patterns of inter-racial interactions and level of integration and segregation within context, but also allowed for a deeper interpretation of how seemingly meaningful the interactions observed, how they came about, and how they contributed to the realisation of racial discourses and power relations.

Tredoux et al. (2005) explain that care should be taken to observe the way in which inter-group relations unfold as this quality of observational analysis can tell us something about the “active segregation of space that the cross-sectional observation of a space cannot” (p.416). A qualitative analysis of the observational data will also allow for a discussion of how interactions may support or mirror racialised discourses. Hook and Vrdoljak (2006) explain that in analysing space as a discourse, what is needed is “to ‘read’ arrangements of space, to study the ‘orderings of place’ to see how they may parallel or support popular discourses” (p. 253). The analysis of the observed use of space has allowed in the integration chapter for some hypothesis to be made on how space may be used to fulfil social functions, construct a sense of personal or social identity, and/or implement relations of power.

A number of studies on contact and segregation analysed observational data. Durrheim and Dixon (2005a) found that the analysis of patterns of contact revealed how “the meanings attributed to contact and desegregation find expression within the spatial and temporal organization of social relations in a given context” (p. 55).

This qualitative analysis of the data has sought to overcome some of the limitations cited in the literature of a quantitative analysis of observational data. For example, Cowan (2005) in his study of observed inter-racial interactions found that a major limitation of a quantitative analysis of observational data was that it did not allow for an analysis of “the level of acquaintanceship or intimacy between interactors” (p.61). Habermas (1978) distinguishes between instrumental action, which focuses on accomplishment in relation to objectified goals, and communicative action, which is focused on reflective understanding and the formation of social relations (cited in Calhoun, 1991). Another potential problem of quantifying inter-racial interactions is that it requires the subjective categorization of individuals into racial groups, which may contribute to the reproduction of the use of racial categories and the naturalization of ‘race’ (Dixon & Tredoux, 2006). While this use of racial categorisation has been unavoidable in this study, the qualitative approach has allowed for constant reflection on the challenges of subjective categorisation and the potential contribution to the naturalisation of ‘race’. A qualitative

description and analysis of the observed data has also allowed the researcher in this study to comment on the complex interactions of 'race' with other category systems such as gender, which according to Dixon and Tredoux (2006) are often concealed and marginalized in the quantitative analysis of observational data. Like Karlson's (2002) study of apartheid school spaces, the researcher has attempted to examine and describe how the way space is used consciously or unconsciously promotes or protests against racial self-segregation.

A limitation of this method of data analysis is that it is potentially very subjective and one can expect the interpretations to reflect, to some degree, the subjective views and background of the researcher. With this limitation in mind, some personal issues of reflexivity have been covered at the end of this chapter. These findings are also not generalizable and allow little in the form of application to large-scale interactions. As Calhoun (1991) points out, "understandings derived from the world of everyday, direct social interaction are likely to be increasingly distorting when applied to the world or large scale social integration and action" (p. 97).

3.5.2. Phase Two

The focus group discussion was also analysed using Thompson's (1990) 'depth-hermeneutics' approach as an overarching theory. However, a thematic content analysis was done to interpret the content of the discussion. Thompson's technique was used in this phase as it allowed for the study of the participants' socially constructed realities about social segregation, integration and 'race' generally, while allowing consideration of South Africa's complex socio-political history, and its impact on the participants 'realities' and experiences.

A thematic content analysis was used to interpret and reinterpret the data. This method of analysis focuses on the themes that emerged primarily in terms of the content expressed by participants. Inductive coding of the focus group transcript was done so as to avoid the findings being led by any previous theoretical models of integration and segregation. This particular approach was chosen due to the time and page constraints placed on this

particular report and in the hope of simplifying and exposing extremely complex and often hidden social phenomenon. Brown and Locke (2008) explain that thematic content analysis has re-emerged in part as “a political ambition to deliver straightforward answers to complex social psychological questions” (p. 382).

While the overall content will be the primary focus of the analysis, the language used by participants will at times be noted and critically analysed in terms of both overt and implicit meanings. In this way some statements may be discursively analysed from a discourse analysis perspective to add greater depth and richness to the analysis and to lend support to the themes highlighted. From a discourse analysis perspective, which is relatively frequently used in research on ‘race’, people are seen to be using language to construct ideologies and versions of the world (Lea, 1996). This method is therefore used to examine how the language people use to convey meaning reflect their ideologies and discourses, which are shaped by, and shape social conditions (Collins, 2004). From a post-modern perspective, “language obtains its meaning through its application in social and cultural practice” (Young, 1997, p. 35). It is hoped that this method of data analysis, while only intermittently used, has contributed to understanding the meanings that the adolescents attach to inter-racial interactions and patterns of integration and segregation, as discourses are systems of meaning that inform our understanding of our lived experiences (Collins, 2004).

The analysis of the focus group data, both in terms of content and discourses expressed, has been pertinent in this study’s attempt to go beyond description. Not only has this method allowed for a range of explanations regarding what cross-racial interactions mean for the participants and why they believe patterns of self-segregation prevail, but in many ways the use of elements of discourse analysis has allowed one to go beyond what the participants think and say to illustrate the concealed implications of their discourses (Collins, 2004). Hammond Stroughton and Sivertson (2005), in their study on racial identity formation in narratives of students, found that discourse analysis allowed them to look at the power of discourses in sustaining ideological positions. The authors explain that both social interactions and discourses that adolescents used to define and understand

themselves and others strongly influence behaviour. Durrheim and Dixon (2005a) also found this discursive approach to be useful in helping them explain the style and content of desegregation attitudes in terms of both their ideological and rhetorical functions. Lea (1996) explains that research on ‘race’ that makes use of discourse analysis is essential “if we are to tackle racism since it is through the taken-for-granted forms of explanation... used by ordinary people, that racism is sustained and perpetuated” (p.184).

3.6. Ethical Considerations

‘Race’ is still a sensitive topic in South Africa due to our history of institutionalised racist policies and practices, and therefore the topic needed to be approached with care. The focus group process could potentially have resulted in the participants thinking about ‘race’, racial interactions and segregation more than they did before. However, it is questionable whether or not this would necessarily be negative ethically. It was felt that the researcher’s counselling experience enhanced her ability to mediate the focus group discussions and manage any potentially sensitive issues or discussions that arose as well as their effects. The nature and rationale of the study was properly explained to the principals of the institutions and those giving consent for the adolescents’ participation. Written permission was obtained from the institutions and information sheets were sent with consent forms to the parents of potential participants (see Appendices 1-3 and 5-6). Information sheets and assent forms were also given to the potential participants themselves (see Appendices 4, 7 and 8). While each participant’s basic biographical information was recorded on the focus group transcript, participants’ names have not been used in this report to ensure anonymity.

Confidentiality was also assured to participants by guaranteeing that the researcher would not discuss the contents of the interviews (in the form of audiotapes and notes) with anyone, other than the research supervisor. All audiotapes, transcripts and notes have been kept in a locked cupboard in the researcher’s office and will be destroyed once the research report had been handed in and evaluated. Prior to commencement of the focus group discussion, the group was requested to keep the discussion confidential and all participants signed a confidentiality agreement (see Appendix 11). They were informed

of the limits to confidentiality in focus group research. Participants were also informed of their right not to participate in the research, their right not to respond to certain elements of the discussion, and their right to withdraw from the study at any point without any repercussions. Some participants passively chose not to engage with certain aspects of the discussion. As mentioned above assent forms and confidentiality agreements were signed by the participants themselves at the beginning of the focus group discussion when the focus group process was explained. Special care was taken to ensure focus group questions were asked sensitively and that none of the participants were made to feel interrogated or judged by the interviewer. No ethical problems or concerns arose from the focus group discussion and none of the participants chose to make use of the private individual debriefing time offered by the researcher to all participants after the discussion.

3.7. Issues of Reflexivity

Reflexivity refers to the idea that while language describes actions, events and situations, at the same time it also constructs these actions, events and situations (Lea, 1996). In research of a social constructionist nature, such as in this study, the researcher's descriptions and deconstructions are seen as constructions, in and of themselves. Personal reflexivity is therefore vital in the interpretation and reporting of the data. In this way, the findings of this study not only tell us something about the way in which the participants construct and make meaning of social interactions, but they are also a reflection of the researcher's constructions. The meanings elicited in the focus group discussions can consequently be seen as co-constructed by the facilitator and the participants, and on a larger scale as a product of social systems (Terre Blanche & Durrheim, 1999). It is therefore important to state at the outset that the findings of this study will "constitute but one interpretation of the [texts] and it may be anticipated that other researchers would reach different conclusions" (Lea, 1996, p.188). It is also vital that I, as the primary researcher, briefly discuss some of my own world views, understanding of 'race' and personal interest in the research, so as to openly acknowledge some factors that might affect my interpretations.

I grew up in a large extended catholic family where different, often opposing views, were taken and openly expressed by different family members. My parents were both of Anglo-Saxon descent and while my father came from a fairly conservative family, both my parents prided themselves on being liberals and though not political activists, they openly taught us the value of fighting for equality and human dignity, and the importance of respect for all people. I have always been extremely privileged and have had access to opportunities that the majority of people in South Africa have not. These privileges have certainly contributed to getting me to where I am academically and professionally. Growing up I was highly aware of the changes going on in South Africa, particularly at the catholic all-girls school I attended, which strove for diversity –culturally, racially and economically. My school environment was about striving for achievement, caring and giving to others, and equality for all –even when society fought against it. The religious nature stressed the importance of giving back to society, and instilled in me a strong desire to contribute to social change and in small ways to reducing human suffering. This, among other things influenced the development of my strong interest in human development, politics and social change.

I have always believed in the right to equal treatment and equal opportunities for all and support policies aimed at bringing about change and redressing the inequalities of our past. I have no doubt that my research interests are driven by all these beliefs but also, in part, by the strong sense of guilt I feel for having benefited both directly and indirectly from a system that was based on the exact opposite of my beliefs -a system that caused many of the social and psychological dilemmas that dominate South African society today. I cannot claim to hold no racist views or to ‘not see colour’. As so simply, but honestly put by Fisher (2007), “I believe that I am a racist because my entire life I have been groomed to become one” (p. 1). I grew up in a highly racialised society, but I believe that it is my constant awareness of ‘race’ that leads me to explore and question its value, or lack thereof, inter-personally and intra-psychically. I believe that we order and categorise people, racially and otherwise, to reduce our own anxieties and in an attempt to make sense of our highly complex social worlds. I also however believe in the inherently altruistic nature of people, their need for self-actualisation and the ability of all

people to change, and I have no doubt that this all influences my experience and interpretation of society, social interactions and the very discussions analysed in this research. I have a tendency to look for the good and to search for even small signs of social change. I am however, by no means an idealist, and no part of me wishes to deny the very ugly and pervasive nature of modern forms of racism that continue to dominate the ideologies of the vast majority of South Africans. I am both a product and a critic of my social system and the interpretations and analyses in this research report inevitably reflect just that.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS OF OBSERVATIONAL DATA

4.1. Introduction

As described in the previous chapter, the observational data was obtained through naturalistic observation of a 'free' space during learners' lunch break. These naturalistic observation sessions were twenty minutes each in length and occurred over five consecutive days. While the intention was to observe the same learners in only one space over the five days, due to the fact that many learners were writing exams not only did the learners vary slightly from day to day, but the space in which the teachers allocated for break time varied from day to day too. On two of the five days break occurred on the playground and the other three days learners were sent to the sports field for break to reduce the noise levels near the classrooms.

In both areas and on all five days relations were characterised by patterns of both racial integration and segregation. What was generally observed was a pattern of social self-segregation among the majority of learners, where social segregation on the basis of 'race' was relatively fixed and was in some way chosen –either consciously or unconsciously. 'Black', 'Indian' and 'coloured' learners seemed to integrate more frequently with each other than did 'white' learners with any other racial group. 'White' females were the most frequently self-segregated racial group. Consistent racial integration was observed among males of all 'races' when playing sports informally during the 'free' time and certain learners were consistently seen to be integrated. It seems that those who integrated on the basis of gender were also more likely to integrate racially. This chapter of the report encompasses an outline and analysis of the main patterns of integration and segregation that were observed among the learners through naturalistic observation.

4.2. The subjectivity of racial categories

At the outset, it is important to highlight some of the major challenges faced in the recording and reporting of the data collected through naturalistic observations. One of

the primary challenges that the researcher was faced with, was the difficulty of classifying people on the basis of 'race' through observation. As discussed in chapter two, racial categories are by no means clear and distinct and the researcher does not advocate the use of racial categories in everyday life. However, if we are to acknowledge and question the consequences of our history of unnecessary and arbitrary racial classification, and the resultant unequal relations of power, opportunities and resources based on 'race', it becomes necessary to make use of the very categories we seek to transcend. While this sounds simple enough, as we have seen throughout South Africa's history, there is nothing scientific or clear-cut about socially constructed racial categories. What makes someone 'black', or 'coloured', or 'Indian', or 'white'? Is it the colour of their skin, the texture of their hair, their culture, religion, or the language they speak? If we depart from the understanding of 'race' taken in this research, which views 'race' as "a social rather than a natural phenomenon, a process which gives significance to superficial physical differences, but where the construction of group divisions depends on... economic, political and cultural processes" (Wetherell, 1996, p.184), where do we even begin? In light of the limitations of naturalistic observation, one would have to attempt to identify different racial groups on the basis of superficial physical differences, such as skin colour. However, even attempts to over-simplify for the purpose of classification are far from simple. Some 'coloured' people are whiter than most 'whites' and some 'white' people are so dark-skinned they could easily be classified as 'Indian', 'coloured', or even 'black' (Fisher, 2007). The categories and indices used to categorise participants in this study are not those of the researcher, but rather those employed by the old apartheid regime.

The attempts to record the 'race' of learners observed in the observations only served to highlight and reinforce the complexity and arbitrary nature of the racial classification system discussed above. It was extremely difficult, sometimes impossible, to determine another person's 'race' on the basis of observation alone. It was particularly challenging to identify learners referred to in the government's racial classification system as 'coloured'. In an attempt to overcome this conundrum the opinion of the second observer was taken into consideration when attempting to classify observed learners whose 'race'

was unclear to the researcher. As discussed above, the apartheid classification system was drawn on. The challenge of categorisation did serve to highlight the almost random and highly unscientific nature of racial classification, and the resultant absurd racial stereotypes and patterns of racial segregation observed.

4.3. 'White' segregation and the integration of 'black', 'Indian' and 'coloured' learners

The clearest pattern of segregation seen in these observations was that socially, the majority of 'white' learners interacted exclusively with other 'white' learners. The strongest and most fixed pattern of segregation observed was among 'white' learners. This was particularly the case with 'white' females, who –apart from two or three learners over the five days- socialised only with other 'white' learners. This is in line with past findings by Schofield and Sagar (1977) who studied seating arrangements in a school dining hall and found that racial contact was infrequent, particularly among girls and older learners (cited in Clack et al., 2005). Clack et al. (2005) found similar results in that all-female groups in an ethnically-diverse university cafeteria were found to be half as likely as mixed-gender or all-male groups to engage in cross-ethnic interactions.

When the 'white' females observed in this study were occasionally seen interacting with learners of other racial groups these interactions were generally brief and appeared to be purpose-driven, or what Habermas (1978, cited in Calhoun, 1991) refers to as instrumental action, which focuses on accomplishing objectified goals. For example, a group of two or three 'white' female learners were occasionally seen briefly talking to and exchanging food with a small group of 'black' male learners. The lack of meaning or depth in the interactions observed raises questions about the nature of this contact in terms of actual integration, which will be elaborated on later in this chapter. In terms of the interaction of 'race' with gender, 'white' female learners on the whole seemed more likely to integrate on the basis of gender than on the basis of 'race'.

'Black', 'Indian' and 'coloured' learners on the other hand integrated socially with each other with apparent ease. In the context of our socio-political history this could be

understood in a number of ways. Under the apartheid system, 'black', 'Indian' and 'coloured' citizens were often grouped by the government and referred to in a derogatory way as 'non-whites'. Historically, during the struggle against apartheid 'black', 'Indian' and 'coloured' South Africans began to unite against the system and defy apartheid-assigned labels such as 'non-white'. Activists such as Steve Biko argued that 'white' should not necessarily be the standard against which everything gets evaluated. He argued that 'black', 'Indian' and 'coloured' South Africans should no longer accept the term 'non-white' and should embrace their identity as 'Black' South Africans (Fisher, 2007). While this served to unite groups that the apartheid government sought to purposefully splinter and divide, the challenge with this view is that it could be argued that by emphasising the distinction between 'black' and 'white', it served to deepen the racial divide.

In this way, this pattern could be viewed in one of two ways. In a positive way it potentially reflects increased integration between 'black', 'Indian' and 'coloured' adolescents. The finding stands in contradiction to views, like those held by Fisher (2007), that the majority of 'coloured' people feel more comfortable interacting with 'white' people than with 'black' people. But could this just be a reflection of the entrenched division or segregation between 'Non-Whites' and arguably 'Non-Blacks', as a legacy of this apartheid-created category of 'non-whites' or Biko's overarching category of 'black'? 'Black', 'Indian' and 'coloured' learners were consistently seen to be socially integrated with each other –across males and females. Whether this was a reflection of greater acceptance of racial integration among 'black', 'Indian' and 'coloured' learners, or a reflection of continued rejection of racial integration by 'white' learners is unclear. One could also hypothesize that this pattern was related to the fact that the 'black', 'Indian' and 'coloured' learners were all minority groups at the school and were in some way united by their minority status.

How adolescents, like the observed participants, make sense of and explain this pattern will be discussed and elaborated on in the following chapter. However, in summary of the observations in this regard, apart from the pattern of overall racial integration

observed among some learners, the general pattern of segregation that occurred was the division of ‘whites’ and the group historically referred to as ‘non-whites’.

This pattern also raises questions about the possible impact of racial heterogeneity on the patterns observed. ‘Indian’ and ‘coloured’ learners were clearly a minority in the social setting when compared to ‘black’ and ‘white’ learners, and one wonders what impact this may have had on the integration observed between ‘black’, ‘Indian’ and ‘coloured’ learners and the self-segregation of ‘white’ learners. According to Moody (2001) ‘race’ becomes most salient as the social setting becomes more diversified, as increased heterogeneity results in the minority groups potentially threatening the majority. This is based on research on the impact of ethnic threat and competition on ‘race’ relations and points to the potential pattern of higher friendship and social segregation in schools where heterogeneity is moderately high (Moody, 2001). The schools racial distribution, as shown in Table 2 below, could easily be seen as moderately heterogeneous in terms of ‘black’ and ‘white’ learners, but not very heterogeneous when one considers the small number of ‘Indian’ and ‘coloured’ learners at the school.

Grade	‘Black’		‘Coloured’		‘Indian’		‘White’		‘Other’		Total	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Eight	8	6	4	1	1	2	7	10	0	0	20	19
Nine	5	1	0	1	1	0	5	1	0	0	11	3
Ten	2	4	1	1	0	0	9	4	0	0	12	9
Eleven	1	2	0	0	0	0	5	4	0	0	6	6
Twelve	2	1	1	0	0	0	6	3	0	2	9	6
Sub-Total	18	14	6	3	2	2	32	22	0	2	58	43
TOTAL	32		9		4		54		2		101	

Table 2: Observation Phase- Number of Learners according to ‘race’, gender and grade

‘White’ learners at the school made up just over 53 per cent of the student population, ‘black’ learners made up just over 31 per cent, ‘coloured’ learners almost 9 per cent, and ‘Indian’ learners only 4 per cent of the student population. ‘White’ learners, as is common in almost all private schools in South Africa, still make up the majority. However, if ‘white’ learners were to completely ‘other’ all other racial groups and stereotypically group ‘black’, ‘Indian’ and ‘coloured’ learners together –as was often

done under the apartheid system, this group would make up almost 45 percent of the student population. If this constitutes a threat to the ‘white’ majority then Moody’s (2001) point highlights threat and competition as a possible explanation for the pattern of social segregation seen here.

As these findings are recorded and discussed, against the background of a reflexive approach, one cannot ignore the possibility that the researcher’s own prejudices or unconscious tendency to ‘other’ in a similar pattern to that enforced under apartheid may have influenced the observations or patterns that stood out. Did the researcher in an unconscious and involuntary way view ‘black’, ‘Indian’ and ‘coloured’ learners together and fail to dissect the divisions between these racial groups? How much of a role did the researcher’s own social cognitions play in the observations and interpretations of these patterns? One would hope that the photos (see Appendix 12) support the findings highlighted in this chapter, and that the co-interpretations made in the focus group discussions will lend this study a greater sense of objectivity, or in the least, some diversity of subjective views.

4.4. Macro-level patterns mirrored in micro-ecological processes

In terms of formal integration or racial heterogeneity, this school was moderately integrated (see Table 2). However, in terms of actual integration on the micro-level of social interactions, observations revealed both segregation and integration among different groups of learners. This seemed to mirror the way in which integration is occurring on a macro level in some areas and across some groups in South Africa, but not at all among the vast majority.

Interestingly, a group of three females (‘black’, ‘Indian’ and ‘coloured/black’ in appearance) were observed in the peripheral areas of both the playground and the field on four of the five days. This pattern could be understood as a reflection of the way in which apartheid forced ‘black’, ‘Indian’ and ‘coloured’ citizens and women in particular, into peripheral areas. Some of the images captured during observations (see Appendix 12) could be seen to mirror the use of peripheral spaces on a micro-level. However, this

pattern may also merely reflect habitual seating tendencies. Tredoux et al. (2005) observed that on a university campus certain regions in the space were consistently preferred by certain 'race' groups. However, this did not for them (or in this case) explain why this pattern occurs across racial lines every time. Why does this group of previously marginalized women, regardless of the change in space from one day to the next, continue to occupy space on the periphery?

The adoption of 'Western' or 'white' ways of knowing in much of South African society is highlighted in the colonial education practices seen in the education system in general, but specifically the private sector of education. The use of school uniforms is one such reflection of colonial education practices (that seem to be aimed at a form of order, control and uniformity) and European influence. They are a symbol of what Karlson (2002) refers to as "an exogenous material culture and spatial practices brought to Africa by the colonisers" (p.341). This raises interesting questions about the potential of these colonial education practices to influence and perpetuate the racial ideologies that accompanied them. Having observed the learners out of uniform on the last observation day it is important to note that no noticeable changes in patterns of integration and segregation were observed on this day and consequently the influence of uniforms on social patterns in terms of racial integration and segregation is questionable. However, it is duly noted that these practices have a lengthy and deep-rooted history, and are likely to permeate the whole school culture and ways of knowing. Not wearing uniform on one day is therefore highly unlikely to disturb or upset the existing school culture and relations of power, both of which, in some way, are likely to influence the patterns of integration and segregation observed among learners.

4.5. Sports: a racial integrator or just another form of illusory contact?

Racial integration was observed on all five days among male learners informally playing sports. Male learners of all 'races' were observed playing either cricket or rugby together in small groups, often of only four or five. Interestingly, this integration around sports occurred whether break was on the sports field or on the playground, and highlights the potential power of sports and team-activities in promoting racial integration. This finding

is in line with findings by Moody (2001) that “extra-curricula activities, such as clubs, sports and student service organizations... provide informal and often enjoyable mixing opportunities in settings of relative equality that foster friendship” (Moody, 2001, p. 686).

According to Allport’s contact theory, racial mixing in groups that are working towards a common and collective goal (such as sports teams or clubs) “should” promote interracial friendship (Moody, 2001). However, whether this integration around sports leads to actual interracial friendship off the sports field is questionable. The meaningfulness of this integration is also questionable, particularly when one considers the pattern observed as the break ended. What was generally observed was that when the break ended and the sports game was stopped, the learners playing sports left the groups racially segregated with the ‘white’ learners generally leaving the space together and the ‘black’, ‘Indian’ and ‘coloured’ learners interacting with each other as they left the space. Very little conversation occurred between the learners while playing sports and the interactions seemed to lack what Habermas (1978, cited in Calhoun, 1991) refers to as communicative action, which is focused on reflective understanding and the formation of social relations. Could these patterns of integration around sports just be another form of what Taylor and Moghaddam (1994) refer to as ‘illusory contact’ (cited in Dixon & Durrheim, 2003), which is when “the appearance of integration belies the reality of continued segregation” (Clack et al, 2005, p.4)?

This pattern of integration in one setting and segregation in another highlights the contextual specificity of contact, as illustrated in a well-known study by Minard (1952, cited in Dixon & Durrheim, 2003). Minard (1952) in a research on a mining community in the United States of America found that ‘white’ miners who integrated with ‘black’ miners underground would often be seen to be separating and walking ahead of ‘black’ colleagues when they surfaced from underground –in other words racial divisions were re-established above ground (cited in Dixon & Durrheim, 2003). This is very similar to the pattern observed among the male learners who engaged in sports on both the playground and sports field at the school. Male learners of all racial groups appeared completely integrated on the basis of ‘race’ while playing sports, but as soon as the break

ended the learners would re-segregate racially and leave the area in sub-groups with learners of their same racial group. Again, 'white' learners were seen to be leaving together where 'black', 'Indian' and 'coloured' learners would commonly leave in one or two sub-groups. This pattern of shifting alliances as the context changes highlights the contradictions inherent in 'race' relations. These contradictions in the way people integrate or segregate in different contexts, Rattansi (1992) argues, are related to group position and the individuals' experience in the racial order. It could be argued that when individuals of different racial groups work together in team sports it does not threaten the existing racial order in the same way social relations may, particularly when the competition unites rather than divides individuals.

4.6. The nature of the space and the potential for flexibility of interactions

One of the patterns noted in the observations was that those learners who chose to be seated for the break period generally sat in fixed groups and their seating patterns were relatively habitual. The members of these groups seemed to change very little within the break and from one day to the next. Interestingly, these fixed groups were the most racially segregated groups observed. A group of 'white' learners, made up of exclusively 'white' females on four of the five observation days, was the most obvious fixed group observed. The members of these groups seemed to have almost no interactions with learners from different racial groups, not even casual encounters or brief greetings seemed to be exchanged between them and learners from other racial groups. On the other hand, those learners who chose not to be seated during the break seemed to interact and integrate more freely. There was flexibility about these groups or individuals. To hypothesize about what drove the pattern of social segregation observed among the fixed groups would be beyond what this method of observation permits. However, through the focus groups conducted with adolescents, some possible explanations, derived from co-interpretations with the adolescents, have been discussed in the following chapter.

Despite the challenge of explaining fixed versus flexible social groups, what this pattern highlighted was that the nature and layout of the space within which 'free play' occurred seemed to subtly impact on the patterns of integration and segregation observed. Greater

integration was observed when learners were on the sports field than on the playground as there was far more open space on the sports field and a very limited amount of formal seating available. However, this pattern could also have been influenced by the fact that certain spaces on the playground were ‘hidden’ from the view of the observer and greater racial integration may have occurred in these spaces.

4.7. Meaningful interactions or casual encounters

One group observed seemed to completely contradict the overall pattern of social self-segregation seen between ‘white’ learners and ‘black’, ‘Indian’ and ‘coloured’ learners. This group was almost completely integrated on the basis of both ‘race’ and gender. The interactions between these group members were seen to be communicative and focused on the formation of meaningful social relations. The interactions between members of this group often lasted throughout the observation period and an intensity was noted in conversations between individual members within the group. This group was seen to be almost a perfect example of actual meaningful integration, and possible explanations for this pattern, which deviated from the norm, will be highlighted in chapter five.

Apart from this fully integrated group and the patterns of integration observed in learners engaging in sports activities, casual cross-racial interactions were most commonly observed between ‘black’ and ‘coloured’ males and ‘white’ females. The researcher would not classify these cross-racial interactions as integration, primarily due to the brevity of the interactions. The meaningfulness, or lack thereof, of this contact is in line with past observations by Amir (1969, cited in Dixon & Durrheim, 2003, p.337) that ideal inter-group contact, the kind that is seen to reduce prejudice, is in reality very rare, “and even when it occurs, it generally produces only casual interactions rather than intimate acquaintances”. This pattern of casual interactions raises questions about the real-life applicability of Allport’s (1954) contact theory in terms of finding natural settings in which ‘ideal’ contact actually ever occurs. It also highlights the need to look more realistically at the possible impacts and effects of casual cross-racial interactions. If ‘ideal’ cross-racial contact, the kind that has been proven in past research to reduce prejudice, is not happening in reality, then what are the effects of the type of contact that

is happening? Is it completely meaningless, or could even casual encounters be slowly chipping away at patterns of complete racial self-segregation? Past research by Prestwich et al. (2008) looked at implicit and explicit racial attitudes and their impact on the quality and quantity of contact between different racial groups. They found that greater contact quality was related to more positive explicit attitudes, which are evaluations that are consciously accessible, controllable and self-reported. On the other hand they found that greater contact quantity was associated with more positive implicit attitudes. Implicit attitudes, which they describe as automatically activated evaluations that occur effortlessly and without intention, are difficult to change and often reliably predict behaviour (e.g. Egloff & Schmuckle, 2002, cited in Prestwich et al., 2008). As postulated in Allport's (1954) theory they attributed this to the fact that contact, rich in either quantity or quality, worked to shift attitudes by increasing knowledge of the out-group, reducing negative stereotyping and especially by affectively reducing inter-group anxiety. What their research tells us is that in order to impact on racial attitudes, it is important to look at both the quantity and quality of contact.

4.8. Conclusion

Overall, relations observed in this phase of the study were characterised by both integration and segregation, but primarily racial segregation. The challenge has been to attempt to understand why some learners integrate freely and meaningfully, others integrate casually and only occasionally, and some learners continue to quite 'strictly' socially self-segregate on the basis of 'race'. It is hoped that the findings of the focus group discussion, outlined in the following chapter, will provide some potential explanations in terms of the way adolescents themselves make meaning of these social patterns.

CHAPTER 5

FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS OF FOCUS GROUP DATA

5.1. Introduction

This chapter includes a thematic analysis of the data obtained in the focus group conducted with a group of eight Grade eleven learners at a private co-educational high school. The focus group discussion lasted approximately ninety minutes and a semi-structured interview schedule was followed. As indicated, the discussion was based on the photos taken at a different school in the naturalistic observation phase of data collection. A range of photos were selected, some general and some more specific, to elicit the adolescents' analyses and descriptions of the patterns of interactions observed. In this way the focus group participants served as co-researchers in analysing the observational data, which was aimed at reducing bias by the researcher.

However, in light of some of the limitations highlighted in previous studies of this nature, this research aimed to go beyond description by stimulating discussion on the meaning the adolescents placed on the patterns reflected in the photos. In this way the focus group discussion was aimed at eliciting explanatory data for the patterns observed in the first phase of this research. It was hoped that the photos would also stimulate discussion on the adolescents' own racial interactions and the meanings they attached to their own and others' patterns of interacting. The primary aim of the focus group was therefore to investigate the participants' understanding of patterns of integration and segregation and the meanings they attach to personal and external racial interactions, explicitly in the content they express and implicitly through the language they use. The focus group data was analysed using a Thematic Content Analysis and the topics discussed will consequently be the primary focus of this chapter. This decision was made based on the page limits and constraints placed on this research report. However, some excerpts and statements have been discursively analysed under the themes to add greater qualitative depth and to add support to the themes discussed.

This chapter is divided into two sections. The first section covers the themes that relate specifically to the adolescents' analysis of the patterns of integration and segregation that they observed in the photos. Many of the patterns of interactions observed and noted by the researcher in the previous chapter were confirmed by the focus group participants. Specifically, the adolescents confirmed a pattern of social self-segregation predominantly on the basis of 'race', in the photo's, among their peers, and based on their social experiences in post-apartheid South Africa. A pattern of gender integration was noted to be more pertinent than racial integration and most participants felt that patterns of racial integration were more likely among groups engaging in sports or team activities than socially. The second section of this chapter covers themes related to the explanatory data elicited in the discussion. The themes discussed here are those highlighted by the participants in response to why they felt that certain patterns of self-segregation and integration occur socially, specifically among their peers at school. Some of the meanings the adolescents attributed to the dominant pattern of racial self-segregation, such as parental influences and homophily, were similar to those discussed in previous studies (e.g. Branch & Newcombe, 1986; McPherson, Smith-Lovin & Cook, 2001 cited in Finchilescu, 2005). However, some more contemporary explanations emerged, and some shifts in the way the adolescents spoke about 'race' and understood the patterns of racial segregation were noted. While their discourses at times reflected modern forms of racism, many of their justifications for patterns of segregation did not, for the most part, seem to be in defence of privilege or in support of inequality on the basis of 'race'. What their often contradictory descriptions and explanations highlighted was the complexity of the topic and their struggle to make sense of and portray their emerging views in the face of, often hidden, but very real ideological dilemmas.

5.2. Patterns of integration and segregation

5.2.1. The dominance of social self-segregation on the basis of 'race'

In the focus group discussion, the participants' comments on the photos confirmed the dominant patterns of social self-segregation on the basis of 'race' observed by the researcher and discussed in the previous chapter. In the most general photo shown of a

variety of learners socialising on a field during break, focus group participants almost immediately picked up a pattern of racial segregation, only a few seconds after noting a pattern of gender segregation. Participants seemed open to discussing 'race' without any initial prompting from the researcher and were at first not very guarded in their observations and comments. The following comments were made in response to what patterns of interactions they saw in the first few photo's shown:

Extract 1

"And they're grouped by race as well" ('Black' male, 17)

Extract 2

"That's definitely race" ('White' male, 16)

Their discussion also confirmed that they experienced similar patterns of social self segregation on the basis of 'race' at their school and among their peers socially. The general feeling was that groups were divided socially on the basis of 'race', in terms of what they referred to as a 'black' group and a 'white' group. When questioned about other learners, such as 'Indian' or 'coloured' learners, while some people felt that 'Indian' learners would socialise with the 'white' learners, the general consensus was that both 'Indian' and 'coloured' learners would primarily integrate with the 'black' group. This will be elaborated on further in another theme. The following comments however illustrate the participants' personal experience of a pattern of social segregation on the basis of 'race':

Extract 3

"Races stick together" ('White' male, 16)

Extract 4

"People will generally stick to their racial group" ('White' male, 16)

Extract 5

"Race is... separated" ('Black' female, 16)

Extract 6

"Well, ja... like I, I'm not normally around different groups" ('Black' male, 17)

Discursively, what is particularly interesting about the above extracts is that differences in language usage can be noted in the way that ‘white’ and ‘black’ learners comment on the pattern they observed. While both racial groups observed the same pattern of social segregation, the way they spoke of, and potentially experienced, this social pattern was different. As can be seen in extract 3 and 4, when the ‘white’ participants commented on the pattern of social segregation, they used words like *‘stick together’*, suggesting a need for racial groups to unite, as if under some sort of attack or threat. The ‘black’ participants on the other hand, as can be seen in extract 5 and 6, used words like *‘different’* and *‘separated’* when they spoke of the social segregation, as if they felt removed or dislocated from other racial groups. This discursive difference is a strong reflection of how more formal forms of segregation were historically and ideologically framed and presented fundamentally differently for different racial groups in South Africa. For ‘white’ South Africans apartheid and forced segregation was justified by and experienced as a need to stick together out of fear of the threat posed by the ‘black’ majority. For ‘black’ South Africans apartheid meant dislocation and the forced separation of racial and ethnic groups, as well as families. The ideologies behind the system were arguably presented and experienced very differently for different racial groups, and the way in which these adolescents speak of current patterns of segregation suggest that these ideologies have in some way stuck or at least continue to influence their experience of even social forms of segregation.

Apart from the socio-political history, it is difficult to hypothesise on why these discursive differences occur and the function that they may serve for the adolescents. The persistence of these discourses may merely be a reflection of the extremely pervasive nature of old racist ideologies entrenched by our past. However, one could also hypothesise that these discourses in some way give us insight into the way in which more contemporary racially-charged issues in South Africa are experienced differently for ‘black’ and ‘white’ South Africans but based on similar historical ideologies. For example, as will be discussed later in this chapter, some of the ‘white’ participants speak of the threat to ‘white’ people of Black Economic Empowerment (BEE) or racial

differences in political affiliations, again reflecting a feeling of being under siege, or politically requiring a continued need to '*stick together*'. It could also be hypothesised that these particular 'black' participants continue to experience a feeling of being separated or dislocated from other racial groups and within their own racial group. The resistance of two of the 'black' participants to categorise themselves and the way in which one of them spoke of enjoying '*white sports*' rather than '*what black people do more often*' reflects a possible feeling of difference and dislocation from other 'black' South Africans, which may be attributable to more modern experiences of separation, possibly along economic lines. But how are these ideologies 'passed down'?

Bourdieu's (1980, cited in Bonilla-Silva, Goar & Embrick, 2006) notion of habitus has been used in past research (e.g. Bonilla-Silva et al., 2006; Durlington, 2006) to provide insight into the nature of social practices. For Bourdieu, habitus refers to a set of socially acquired dispositions (thoughts, beliefs and behaviours) that cause a person to view the world in a particular way (Bonilla-Silva et al., 2006). These dispositions are thought to develop in response to certain structures (such as familial and educational structures) and external conditions. Habitus is determined not by individual character and morality, but rather "deep cultural conditioning that reproduces and legitimates social formations", and can help to "normalize and legitimate social closure" (Bonilla-Silva et al., 2006, p. 233). Bonilla-Silva (2003) emphasizes the racialized character of the notion of habitus and argues that a process of racialized socialization conditions and creates (particularly among 'whites') racial tastes, perceptions, feelings, emotions, and views on racial matters. This habitus of self-segregation is inevitably linked to South Africa's history, and could be used to explain how socialisation and the internalization of culture or social structures, through experience, results in certain social choices. Habitus could be seen to not only guide social choices in terms of patterns of self-segregation, but through daily practices and conversations, choices and their meanings are expressed and constantly remade and perpetuated. This idea contributes to an understanding of the persistence of self-segregation.

When questioned about their experience of social interactions among South Africans in general, most participants felt that the photos depicting clear racial segregation reflected the social experience of most South Africans. When asked to reflect on the patterns of integration and segregation that they observed outside of the school setting, participants again generally confirmed a pattern of social segregation on the basis of 'race'. Participants seemed to feel that there was an even more clear-cut pattern of segregation among South Africans in general, when compared to themselves or their peers. The following extracts serve as an example of this experience:

Extract 7

- Facilitator:** Which photo do you think depicts most people's experiences in South Africa? Not yours, but most people. Like when you go out and look around in public spaces –the zoo or a shopping centre– which photo do you think is most like that?
- White, f:** Photo one or these photo's (points to photo's on page two (segregation))
- Facilitator:** You think photo two
- Group:** Ja, ja.
- Facilitator:** Okay. So a lot of people are saying photo two, which depicts segregation?
- Group:** Ja
- Facilitator:** Do you think most people in South Africa continue to socially divide themselves on the basis of race?
- Group:** Ja (nods of agreement)

Extract 8

“Like if you go to Monte or something. Then you'll find people are segregated.”

(‘Black’ male, 17)

The focus group discussion consequently highlights the fact that these particular post-apartheid adolescents continue to experience a dominant pattern of social self-segregation on the basis of 'race', which was in line with observations made by the researcher in phase one of this research and in line with much of the recent research on inter-racial contact in South Africa and abroad (e.g. Clack et al., 2005; Dixon & Durrheim, 2003; Tredoux et al., 2005).

5.2.2. The unquestioned integration of ‘non-whites’ and some isolated incidents of racial integration

As observed in the naturalistic observations, participants confirmed that greater integration occurred between ‘black’, ‘Indian’ and ‘coloured’ learners than any of these racial groups with ‘white’ learners. The participants failed to question this pattern and spoke very generally of ‘black’ and ‘white’, which seemed to be in part due to the fact that ‘Indian’ and ‘coloured’ learners were both clearly a minority at the school, as can be seen in Table 3 below of the racial demographics of the learners at the school.

Grade	‘Black’		‘Coloured’		‘Indian’		‘White’		‘Other’		Total	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Eight	17	13	2	1	4	2	41	28	3	0	67	44
Nine	12	12	1	1	1	1	41	37	0	1	55	52
Ten	17	6	1	0	3	2	43	25	0	0	64	33
Eleven	17	7	1	1	0	1	37	25	0	0	55	34
Twelve	16	16	2	3	2	2	40	28	1	0	61	49
Sub-Total	79	54	7	6	10	8	202	143	4	1	302	212
TOTAL	133		13		18		345		5		514	

Table 3: Focus Group Phase- Number of Learners at the school according to ‘race’, gender and grade

The following extract and comment confirm the observation made by the researcher in phase one of this research, that among this particular social group racial integration is more likely to occur socially among ‘black’, ‘Indian’ and ‘coloured’ learners, what Carrim (1998) refers to as ‘intra-black’ desegregation.

Extract 9

- Facilitator:** Okay. And other than that group. Do you think... racially you say... well I suppose people are talking quite generally about white and black... what about the people who I suppose were historically categorized under different racial groups. What groups are those people in?
- White, m:** Well, we don’t have a lot of... It’s like mainly white and black
- White, f:** Ja
- Black, m:** But the coloured people tend to hang out with the black people
- Group:** Ja, ja

Extract 10

“If you look across the school, like S said, the trend seems to be that Indian and coloured people would generally hang out with black people” (‘White’ male, 16)

As the participants hint at, this pattern may be related to the fact that ‘black’, ‘Indian’ and ‘coloured’ learners are all still a minority at the school and consequently stick together. The fact that they are a minority at the school could be seen as a reflection of South Africa’s broader socio-political history, the history of the school, and of the general trends seen in the segregation and desegregation of the education system in South Africa, as discussed in the literature review. Based on past findings by Moody (2001), the fact that the school is only moderately heterogeneous is also likely to influence the pattern of friendship segregation between ‘black’ and ‘white’ learners, noted above. Moody (2001) found that diversity in the middle ranges was associated with increased friendship segregation. He did however find that this pattern could be influenced or mediated by the way that the school organises student cross-racial mixing, suggesting that school policies or practices may influence patterns of integration and segregation.

What was interesting in the discussion was that the participants did not question or even seem to notice the collaboration of ‘black’, ‘Indian’ and ‘coloured’ learners. If the researcher had not questioned them about it they would have failed to mention it all together. This could be attributed to a lack of cognitive maturity among the participants, it could indicate that they do not mentally categorise peers into the racial groups historically used, or it could just reflect an unquestioned acceptance of these patterns. Carrim (1998) too found in his research a consistent bipolarity between ‘whites’ and ‘blacks’ and a lack of consideration of what he refers to as ‘intra-black’ relations. He attributes this bipolarity, noted in this focus group, to contemporary South African educational reforms which were aimed at structural and systematic changes in the South African social order and consequently questions of ‘race’ were treated in a very generalised way. The way in which participants in this study bipolarise issues of ‘race’ into ‘black’ and ‘white’ may very well be a reflection of the way in which educational reform has been approached in South Africa.

In her article on schools in the ‘new’ South Africa, Reid (2002) highlights a comment made by a teacher, which is related to this particular pattern of ‘intra-black’ integration, and segregation from ‘white’ learners, and can be linked to the participants’ explanation or understanding of this pattern. She explains that being accepted socially by a ‘white’ person, who is still generally considered part of South Africa’s social elite, is seen as an achievement for ‘black’ students (Reid, 2002). This reference to groups made up of ‘white’ learners being slightly more elite or exclusive is referred to but reframed by the participants in this study when explaining their understanding of this pattern of integration between ‘black’, ‘Indian’ and ‘coloured’ learners but segregation from ‘white’ learners. This can be seen in the below extracts:

Extract 11

“I was going to say something about... like this might be generalising but, I think... from like experience, say for instance you come into the school new, and you like haven’t made friends or anything like that. I think that black people are a lot more approachable. They’re more open, more friendly. If you ever have to get into... the first group you’d probably get into would be with like black people, ‘cause they’re just more open. There’s something about white people, I don’t know, they just don’t seem as approachable.” (‘White’ female, 16)

Extract 12

White, m1: Ja, white people are intimidating.
Black, f: (laughs)
White, f: To be friends with them is a lot harder because they just don’t seem as accepting. That’s like one thing I really like about black people, they’re just so open and friendly to people... like you can just go and they’ll be your friend.
Facilitator: That’s interesting. Do people agree with that?
White, m2: You’ll find that mostly at our school, like a new person will come in you’ll see that...
White f: They’ll first be friends with all the black people

While reframed or understood by the participants as a positive reflection of ‘black’ people, these extracts still reflect racial stereotypes, South Africa’s old social order and an experience of unequal relations between ‘black’ and ‘white’ adolescents at the school. In extract 11 the participant seems to refer to a hierarchy with the ‘black’ group being on the lowest level of the social order when she says, *“If you ever have to get into... the first*

group you'd probably get into would be with like black people." While she frames this as being a positive reflection of a stereotyped personality of 'black' people, her use of language implies an experience of a racialised hierarchy and of the 'white' group being in some way more elite or exclusive, more difficult to gain membership into. Moody (2001) explains that if status is strongly related to 'race', stereotypes are often more magnified and one is likely to see patterns of racial segregation.

The use of stereotypes is commonly seen in racist beliefs and practices. Finchilescu (2005) in her study on how meta-stereotypes potentially hinder inter-racial contact explains the negative consequences of stereotyping in terms of "the feeling of being de-individualised, of having one's personal qualities and experiences dismissed, and being subsumed within a larger category" (p. 465). While the stereotype used by the participant in the above extract is not necessarily negative there is no doubt that her use of racial stereotyping in some way de-individualises her 'black' peers and reinforces beliefs about differences along racial lines, potentially perpetuating patterns of social self-segregation by normalizing and naturalising difference and consequent divisions on the basis of 'race'. Bhabha (1994 cited in Hook, 2006c) argues for a recognition of the stereotype as an ambivalent mode of knowledge and power, which is less about the recognition of images as positive or negative and more about the actual process of subjectification that is operationalised in the use of stereotypes.

On top of the failure to see or comment on racial integration among 'black', 'Indian' and 'coloured' learners, in general, participants found it difficult to think of racially integrated groups at all. They could think of one or two in their school, or isolated incidents of racial integration among some learners, as shown in the below comments.

Extract 13

"Although there is like a group of girls that are like... well there's a couple of black people and white people and coloured people that chill together" ('White' male, 16)

Extract 14

- Black, f:** There are a few people who are just like... (inaudible)
Facilitator: Who just?
Black, f: Ummm... who are just like friends with different groups.
Facilitator: So there are some people who are not just in one group but wander from group to group

This followed the pattern observed by the researcher in the naturalistic observations, of one or two groups that were socially integrated on the basis of both 'race' and gender. When this integrated group was shown to the participants in a photo, they seemed a little sceptical of the 'reality' of the interaction, as illustrated in the following comment:

Extract 15

"Well, it's likely that one of their friends... like these three people... one of their friends is friends with that group or... someone from that group. So they're just tagging along." ('Black' male, 17)

Again, what was confirmed by the focus group participants is that socially, integration across 'races' is still the exception and sometimes, even for this generation, hard to believe.

5.2.3. Gender integration

Another pattern noted by the participants in the focus group, which supported the observations made by the researcher, is a greater pattern of gender integration than racial integration socially. Participants felt that socially they were more likely to integrate on the basis of gender than on the basis of 'race'. The following extract and comment supports this pattern.

Extract 16

- Facilitator:** Hold on... so you're saying that there's big gender mixes in this photo?
White, m: No, like in our lives... in our school
White, f: Ja
White, m: The genders are mixed in our school

Extract 17

“We don’t have gender divide I don’t think” (‘White’ female, 16)

Past research done by Clack et al. (2005) on patterns of segregation in a multi-ethnic cafeteria found that gender integration was generally associated with greater racial integration in that all-female groups were half as likely as all-male groups and mixed-gender groups to engage in inter-racial interactions. The pattern of greater gender integration being related to greater racial integration was observed in phase one of this study in that groups that were integrated on the basis of gender were also more likely to be integrated on the basis of ‘race’. However what is reported by the focus group participants is that while they may integrate on the basis of gender, they still self-segregate racially. One might however ask whether increased gender integration may in the long-term result in greater racial integration.

Why participants felt these patterns occurred will be covered in the next section of this chapter, which highlights the dominant themes in response to how these post-apartheid adolescents made sense of the above-mentioned patterns of social integration and segregation that they noted.

5.3. Participants’ explanations for patterns of integration and segregation

5.3.1. Racialised interests and the rationalization of segregation

All participants spoke of how they felt that it was primarily interests that brought people together or kept them apart, consequently directly impacting on patterns of social interactions. Participants saw similar interests of a diverse range as one of the primary explanations for patterns of social segregation and integration. This is illustrated in the extracts below:

Extract 18

- Facilitator:** Okay... and why do you think that group is integrated?
White, f: They have similar interests all of them, whether they're white, black, coloured, whatever
White, m: They listen to the same music

Extract 19

- Facilitator:** Ja. And you say people are similar. Someone said looks...
Black, m: And the music they listen to
White, m: Ja.. that's a big one
White, m: You notice like Goths and (inaudible) (everyone laughs)... and then people who listen to hip hop and rap are together
Facilitator: So music can sometimes bring people together
Group: Ja, ja (nods)
Facilitator: And do you think racial groups listen to different music and that's what influences the social patterns
Group: Ja, ja (nods)

Extract 20

- White, m:** It tells you about their interests straight away. You can see... he's holding a rugby ball and they're more into their cellphones and chit chat...
Group: Ja (some agreement)
White, m: ... and social what's happening this week-end
Facilitator: So you think that in the photo's you can kind of see their interests... the things that are maybe bringing them together....
Group: Ja

As alluded to in extract 20, when commenting on a photo depicting clear racial segregation, most participants felt that different racial groups tended to have different interests, which perpetuated patterns of self-segregation on the basis of 'race'. Participants focused specifically on music interests and sports, which they felt were perceived to be different for 'blacks' and 'whites'. Hammond Stoughton and Sivertson (2005) also found that music was often used as a "racial signifier and a symbol of cultural disparity" (p. 289). A number of participants in Buttney's (1999) study also highlighted differences in music interests, which he refers to as an "identifiable popular culture difference" (p. 257) as something that made it more difficult to racially integrate socially. The extracts below by focus group participants in this study illustrate what can be seen as the racialisation of interests.

Extract 21

- Black, m:** Well, I don't know, sometimes they divide people. Because people have this perception that some interests should be...
- White, m:** Ja, white or...
- Black, m:** ... there're white interest and there're black interests. So...
- White, f:** Ja

Extract 22

"Also, how they always talk about like cricket being a white sport or soccer being a black sport... or whatever that is." ('White' male, 16)

According to Foster (1993 cited in Hook, 2006a) racialisation is both a psychological and social process of meaning-making in which social significance is given to human features, providing a basis for social categorisation. While on the surface these explanations come across as harmless, critically one needs to question whether these explanations are merely defensive rationalisations for the continued choice to self-segregate on the basis of 'race', rationalisations which in some way generate meaning for the participants and justify racialised and even racist practices. Durlington (2006), in his study on gated communities, argues that local meaning is generated when rationalisations are asserted by individuals in their daily practices and conversations.

What one needs to ask is what function do these rationalisations serve for the participants? Psychologically, rationalisation is when reasonable explanations are given in an attempt to justify attitudes, beliefs or behaviour that may otherwise be unacceptable (Sadock & Sadock, 2003). In the case of these participants it appears that by explaining their decision to self-segregate on the basis of differences in interests rather than overt racial differences they avoid coming across as racist, which is clearly deemed unacceptable in post-apartheid South Africa. The problem with this shift from justifications based on 'race' to justifications based on racialised interests is that it merely serves to hide or camouflage the racist ideologies behind them and perpetuates racial stereotyping by portraying 'black' people as having certain stereotypical interests and 'white' people as having different stereotyped interests. While these differences are not perceived negatively, as Carrim (1998) argues is the case with bad forms of

multiculturalism, differences between racial groups are highlighted while individual differences in interests within racialised groups are underemphasized or ignored. Surely not all the 'white' girls in a certain social groups like exactly the same music or play the same sports. Differences are selectively seen and highlighted to support and justify the participants' current views and practice of social self-segregation on the basis of 'race', even though there seems to be a part of them that knows racial segregation is socially unacceptable.

The racialisation of interests could be seen to stem from racial stereotyping in society, which as discussed above has the potential to perpetuate racist beliefs and practices. What was interesting about these participants is that they seemed to agree with some of the stereotyped interests, particularly music, but some resisted the opinion that certain interests should be seen as exclusively 'white' or 'black', particularly in reference to sports. This agreement or disagreement with the racialisation of interests depended on whether it served the participants' interests or not. They generally accepted that music interests were different for different racial groups, and used this to justify patterns of segregation. However, if they wanted to engage in sports that were not stereotypically seen as sports that their 'race' group engaged in then they resisted the racialisation of these sports. A few of the participants spoke about how they engaged in a sport that was not stereotypically seen as an interest that someone of their 'race' engaged in, indicating some resistance to this racial stereotyping.

5.3.2. Segregation as natural and socially acceptable

Similar to the rationalization of segregation through the racialisation of interests, is the naturalisation or normalisation of segregation as a means of explaining or justifying its occurrence. This theme of racial segregation being normal and natural, as shown in the following extracts, was a recurrent theme in explanations for the dominant pattern of social segregation.

Extract 23

Facilitator: And do you think they've chosen to sit like this?
Group: Ja
White, m: I think it's just...
White, m: ...normal
White, m: ...it just naturally happens. At break you just know where to go

Extract 24

"I think that it's just like a natural thing" ('Black' female, 16)

Extract 25

"As in... like the white people will be on the black people's side and the black people will be on the white people's side... if there's a fight. It's very strange."
('White' female, 16)

Extract 25 relates to the theme of the naturalisation of segregation in that it highlights one of the participants' feelings that it was in some way unnatural or 'strange' to defend people from another racial group over people from one's own racial group. The naturalisation of segregation, which Bonilla-Silva (2003) understands as a rationalisation for racial and racist phenomena, was also found in interview accounts in research by Dixon and Durrheim (2003). In their interviews with beach-goers who engaged in similar practices of social self-segregation they found that the durability of segregation was read by participants as confirming the 'natural' tendency towards racial separation, which "thereby reproduces and legitimates –an ideology for defining 'our' relationship with 'them'" (p. 20). The above extracts definitely highlight participants' views that there is a certain naturalness to racial segregation. However, it is questionable whether the participants in this study –who engaged in little or no noticeable "othering"- used the patterns of segregation that they engaged in to understand their relationships with colleagues of a different 'race'. In contrast, participants in this study seemed to define their relationships with colleagues of a different 'race' in terms of the little integration and inter-racial interactions that did occur between them rather than the social segregation that dominated their experiences. They seemed to prefer to define and understand their relationships more in terms of the things that brought them together and gave them the opportunity to integrate, than in terms of the things that influenced them to socially self-segregate.

Also, seating patterns were spoken about as natural in that they were relatively fixed and habitual, again highlighting the durability of segregation. The extracts below illustrate this point.

Extract 26

- Facilitator:** And do you think it's the same at your school, in your experience?
Group: Ja
White, m: Ja, mostly
Black, m: Everyone always sits in the same place
White, m: Ahhh, always
Black, f: (laughs)
Facilitator: So where they sit even is the same... and who they sit with... is the same?
Group: Ja, mostly (agreement)
White, m: Well, the white boys usually just go off and play rugby or something
Black, f: (laughs)
White, m: Ja, 'cause they're always on the field
White, m: But that's exactly it.
White, m: But everyone's at the same place at like break and after school as well

Extract 27

"Ja, like if you were outside of school and put them somewhere, they'd all still go back." ('White' female, 16)

The habitual nature of seating patterns was also found by Tredoux et al. (2005) on a university campus. They noted a preference for certain spaces by certain 'race' groups across different days, with patterns being replicated over different days by different students. This pattern they attributed to existing states of segregation and integration in the space, which will be elaborated on further under the theme of school influences.

5.3.3. Homophily and the desire to 'fit in'

The concept of homophily suggests that people prefer to interact and develop friendships with people who are similar to themselves on multiple dimensions (Finchilescu, 2005; Moody, 2001). Homophily was frequently cited by a number of participants when trying to explain and understand the dominant pattern of racial segregation. The following

extracts demonstrate how participants felt similarities impacted on friendship and seating patterns:

Extract 28

- White, m:** Also maybe, just the way people are... can relate to people that look like them. Maybe the same race... and culture –that sort of thing
- White, f:** Ja
- Facilitator:** So, sometimes looks attract you to certain types of people, people who look like you... maybe you identify with them.
- White, m:** Ja
- Facilitator:** Or culture you said.
- White, m:** Ja
- Facilitator:** What does everyone else think? About why that's happening or...
- White, f:** I don't think you'd really hang out with someone who wasn't similar to you... you wouldn't really find anything to relate to with them.
- White, m:** Ja

Extract 29

“People will generally stick to their racial group. Probably because you just feel comfortable and that there are people who are like you.” (‘White’ male, 16)

Extract 30

“I think that it's just like a natural thing... like you...people just go to whoever they think is most like them... or... ja” (‘Black’ female, 16)

Similar explanations for segregated seating patterns were given by focus group participants in studies by both Buttny (1999) and Hammond Stoughton and Sivertson's (2005). In Hammond Stoughton and Sivertson's (2005) research, participants were seen to naturalize separate seating “along the lines of natural preferences and the tendency of people to want to ‘stick with their own kind’” (p. 284). What is significant about these explanations is that they once again potentially draw on racial stereotyping and the selective overemphasis of differences rather than similarities between different racial groups. What has also been raised in previous research is whether actual similarity is at the root of decisions to self-segregate, or whether social categorisation and group identification play a more powerful (albeit less conscious) role in decisions to self-

segregate (Finchilescu, 2005). In a study of this nature, there is no denying the influence of group processes on the patterns observed and highlighted, particularly among adolescents. The participants themselves make reference to the influence of group processes when they speak of how learners can be teased for frequently engaging in inter-racial interactions.

The desire to be accepted and judged positively by one's peer group, which is particularly pertinent to adolescence, complicates our analysis of this explanation. Hammond Stoughton and Sivertson (2005) point out the need to understand these types of explanations within the context of "the intense desire of young adolescents for a sense of affirmation and belonging from peers" (p. 285). The desire to fit in and avoid ridicule was indirectly highlighted by participants in this study as a factor potentially influencing and encouraging a pattern of conforming to social self-segregation on the basis of 'race'. Particularly when one looks at how participants felt teased for integrating. The adolescents spoke of being called a '*wigger*' or '*coconut*' for mixing socially with people of a different 'race' or engaging in activities that are perceived to be dominated by a different racial group.

Extract 31

"If you're a white person and you hang out with black people, people might start calling you a "wigger" or something like that" ('Black' male, 17)

Extract 32

Facilitator: So, do you think you were teased?
Group: Ja, ja
White, f: People do get teased
White, m: They don't get accepted though
White, f: Like I do basketball, 'cause like as a white girl –and it's meant to be like a black sport- they're like 'ja, those girls are wiggers' –all the white girls that do it. Friends of mine say that, and they're just joking but it's really irritating actually.
Black, m: Ja, 'cause you know they actually think that

When asked to describe a '*wigger*', the following explanation was given:

Extract 33

“Well, it’s like a white person who acts like a black person, so it’s like... you know it came from the word ‘nigger’ –excuse... everyone- and then they changed it to “wigger” for whites... ja” (‘White’ female, 16)

The term ‘*coconut*’, seen in the following comment, was used by participants in discussing how ‘black’ people are teased or mocked for engaging in activities perceived to be ‘white’.

Extract 34

“They talk about a “coconut”... if you acting too much like a white person if you’re black. It’s so silly... I think it’s so stupid” (‘White’ female, 16)

Generally, the focus group participants felt that the way in which people were teased or mocked for socialising with people of a different ‘race’ or engaging in activities perceived to be dominated by a different racial group had the potential to reduce social interactions between ‘black’ and ‘white’ adolescents. Reid (2002), in an article on schools in the ‘new’ South Africa, found that adolescents reported a similar phenomenon with learners describing how ‘black’ students who befriended ‘white’ students are teased and called “Oreos” (‘black’ on the outside and ‘white’ on the inside). This is similar to the concept of a ‘*coconut*’ discussed by participants in this study. As suggested by the above extracts, clearly the desire to conform and avoid ridicule is in some way influencing social patterns of segregation.

5.3.4. Influences on patterns of self-segregation

Similar to findings in previous research (e.g. Branch & Newcombe, 1986; Hammond Stoughton & Siverson, 2005; Moody, 2001), participants noted factors such as parental, school and peer influences, which may impact on patterns of integration and segregation. The way in which the participants spoke of and made meaning of these influences will now be discussed.

5.3.4.1. Parental influences

The extracts below highlight parental influences as a factor that many of the participants felt potentially impacted on patterns of social self-segregation.

Extract 35

“Also, the whole like, ummm... I think the groups you end up with... We don’t think about it but it’s kind of how you are... your home life. Like how you’re raised and that is the same... it’s usually with people who have similar upbringing as you... if you think about it. Like we didn’t really bring it up... like I don’t know... our parents would think the same maybe... and other groups’ parents would think the same... I don’t know.” (‘White’ female, 16)

Extract 36

“Ja, their opinions. A lot of people, you know sort of take on the opinions of their parents.” (‘White’ female, 16)

Extract 37

“Maybe a silly example, but there’s like a guy in our grade who... he’s kind of stopped now, but he was very rude and racist about people. And that was kind of like brought on by his father, who’s very very racist. And you could tell by the way he spoke about it that he just took on his father’s views. I mean, he’s calmed down a lot now, but he used to be very bad.” (‘White’ female, 16)

Despite the way in which participants highlighted parental influences as an explanation for racial attitudes as well as social patterns, they did occasionally express some resistance to the more overt opinions or influences they felt could be exerted by parents. The extract below is an example of this resistance and also highlights the participant’s awareness of the impact of ideologies on patterns of relating.

Extract 38

“I think a lot of us dismiss what our parents say, about... interracial relationships. Because as you say we were born into a new system, so we don’t have the same ideology that they might have had back then. So, we’re open to something like interracial relationships... it’s more likely.” (‘White’ male, 16)

While the little bit of resistance to parental influences reflected in the discourses inspires hope in many ways, the dominant trend shown in the above extracts was the use of parental influences as an excuse or justification for decisions to self-segregate. One

needs to critically question whether this was a way of defending their choice to self-segregate but dissociating themselves from the choice by blaming it on external influences. Could some of the views that they say are their parents', actually be theirs? The use of defences to justify the dominant pattern of self-segregation on the basis of 'race' will be elaborated on further under the theme of defensive strategies.

Participants also felt that segregation seemed to increase with age and there seemed to be a feeling that with age came experience, understanding and a greater concern for what other people thought, all of which made social segregation on the basis of 'race' more likely.

Extract 39

"When you come into high school... you follow, like the grade twelves, you see them and how they do it. And then everyone wants to now become bigger and 'maturer', and then they start going their own ways, and once that happens then they start segregating." ('White' male, 16)

As illustrated by the above extract, self-segregation seemed to be related to the desire to fit in and be 'mature'. This is in line with past findings by Hammond Stoughton and Sivertson (2005) whose focus group participants highlighted more exclusionary seating patterns in the school cafeteria among older students, which they also attributed to a natural function of becoming more mature and more discriminating in their friendship choices. Branch and Newcombe's (1986) research findings also showed changes in racial attitudes "as children mature and develop a more global and expansive world view" (p.718). They noted that in younger children, with an increase in cognitive maturity and abilities, came a change in racial attitudes. This they hypothesized to be due to a better ability to synthesize their social experiences and to take in and integrate into their views, messages given to them by parents and extrafamilial social education, particular as they entered formal education. Bourdieu's (1980, cited in Bonilla-Silva et al., 2006) notion of habitus could again be used to understand why these acquired patterns and dispositions increase with age, as socialisation processes are internalised.

5.3.4.2.School influences

This brings us to the theme of how school culture and older peers potentially influence patterns of social interactions. Participants felt that certain schools were made up of older learners, or had a culture, that perpetuated racism and patterns of segregation on the basis of ‘race’. The following extracts illustrate this theme.

Extract 40

- White, f:** My brother’s school is very separated like that. He’s at [school’s name]...
- White, m:** You’ll find it’s... it’s probably because there’s still a lot of racism there though.
- White, f:** Ja... and he wasn’t like that before... it was only since he went to the school. So, I think the school influences people a lot.

Extract 41

- Black, m:** People have changed
- Facilitator:** They’ve changed here?
- Black, m:** A lot, ja
- Group:** Ja
- White, m:** And people you used to know
- White, f:** Ja, they do... because of where they go
- Black, m:** ...because of the school
- White, f:** I think it’s the older people that influence them
- Facilitator:** So, maybe the teacher’s views? Or what’s encouraged?
- White, f:** Or the older kids at the school
- Black, m:** Ja, ja. I don’t know. Like she was saying with the whole schools thing... where at your primary school everyone would be the same
- White, f:** Happy, ja
- Black, m:** Ja... I know at high school it’s more separated than before

This could be understood in a number of ways. As with parental influences, a certain culture or way of thinking may be learnt by young adolescents, who according to Erikson (1950), due to a developmental need for identity formation, are highly sensitive to the way that they come across in the eyes of others. Erikson (1950) states that for the adolescent “it is his privilege, not his duty, to accept a pal of whatever kind. As far as ‘general citizenship’ is concerned, he catches on to the school’s concept of behaviour” (p.307). Before one casts judgement on these explanations, as highlighted above, one

needs to constantly keep in mind the importance for adolescents of being accepted and judged positively by their peer group.

What is interesting about this explanation is that it points to an area for potential intervention in terms of changing patterns of self-segregation. In terms of very basic and practical learnt norms in the school environment, one could look at the potential influence of existing states of integration and segregation on new arrivals to a space, which could help explain how the school culture so strongly influences patterns of relating. This is in line with findings by Tredoux et al. (2005) who observed how on a university campus, existing states of integration and segregation were seen to influence later patterns observed in that a person arriving at a new space was seen to observe the existing seating pattern and fit into the pattern based on the observation made. In this way they found that “prior states of a space can be expected –to some extent- to have independent effects on later states” (Tredoux et al., 2005, p.428). This could in part explain the persistence of patterns of segregation in social spaces in general and in the school environment specifically.

Many of the participants also felt that, in terms of school influences, growing up and going to school with people of a different ‘race’ could in some ways encourage racial integration socially. This is shown in the below extracts

Extract 42

“I think it’s also friends from little... again. ‘Cause I know people that are mixed they have been through primary school, the whole of primary school together, and they’re still like really good friends” (‘White’ female, 16)

Extract 43

White, m: They could also have been friends from like when they were really small and then just gone to the same school and stuff...

White, f: Ja

Black, m: Ja

White, m: ... and they’ve just stayed with each other

Facilitator: Okay. So that’s similar to what M was saying earlier, that if you’ve been friends with people from when you were younger, it’s more likely that race is not an issue for you.

Black, m: Ja, You tend to be friends with them later

While these explanations show verbal support for the idea that early contact may positively impact on later patterns of social integration, the participants' reported patterns of self-segregation generally seemed to contradict the idea that early inter-racial friendships would have any lasting affect on later friendship and general socialising decisions. Everyone in the focus group who spoke about growing up in a racially integrated school and with friends of other 'races' went on to speak about how they still chose to self-segregate socially when they got to high school.

What these particular explanations and seeming contradictions speak to, which has been highlighted in past research (e.g. Clack et al., 2005, Hammond Stoughton & Sivertson, 2005), is the role of inter-group perceptions and practices in shaping social interactions and the organisation of social space. What seems to be relevant, particularly in relation to the school culture and norm, is the learnt experience of socially acceptable patterns of interacting and space usage.

5.3.5. The impact of sport and team activities on patterns of integration and segregation

In phase one of this research it was observed that the majority of racial integration that occurred during break at the school was based around sports. Comments by the focus group participants supported this observation and highlighted the potential of sports and team activities to encourage integration. This theme is supported by the following extracts.

Extract 44

White, f:	They're kind of mixed again
Black, f:	Ja
White, m:	Ja, it looks like just whoever likes the sport... it doesn't matter who you are.
White, f:	Whoever wants to play, plays
White, m:	Sports can divide and bring together
Black, m:	In this case, it definitely brings them together.

Extract 45

- Black, m:** You spend a lot of time together and you tend to...
White, f: Sports, like bonds you
White, m: You tend to like interact with each other more...
Facilitator: So, you bond by spending time together and learning about... do you think learning about others makes it easier to mix with people from other groups?
Group: Ja, ja
Black, m: Ja, it makes it easier to know what to talk about
White, f: Ja, you wouldn't have known before
White, m: Like you don't talk about stuff that would hurt them in a way. Like if something happened in a family and stuff, you know not to go down that route. 'Cause they would get really upset and offended and stuff.
White, f: Also, in sports you face harder things than you do in school. Like, just sitting at break, there's not like anything difficult about it. Where with sports you all have to persevere together as a team... and it definitely brings you closer to people

Extract 46

"Mam, it can also get you together. Because if you like, if you like... play sports with some other people. Like in an older grade or younger grade. And also of a different race. You spend a lot of time together with each other and you get like, you start becoming close friends because you spend so much time together. So that can get, that can get you to be closer to them even though you of a different race or something." ('White' male, 16)

These explanations show direct support for the contact hypothesis, particularly the facilitating conditions that are associated with 'ideal' contact. Allport (1954), in his contact hypothesis, and Pettigrew and Tropp (2006, cited in Prestwich et al., 2008) highlight three facilitating conditions that contribute to the reduction of prejudice with greater contact, namely: perceived equal status between group members, common goals attained through co-operation, and contact that is supported by authorities or norms. Sports are likely to be supported by authorities and, as highlighted by the last comment in extract 45, participants generally work together towards a common goal. This type of contact is thought to reduce prejudice by increasing knowledge of the out-group (as mentioned in extract 45), reducing negative stereotype use, and particularly by decreasing inter-group anxiety on an affective level (Prestwich et al., 2008).

Most of the participants in the group supported the idea that sports encouraged greater social integration of different racial groups. However, as was noted in phase one of this research, this integration did not seem to extend beyond the sports field. While it increased opportunities for contact and increased knowledge of individuals from different 'race' groups, all of the participants who spoke of playing sports with peers of a different 'race' also spoke of how they self-segregated on the basis of 'race' when not engaging in that sport. Also, in the light of certain interests being seen as primarily for different 'races' or the racialisation of interests, as discussed at the beginning of this chapter, participants also highlighted sports as something that had the potential to divide and perpetuate patterns of social segregation. The following comment illustrates this point.

Extract 47

"Also, how they always talk about like cricket being a white sport or soccer being a black sport... or whatever that is. That's what divides it... But when they play it as a team, then you're a team... that's the good thing about it. But there's always going to be conflict" ('White' male, 16)

While participants clearly saw sports and team activities as something that increased contact and facilitated the integration of different racial groups, as discussed in the previous chapter, it is still questionable whether this has any lasting or continuous effect on social patterns of interacting. As mentioned, most focus group participants discussed how, even though they engaged in sports and team activities, both formally and informally, with learners of a different 'race', when given the choice they continued to socially self-segregate on the basis of 'race'.

5.3.6. Intergroup anxiety and the avoidance of conflict

A commonly cited reason for the avoidance of inter-racial contact in past research (e.g. Finchilescu, 2005; Prestwich et al., 2008) re-emerged as a theme in this study. Participants cited the threat of racial and political conflict as a factor that potentially discourages racial integration socially. A history of conflict between groups is thought to be one of many factors that can lead to high levels of anxiety, specifically what Stephan and Stephan (1985, cited in Finchilescu, 2005) refer to as 'intergroup anxiety'.

Intergroup anxiety is thought to encourage the avoidance of intergroup contact. The extracts below, both thematically and discursively, highlight participants feelings of anxiety around contact with peers of a different 'race'. While extract 48 speaks directly to the participant's anxiety in his use of the word '*safe*', which seems to imply a fear of some sort of threat, extract 49 highlights participants' past experiences of conflict between different racial groups.

Extract 48

"They could just like feel safe around like each other... and they don't feel safe in telling other racial groups" ('White' male, 16)

Extract 49

White, m: People, like don't want to say something wrong and then start like a big fight...

White, f: Ja. What happened in grade nine again [talking to black female]? Between the girls, there was a fight between the black girls and the white girls? I don't even know how it started, but like the next thing the black girls were saying 'ja, you guys are just like the apartheid', when nothing had even happened to them. And they were like screaming at us and we weren't involved in it. And it was like such a big... I don't even know how it started. I just stayed out of it.

Does anyone remember?

White, m: Ja

Black, f: (laughs) I think I remember that...

White, f: What happened?

Group: I don't know.

Facilitator: So, racial conflict and things like that...

White, f: Ja. Like bringing up the past when it doesn't even apply to you.

Extract 49 demonstrates what Plant (2004, cited in Finchilescu, 2005) argues is a result of anxiety and is referred to as 'negative expectancies' about the likely outcome of intergroup contact, and specifically concerns about being perceived as prejudiced. These negative expectancies are likely to encourage future avoidance of contact. In fact one would expect that any sort of conflict that arises from intergroup contact would reduce the likelihood of future contact and consequently reduce the occurrence of social integration.

The final comment made in extract 49 in which the participant implies that in situations of racial conflict ‘black’ peers *‘bring up the past when it doesn’t even apply to them’*, also highlights what Tihanyi (2007) speaks about as a lack of “wide-spread and sincere effort on the part of past and present beneficiaries of the system to face history and acknowledge their gains at the expense of others, whether intentional or not” (p. 192). While seemingly harmless, this lack of acknowledgement, Tihanyi (2007) feels, has the potential to hinder educational reform and long-lasting social change in South Africa and abroad. In relation to this research one needs to reflect on the impact of comments such as these on the continuing pattern of social self-segregation. They could be seen in some way as denying the wrongs of the past and defending the status quo, which raises obvious barriers to social change.

According to Stephan and Stephan (1985, cited in Finchilescu, 2005) the nature of the contact situation is important, as “a competitive situation or situation in which there is no interdependence between the interacting groups is likely to create more anxiety than a co-operative situation” (Finchilescu, 2005, p. 463). One could hypothesize that when participants speak of sports as both an integrator and segregator, that two types of contact situations in sports are possibly experienced: one that encourages competition between different racial groups over the nature of the sport played, and another that encourages co-operation, team work or interdependence. This is likely to be a factor that influences whether sports and contact in general works to encourage or discourage integration between different racial groups.

Another related sub-theme that emerged to explain social segregation was the avoidance of conflict over politics, which for the ‘white’ participants continued to be perceived as highly racialised. This is demonstrated in a comment made by one of the ‘white’ participants.

Extract 50

“But also, I find that... I don’t know... like the whites can talk about something that they feel comfortable about in government or you know... they can always talk about that... Where the whites may always say you know DA or Cope... or

whatever that is. Whereas the blacks are strongly ANC or whatever else... It becomes... as soon as you mention it..." ('White' male, 16)

The racialisation of politics for this participant seems to act as a further barrier to racial integration. It also seems to once again perpetuate more contemporary assumptions and racial stereotypes regarding political affiliations. Again, discursively, his use of the word '*comfortable*' speaks to his discomfort with some political or government issues and implies an underlying sentiment of being politically threatened or marginalised. Durington (2006), in his study on community members' rationalisations of gated communities, found that many of the 'white' South Africans he spoke to expressed some fear that they are, or will be, victims of a new political system in which they are the new minority and find themselves politically disempowered.

The extracts below illustrate the strong implications of anxiety around politics and the potential conflict that may arise from it. In extract 51 both 'black' and 'white' participants speak of how it makes them '*mad*' and '*it always gets to you*'. This affective element was also demonstrated in the non-verbal discomfort and difficult emotions that arose, and is highlighted in extract 52. The discomfort and anxiety were tangible in the focus group, and the laughter, which will be discussed later as a defence and theme in its own right, seemed to be aimed at diffusing participants' anxiety about the topic at hand and the potential conflict that might result.

Extract 51

- Facilitator:** So it relates to the politics you spoke about earlier
White, f: It makes quite a few people mad
Black, m: It does ja
Facilitator: And do you think it affects you?
White, m: Well you try not let it affect you, but with other people... it always gets to you
Black, m: Ja... letting it affect them. And then they share their views with you... and you don't really agree... so

Extract 52

- Black, m:** We don't talk about politics. Like, say someone comes up with the whole subject we try to avoid it... talk about something else. So, we're not into politics.
- Facilitator:** Okay, you think people try to avoid the subject. It sounds like it can be quite a conflictual topic?
- Group:** Ja, yes
- Facilitator:** I see everyone seems to be getting uncomfortable as we talk about this
- Group:** (laughs)
- Facilitator:** You think it's avoided generally then? Do you think it's an issue of race that makes people avoid it?
- Black, m:** I don't think it's an issue of race... it's just politics.

Interestingly, the topic of politics seemed to be much more anxiety provoking for these participants than the topic of 'race'. The 'black' male involved in the conversation played out in extract 52, seemed to be particularly avoidant of the topic and denied that it had anything to do with 'race'. However, when one looks at the one participant's clear racialisation of politics, one wonders whether more direct racial conflict, which historically would be interpreted as revealing more old-fashioned forms of racism, has not been replaced and concealed by a more contemporary 'political' discourse. If it is perceived that political affiliations mirror racial lines, and that different political parties have the interest of different racial groups in mind, surely politics would be perceived to potentially threaten the status quo. If one looks at the discourses that 'racialise' politics, on a critical level, they could be interpreted as advancing more modern forms of racism. Bulhan (1985, cited in Stevens, 1998) explains that the process of 'racialisation' "assists in the distinction between 'self' and 'other' (or 'us' and 'them') into irreconcilable opposites" (p. 208). For the participant avoiding the political conflict, his intention could be seen as a general avoidance of anxiety around perceived irreconcilable differences, political conflict, and the racial conflict that seems to be entangled with politics.

5.3.7. BEE and economic threat

A more contemporary theme also emerged in the focus group discussion to explain areas of conflict or disagreement between 'races' that may impact on patterns of integration and segregation. Black Economic Empowerment (BEE) and quota systems and policies

intended to redress the inequalities of the past were raised by one 'white' male participant particularly. However, some other participants expressed agreement or similar frustrations. The following extracts illustrate this theme:

Extract 53

"I don't want to sound heavy here, like... but like in the white family I always say... like my family is seriously into the entertainment industry, and in the entertainment industry... like the building industry, which A's father is in, uhh.. There's a big thing with BEE and uhh... all of that stuff... which really frustrates people. That brings... uhh... a lot of ... tension. Ja." ('White' male, 16)

Extract 54

White, m: I mean initially BEE was a good thing...
Black, m: Ja
White, m: ...when... it is a good thing... I like it. But it's how people and businesses interpret it. It's how they make it to what they want... sooo... like the SABC is very very heavy on BEE. If you're white you can't go to the SABC. That's how it is. That's really how it is. They... seriously...

Extract 55

"But, you know... we weren't born into that era... uhh and that's what peeves me off, and my family was in Rhodesia at that time, but... I mean during apartheid. So that's where BEE and all that other crap..." ('White' male, 16)

Thematically, these comments highlight this particular 'white' male's fear of economic threat or marginalisation by policies aimed at redressing the inequalities of the past. Interestingly, this theme did not seem to be a major area of concern for other focus group participants and one wonders whether this particular participant's frustrations relate to the fact that as a 'white' male theoretically he has the most to lose in terms of access to economic resources and opportunities, which his particular racial and gender group historically dominated. On a thematic level, Stevens (1998) found that a similar theme emerged in his discussions with 'coloured' South African adults, who perceived 'black' South Africans as economically threatening, particularly in the context of affirmative action and employment opportunities. According to Ashmore and Del Boca (1976 cited in Stevens, 1998) this fear of losing economic privileges is common in societies undergoing social transition.

Discursively the above extracts reflect a number of contradictions, commonly seen in racial discourses and briefly discussed in the literature review of this research report. While the participant overtly claims to support BEE he projects his frustration and fear of it onto others when he states that it '*really frustrates people*' and then indirectly describes and groups it with '*all that other crap*', implying a lack of support for it and reveals his real, possibly less conscious, feelings on the matter. Bonilla-Silva (2003) in his outline of contradictions in modern forms of racism argues that abstract liberalism, which can be seen in the participant's expressed support for BEE, is frequently used by 'whites' to rationalize racist views or practices while representing themselves as moral and reasonable. On a discursive level, when one looks at extract 55, one also wonders about the meaning behind the participant's language usage in terms of his reference to Rhodesia rather than Zimbabwe. Durington (2006) argues that the inability of former citizens of Zimbabwe to refer to the country as Zimbabwe "indicates a denial of cultural and political change and instantly gives the individual the status of a 'when we'" (p. 156).

The way in which these feelings and frustrations regarding BEE were expressed, often followed in the discussion by comments demonstrating a lack of racist intent, critically can be seen to illustrate a more modern form of racial ideology. Ansell (2004) in her study on racial ideologies in post-apartheid South Africa found that 'black' and 'white' South Africans had fundamentally different discourses on 'race' and racism. In her study she speaks of new forms of racism, which "disavow racist intent and work via circumvention of anti-racist and transitional or nation-building rhetoric but nevertheless mobilise meaning in defence of the racially inequalitarian status quo" (Ansell, 2004, p. 22). The above comments seem to do exactly that. The question is, particularly in light of the fact that these comments came from the same 'white' male, how much of this is a reflection of his ideas and attitudes and how much of it comes from parental and other influences?

In line with Ansell's (2004) findings of different discourses reflected by 'black' and 'white' South Africans, and under the same theme of feelings regarding policies aimed at

redressing inequalities of the past, one of the ‘black’ participants in the focus group discussion expressed fundamentally different concerns. In the following comment he expresses frustration regarding comments made by his peers that imply that his successes in sports are token appointments based on his ‘race’, aimed at redressing inequalities of the past rather than rewarding his skills and selecting the best person for the team.

Extract 56

“...then you get selected or something then people like behind your back say ‘ja, it’s because he’s black’ or...” (‘Black’ male, 17)

Stevens (1998) explains that prejudiced discourses like the one reported by this participant, which he also found in his study, tend to “reinforce the dominant racist stereotypes that ‘Africans’ are often incompetent” (p. 209). He argues that comments, such as those made by some implies token appointments, may function to marginalise ‘black’ competitors and in some way to preserve access to these positions, and consequently resources, by ‘white’ competitors.

Highly relevant to this study is the potential effect of this competition and feeling of threat on contact and social interactions between racial groups. Finchilescu (2005) argues that just as apartheid laws reified competition between racial groups, post-apartheid policies like BEE and affirmative action, while highly necessary, tend to maintain this focus on competition between racial groups. This clearly has the potential to socially divide racial groups. Previous research, such as that by Platow and Hunter (2001 cited in Finchilescu, 2005), has shown the negative effect of competition on intergroup attitudes and interactions. High levels of competition and anxiety regarding conflict between different racial groups, as discussed above, are highly likely to be encouraging continued patterns of social self-segregation.

5.3.8. Intra-psycho processes and the use of positive self-presentation strategies

The approach taken in much of this analysis so far, has been primarily a discursive one, in which the focus has been on linking participants’ explanations and attempts at meaning

making to social, political and economic processes. Hook (2006a) argues that social psychology in South Africa, for a number of compelling reasons, has tended towards a discursive or social-constructionist approach in understanding and analysing issues of 'race'. However, Hook (2006a) and Foster (2006), as discussed in the literature review chapter, highlight the need to consider individual processes as well as social ideological processes that are contributing to patterns and constructions of social interactions. Hook (2006a) specifically argues for the use of a psychoanalytic approach to understand the psychical density of racism and, "its emotional intensity and its tenacity in the face of structural change" (p. 192). The following themes highlight the defensive strategies most commonly used by the participants in their explanations and meaning-making of patterns of integration and segregation. They highlight some of the more intra-psychic and probably less-intentional meanings behind their explanations, many of which demonstrate the idea of a defensible racism, where elements of prejudice co-exist but are covered by "perfectly rational propositions that hold up well under scrutiny for racism" (Hook, 2006a, p. 182).

5.3.8.1. Wit, displacement and avoidance

At first glance of the data collected, one of the most obvious patterns is the use of laughter and wit to diffuse anxiety around the topic at hand. While some participants spoke openly about the use of laughter (see extract 57) in issues of 'race', most were merely observed using laughter, either when they seemed to disagree with what another participant had said (see extract 59), or when they felt anxious about the direction in which the conversation was going (see extract 58).

Extract 57

White, m1: Like with drama...

White, m2: ... it breaks the race barrier and the gender barrier

White, m1: With drama you act... like that's your character. If you act like a racist person, you tune that oke... you say it how it is. But then you know... you know... and then you all laugh about it afterwards. That's what I find drama... I like about drama... you don't look at race, I don't see that in drama.

Extract 58

- Facilitator:** I see everyone seems to be getting uncomfortable as we talk about this
Group: (laughs)

Extract 59

- White, m:** ...like, where you come from is ja... 'cause my step-dad used to work for the police force during the apartheid, so I think that that's had a big influence on him... on me
Facilitator: Okay
White, m: I mean I'm not a racist, but...
Black, f: (laughs)
White, m: ... I find that that has influenced me

The participant who overtly speaks about the use of laughter and wit in extract 57 frequently made jokes throughout the focus group discussions, often at his own expense, to reduce social tension. Durrington (2006) in his study found that humour reduced social tension as well as revealing one's views and political leanings. The function of wit and humour to reduce social tension can be understood in terms of the psychoanalytic understanding of it as a defense mechanism. As a defense, wit can be understood as a form of displacement that involves distraction from a distressing affective issue (Sadock & Sadock, 2003).

As discussed above, the laughter noted in extract 59 could be seen as a subtle means of showing the participant's disagreement with what the other participant had just said or it could again be seen as a defensive means of reducing her own anxiety around what is being discussed. This particular participant frequently laughed when she became uncomfortable, particularly when conflict or racism was discussed. Apart from the laughter, what is particularly interesting about the comment being made in extract 59 on a defensive level is the way in which the participant implies that his father is racist and then follows this statement with a denial of his own racism. While the denial will be elaborated on further in this analysis, the strategy used by the participant in this extract reflects more than a basic denial of racism. Bonilla-Silva (2003) speaks of how stories of disclosure of knowledge of someone close, often a parent, who is racist, can be seen as

having an almost religious motif. In Bonilla-Silva's (2003) words, this participant's narrative comes across as a confession as if "expecting absolution from listeners from the possibility of being regarded as racist" (p. 92). Van Dijk (1999) explains that the individual function of denial in self-presentation is to avoid being perceived as racist.

This same participant, throughout the focus group discussion showed a real discomfort with the topic of 'race' and seemed to constantly attempt to avoid the topic by highlighting gender or diverting the discussion in some way. This is illustrated in the extract below, in which he first highlights gender segregation to shift the focus away from racial segregation alone, and then he asks the group an arbitrary question about a book in the photo, arguably in an attempt to divert the conversation away from 'race'.

Extract 60

- Facilitator:** Okay. Do you want to describe what you see in this photo?
Black, f: Mixed race
White, f: Mixed race
White, m1: Mixed races and gender
Facilitator: Okay. So the group is mixed on the basis of race and gender
White, m2: That's music... I say that's music oriented. Straight away.
Black, f: How do you know it's music?
White, m2: Uhhh, no... that's what I say
White, m1: What book is that guy holding?

When the group was openly questioned about the tendency to bring the discussion back to gender rather than 'race', the fact that gender felt less '*sensitive*' in the context of our socio-political history was highlighted by one of the participants who gave the following explanation for why she found it easier to talk about gender rather than 'race'.

Extract 61

- Facilitator:** As we talk about gender here, I'm wondering whether you find it easier to talk about gender than you do about race
Group: Ja (nods)
Facilitator: Okay I see some nods and some uncertainty. N, you think it's easier?
Black, f: Yes
Facilitator: Ja. Why?

Black, f: Well, 'cause... like obviously, coming from apartheid and like with peoples parents and all the different views, race is still like a very sensitive subject. And like... sometimes... people think... lets say I make a comment about J, some people will say 'oh, you're only saying that because he's white' or... race is still a sensitive issue. But gender is like... I don't know... between boys and girls, there're only like two things.

In this participant's comment, rather than denying her avoidance, she overtly acknowledges the fear of being branded a racist and at the same time highlights the complexity of the issue of 'race', particularly in the context of South Africa's socio-political history.

5.3.8.2. Distancing, denial and positive self-presentation

While the participants verbally confirmed a general pattern of racial segregation in their own social groups, constant attempts were made to separate or distance themselves from these patterns. While they all acknowledged that they themselves socially self-segregated on the basis of 'race', they constantly spoke about having friends of different 'races' and interacting with people of other 'races' at school. They specifically seemed to be distancing themselves from patterns of interactions that they saw to be driven by racism.

Extract 62

White, m: But, mam we also see like if a fight happens between grades and stuff like that, you'll see that all our grades no matter what race you are will back our grade.

White, m: Ja

Facilitator: Okay, so there's something about being a team as a grade...

Group: Ja, ja

Facilitator: ... that unites you. Above race and above gender.

White, m: Ja. Like we'll back our grade like the whole way

White, f: There was a fight with the black boys and a matric white guy and like our whole grade was like on our boys side.

White, m: The whites and black guys from our grade

White, f: Everyone was on our grade's side

White, m: But I mean, like I said before... how we all grew together, since grade eight. We've noticed our differences, and now we've dealt with them and now... we are where we are.

Extract 63

- Facilitator** Your school you think is a little more mixed that that?
White, f: Ja, I think it's very mixed. Like cricket, it's not just like white people or black people... like M plays cricket.
White, m: There's more black people in the one team (laughs)
Black, m: In sports it is more mixed
White, m: But sometimes there is conflict, like in cricket... but, like, we were all together. Like M, L, myself... I wasn't the best cricket player...
Group: (Laughs)
White, m: Like we all got together and we all did it you know...
White, f: Our school's nice like that
White, m: It brought us together

Extract 64

“That's more like us (points to integration photo five), but that's more like the whole school (points to photo one –with both integration and segregation)”
(‘White’ female, 16)

On a critical level, these comments and extracts could be seen as purely defensive of participants' chosen patterns of interacting and as a reflection of their desire to be seen by the researcher and each other in a positive light, known as the halo effect or positive self-presentation. While the participants acknowledge their own self-segregation, in the same breath they contradictorily make attempts at distancing themselves from this segregation, by highlighting their own racial integration. Van Dijk (1999) argues that one of the properties of modern forms of racism is its often blatant denial, and discursively he shows how distancing can be used as a subtle form of denial. Both laws and general societal norms forbid blatant forms of racism and because people are generally aware of this, and often acknowledge and share similar sentiments about racism (Billig, Condor, Edwards, Gane, Middleton & Radley, 1988), it is common to see some form of denial in contemporary racial discourses.

While one can take a very critical and judgemental view of the above comments, labelling the participants as racists, in many ways their comments and approach can also be seen to reflect some potential changes in patterns and attitudes towards these patterns. On a content level their comments reflect greater inter-racial friendships among themselves and their peers, and more importantly they seem to reflect a greater desire for

racial integration and a pride at engaging in activities that give them the opportunity to integrate socially. Participants wanted to be seen and perceived, not just by the researcher, as racially integrated. They came across as open to social integration across 'race' and gender, and even though this was not physically occurring there seemed to be some sort of striving for greater social integration. This is reflected in the way in which participants idealised the past, in terms of portraying past patterns of racial integration, and spoke of themselves as having friends of a different 'race', which can be seen in the below extracts.

Extract 65

"Well, ja. I think that there are similarities between different race groups. 'Cause I've like grown up around... like most of my best friends are white... and I have a few best friends that are black. 'Cause I've been with them, the white people since I've been like in grade one..." ('Black' male, 17)

Extract 66

"I was like...I had in preschool, my best friends were black... well ja most of them, ja. When I went to high school (laughs)..." ('White' male, 16)

Extract 67

Black, m: Ja, ja. I don't know. Like she was saying with the whole schools thing... where at your primary school everyone would be the same
White, f: Happy, ja
Black, m: Ja.. I know at high school it's more separated than before

On a critical level, Bonilla-Silva (2003) in his discussion with college students in the United States found that the primary purpose of referring to oneself as having best friends of a different 'race' was positive self-presentation and as a way of demonstrating and building one's investment in colour-blindness. While they overtly express a striving and preference for racial integration and not considering colour in friendship choices, in both extract 65 and extract 66, their use of racial discourses in their categorisation and reference to 'us' and 'them' contradict this investment in colour-blindness.

What was particularly interesting was that their reported past patterns of interacting seemed to completely contradict their current patterns of social self-segregation. The

participants seemed to be presenting with a dilemma, similar to that found by Buttny (1999) in his study, in that the strategies they used, which served to highlight the many contradictions in their reported patterns of integration and segregation seemed to reflect a gap between an imagined ideal and their everyday reality. This ideological dilemma, as highlighted by Billig et al. (1988) will be elaborated on further in the final chapter of this report.

5.3.8.3.Social identity and abjection

At the end of the focus group, when participants were asked to categorise themselves on the basis of 'race', both of the 'black' males in the focus group resisted this categorisation in different ways. While not necessarily problematic, critically one needs to explore the potential reasons for this resistance and the function it served for them. Is it because of our history in which 'black' South Africans constantly had to defend their 'black' male identity? Did the participants not want to identify with an identity that they had to defend? Or is it related to the fact that they attend a previously 'white' only school and seem to come from relative privilege, both of which were historically associated with a 'white' identity? Buttny (1999), in his discursive analysis of college students' explanations for differences and voluntary segregation, found that one of the most noticeable differences in the discourses of 'white' and 'black' Americans was the focus on social identity. While issues of social and group identity dominated the discourses of 'black' participants, "identity was virtually not an issue for Whites, who have the "privilege" (Frankenberg, 1993) of being the dominant group" (Buttny, 1999, p. 263).

The following explanations were given by the two participants who either resisted categorising themselves or categorised themselves unconventionally:

Extract 68

"...ja, I'm just saying maybe it feels like I'm going against everything I stand for, 'cause I just see myself as a person, and I ... I do whatever I want to do. Like, I play chess. And in grade eight and stuff it was really hard because people... everyone always judged me." ('Black' male, 17)

Extract 69

- Black, m1:** Ja, please ask him why he classified himself as white.
Group: (laughs)
Black, m2: I don't know. Like... I enjoy white sports... like surfing, waterpolo... I find it more interesting than what black people do more often. I don't know why.
Facilitator: So, maybe there are some things that you think you identify more with 'white' things... like your interests are maybe perceived to be more white? Is that what I'm hearing you say?
Black, m2: (nods)

In extract 68 the participant seems to be appealing to a colour-blind rhetoric, a non-racial ideal, which could be understood in the context of our socio-political history. As discussed in a previous chapter, non-racialism was an integral goal of the anti-apartheid movement and it is currently inscribed in the South African Constitution as an ideal. However, in practice it is a highly contested and ambiguous ideal (Ansell, 2004), and this participant's arguments frequently reflected this ambiguity as he battled at times to both acknowledge and deny difference. His attempt to acknowledge and accept differences is reflected in the extract below.

Extract 70

"No, it doesn't. I don't know... I really don't mind what people think... like I don't mind racist people, 'cause it's what they think and I think that's right. I don't know, like if you don't like black people or don't like white people... it's your views... no-one should try to change you" ('Black' male, 17)

On a critical level, one of the potential challenges posed particularly by extract 69 is that the participant seems to be resorting to the process of capitulation, which Stevens (1998) found in his analysis of the 'racialised' discourses of a group of 'coloured' adults. Capitulation is a process, proposed by Bulhan (1985 cited in Stevens, 1998), which "involves aspirations at being assimilated into the dominant racist culture, as they perceive this route to be the one which is more likely to secure these needs and interests" (p. 212). Soudien (2007) also argues that types of 'knowing' that position 'white' people as the bearers of preferred knowledge and 'black' people as inferior in their understanding of the world has the potential to influence views and preferences. Critically, the preference for 'white' things expressed by the participant in extract 69 may

be a reflection of the continued types of 'knowing' discussed by Soudien (2007), and worryingly, a reflection of the way in which this participant's social and educational environment continues to position 'whites' as superior in the social order.

Psychoanalytically, what extract 69, and in general the resistance of both 'black' males to categorising themselves, may also illustrate is the experience of abjection. This Hook (2006a) describes as a feeling of horror and disgust, a kind of anxiety "concerning the borders of the ego, fears and affects concerning how the boundary lines of identity might be disrupted, unsettled, made disturbingly permeable" (p. 183), a feeling of not being able to tell apart 'me' from 'not me'. Bulter (1993 cited in Hook, 2006a) specifically applied the notion of abjection to spatial arrangements as well as its role in self-definition. The participant expressing his resistance to defining himself as 'black' in extract 69, could be understood as not only trying to keep the contaminating effect of the 'Other' out, but simultaneously attempting to eject the loathsome elements of himself. So, just as Fanon understood the 'white' racist's attempt to project and externalise bad qualities of himself onto the 'black' man, this participant could be seen to be projecting and externalising his own bad onto the 'black' 'other'.

The function the defences discussed here serve are many, but seem to focus on the reduction of anxiety, and highlight the highly emotive aspects of 'race' and the often contradictory nature of attempts at meaning-making. This will be elaborated on in terms of meaning and potential consequences in the final chapter of this research report.

CHAPTER 6

INTEGRATION AND CONCLUSION

As South Africa once again celebrates its democracy and freedom on so many levels, one cannot help but reflect on progress made since the fall of apartheid and the abolition of forced segregation. While it is well worth celebrating the tangible and measurable changes made in terms of physical desegregation and the formal integration of so many social and institutional spaces, it would be naïve to consider these formal markers alone as signs of real social change. Firstly, studies on the desegregation of formal institutions have shown that desegregation does not necessarily result in integration (Carrim, 1998; Tihanyi, 2007). Secondly, even in institutions and social spaces where formal integration has been implemented many researchers have noted a pattern of ‘illusory contact’ (e.g. Clack et al, 2005; Dixon & Durrheim, 2003), where the appearance of integration masks the social reality of very little actual meaningful contact. This study consequently sought to look beyond the more formal and measurable changes in patterns of integration and segregation towards a naturalistic exploration and analysis of the actual patterns of racial interactions, integration and segregation occurring in a social space among post-apartheid adolescents.

However, to overcome the limitations of a purely descriptive study, and to attempt to understand continued patterns of self-segregation found here and in past research (e.g. Cowan, 2005; Dixon & Durrheim, 2003; Moody, 2001), this study also aimed to explore the meanings of the interactions and patterns of integration and segregation observed, from the perspective of a group of post-apartheid adolescents. The expressed meanings of these patterns were then looked at in terms of the both the explicit content expressed, and the implicit meaning and ideologies revealed in the way these understandings were articulated. By exploring how these constructed meanings may serve the demands of the adolescents’ context it is hoped that this study, by looking at a myriad of social, psychological and ideological factors, makes a contribution to understandings on how and why social self-segregation on the basis of ‘race’ persists fifteen years after the demise of apartheid.

While patterns of both integration and segregation were observed among the adolescents in phase one of this study, the dominant pattern noted by both the researcher and the interviewed group of post-apartheid adolescents was that of social self-segregation on the basis of 'race'. While the integration of 'black', 'Indian' and 'coloured' learners was observed, this pattern, while confirmed by focus group participants when queried about it, was not noted as significant by the adolescents themselves. In fact, the adolescents spoke almost exclusively of 'blacks' and 'whites', with very little unprompted reference to the apartheid defined categories of 'Indian' and 'coloured'. While this could be seen to be indicative of shifts in racial categorization, it was also postulated to be a reflection of the minority status of certain racial groups in the social circle studied.

An interesting finding from the focus group's discussion was that the dominant pattern of social self-segregation, as revealed discursively, seemed to be experienced differently by 'black' and 'white' participants. While the way in which the 'black' participants commented on this pattern implied an experience of continued dislocation and separation between racial groups, which was reiterated in some of the strategies used in the explanation of these patterns, 'white' participants, on the other hand, spoke of this pattern in terms of the need for racial groups to '*stick together*', as if under threat of some sort. This experience of threat, both economic and political, was reiterated in some of their explanations of this pattern. The way in which these adolescents spoke of current patterns of segregation suggest that the ideologies behind the apartheid system of forced segregation were arguably presented and experienced very differently for different racial groups, and these ideologies have in some way stuck, even if just primarily on an unconscious level. This finding speaks to the virulence of racial ideologies in terms of their continued impact on social patterns.

In terms of patterns of integration, what was observed by the researcher and confirmed by the adolescents was the presence of one or two racially integrated groups. While attempts were made to try and understand this group, the focus group participants expressed some scepticism about it, and further research into seemingly integrated groups is warranted to

explore the reality of the integration as well as the factors that make meaningful and lasting integration possible among groups such as those observed. In terms of patterns of integration, this study found gender integration to be more likely than racial integration, which may be related to the fact that in light of South Africa's socio-political history, gender was perceived by the participants to be less '*sensitive*' and less likely to result in conflict. The most obvious factor that was observed to be associated with integration was sports, which in line with the contact hypothesis, highlighted how co-operation, team work or interdependence can facilitate positive contact and can encourage integration between different racial groups. However, integration associated with sports was not observed to be generalised to social interactions and at times it was even highlighted as a factor that could divide racial groups. The potential of sports to divide rather than unite seemed to be related to the racialisation of sports and interests and the existence of competition, imposed by broader policies of affirmative action, the social influence of intergroup relations, and intra-psychic processes. Related to the observation of sports as an integrator are postulations that the nature of the space, in terms of what sort of social activities and interactions it facilitates, could influence the likelihood of social patterns of integration or segregation. It may be useful for future research to explore how the nature of the space, in terms of factors such as seating and the availability of certain facilities, may impact on social interactions so that educational institutions could, through the design of certain spaces, create conditions that encouraged greater racial integration socially.

A diverse range of explanations and meaning were given by participants for the dominant patterns noted above. At times their arguments and explanations were critical of the patterns of segregation. At other times their arguments appeared to justify or defend these patterns as normative and natural. This apparent inconsistency seemed to reflect the way in which the participants were actively battling with different accounts and attempting to make sense of something complex and often hidden.

When the dominant pattern of social self-segregation was justified by the participants, it was often through an appeal to both differences (in the form of differences in interests,

sports and music preferences) and commonalities (specifically homophily and parental influences). One needs to be critical of the fact that differences rather than similarities between different racial groups are highlighted, while the differences within racial groups are ignored or minimised over the commonalities. These explanations seem to be based on selective attention being paid to factors that justify and support the argument for self-segregation rather than the factors that challenge it. The most commonly cited explanation for self-segregation was differences in interests. Music, sports, and interests in general tended to be racialised by participants for the purpose of rationalisation. One of the major challenges with this is that rationalisation tended to be based on racial stereotypes, which, while not necessarily negative in nature, could be seen to de-individualise people, perpetuate social categorisation, and ultimately reinforce the belief in differences along racial lines. All of this subtly work to normalise social segregation and to reinforce its status as a dominant and socially accepted way of interacting in South Africa. Similar to the findings of Durrheim and Dixon (2005a) it is not that the focus group discussions necessarily revealed personal prejudice towards different racial groups, or racism in the form of negative stereotypes and attitudes, but that more contemporary forms of racism were expressed in and perpetuated through the shared meanings that the participants attributed to the dominant patterns of self-segregation and the very social practices that they justify and maintain.

More contemporary forms of racism were revealed in explanations and arguments aimed at maintaining the status quo. Some of the participants spoke of factors such as political affiliations, and conflict around affirmative action and Black Economic Empowerment (BEE), which they felt reduced the likelihood of social integration. These explanations could be seen to reveal underlying fears of economic or political threat, or marginalisation by policies aimed at redressing the inequalities of the past. Apart from maintaining the status quo, these explanations also highlight the issue of competition between racial groups, which past research, such as that by Platow and Hunter (2001 cited in Finchilescu, 2005), has shown to negatively affect intergroup attitudes and interactions. High levels of competition and anxiety regarding past and potential

experiences of conflict between different racial groups are highly likely to be contributing to continued patterns of social self-segregation.

A number of external influences were also highlighted by participants as possible explanations for social self-segregation. Many participants felt that the tendency to self-segregate increased with age, and worryingly, associated this with an increase in maturity. However, they also attributed this trend to the influence of parents, peers and educational institutions. These influences are highly pertinent, particularly when one considers the importance for adolescents, in terms of identity formation specifically, of being accepted and judged positively by their peer group. Many of the explanations provided by the adolescents, such as external influences and racialised interests masked the direct influence of 'race' alone on the patterns, and served to not only externalise blame, but to present themselves in a positive light, one in which they could avoid being labelled racist and all the complex emotions attached to that label. This was often done through the use of discursive strategies and defences.

When participants' explanations were not geared towards justifying continued self-segregation, some of them expressed a resistance to this pattern of social interacting and many of them made use of strategies to portray themselves positively and to associate themselves with racial integration rather than segregation. It is questionable whether these views reflected an actual desire for greater social integration or if they were merely conforming to current social expectations and ideals. However, what the use of many of these strategies did highlight was the often neglected emotional nature of 'race' and the highly complex intra-psychic processes that accompany it. The strategies used, such as wit, avoidance, distancing, abjection, and outright denial, all served the participants in some way. These strategies seemed to be used by participants to either present themselves in a positive light, to reduce their anxieties, and/or to reduce their chances of being perceived as racist.

However, revealed in these strategies and embedded in the participants' explanations were many contradictions. When one considers the experiential and highly emotional

aspects of the topic this should not be surprising. Buttny (1999) found seemingly conflicting views in his analysis of students' discursive constructions of racial boundaries, difference and voluntary segregation, and argues that these contradictions are a reflection of "not only the complex and contested character of these issues, but also the participants' attempts at trying out and working through various discursive positions" (p. 260). The participants in this study were seen to be battling to make sense of something highly complex, abstract and hidden. These many contradictions were consequently understood by the researcher to be a reflection of a dilemma, similar to the "ideological dilemmas" proposed by Billig et al. (1988). This very real dilemma seemed to be characterised by a large discrepancy between a social ideal and the lived reality of 'race' relations in South Africa. While most participants, either overtly or through the use of strategies, showed an aspiration towards an ideal of racial integration socially, this ideal did not fit with the undeniable fact that their experiences and lived realities were predominantly characterised by self-segregation.

This dilemma is constantly reflected in this analysis, both in the contradictions within the participants' explanations and the seemingly conflicting arguments in the researcher's analysis of these explanations. I too found myself having to constantly engage with contradictions and relentlessly battled to make sense of and come to a clear-cut argument of my own. One could argue that psychologically, through a process of projective identification, the ambivalence of the participants was at times projected onto the researcher, who then identified with and played out this ambivalence in the analysis. In analysing the data I found myself constantly torn between being critical of what the participants presented and being optimistic about changes and less judgemental of their valiant attempts to make sense of something so complex. This report highlighted my own contradictory explanations, my own prejudices and tendency to racialise, and my own intra-psychic processes of guilt and denial. One of the main limitations of this research is its highly subjective nature. The constant reflexivity that this research required was highly revealing and anxiety provoking at times, which often heightened my respect for the participants who made such valuable contributions.

The most optimistic outcome of this analysis was that the very nature of the focus group discussion and the conflicting accounts that emerged from it, highlighted the fact that racial thinking and ideas on segregation and integration between and within young South Africans are still fluid and subject to change. These participants made courageous attempts to honestly battle with the complexity of 'race', which is so often avoided for fear of criticism or fear of facing the very difficult emotions they tend to evoke, particularly against the background of South Africa's socio-political history. In front of strangers and their peers they openly struggled to make sense of and engage with the very real ideological dilemma posed by the fact that the ideal of a racially integrated 'rainbow nation' of post-apartheid South Africa that they were brought up to believe in, on reflection, is so vastly different from their everyday lived reality of racialised differences, conflict and social self-segregation on the basis of 'race'.

Hammond Stoughton and Sivertson (2005), in explaining the potentially negative impact of discourses on beliefs about 'race' and subsequent racial identities and patterns of interacting, claim that "talking together and sharing social worlds can lay the groundwork for challenging dominant, taken-for-granted discourses and creating counter-discourses" (p. 292). These counter-discourses or alternative narratives are aimed at critiquing normalised dialogues that perpetuate racial stereotypes, validating the views of marginalised groups, and allowing 'white' students to question whiteness as the 'correct' or desirable way of being, by increasing awareness of the privilege and power held by racial positions (Hammond Stoughton & Sivertson, 2005). Bringing students of different racial groups together in dialogue, both formally and informally, should become a goal of the educational environment.

As can be seen, a range of explanations and socially constructed meanings were revealed in this research, many of which sought to justify a dominant pattern of social self-segregation. However, when one considers that this research was framed, maybe wrongfully so, as a project to elicit explanations for continued social self-segregation, it is not surprising that the bulk of responses given by adolescents come across as justifications for this pattern. If one were asked to debate a certain point, whether one

believed that point or not, it is hard for one's argument not to come across as being in support of that point. What has been vital in this analysis therefore, and it is hoped that this has been conveyed in this integration, is not just an analysis of the explanations, but an exploration of the possible function that these explanations may serve for the adolescents expressing them. As has been discussed, while some explanations appear to be aimed at maintaining the status quo or perpetuating racial stereotypes, revealing more contemporary forms of racism, in many cases the adolescents' often contradictory explanations have been aimed at making sense of a highly complex and often hidden ideological dilemma. In many ways the function of the meanings revealed and constructed in the focus group discussion, is to attempt to make sense of emotionally charged feelings of ambivalence and the contradictions between the socially imposed ideal of racial integration and their reality of social self-segregation. What we as researchers need to be wary of is imposing our own ideal of transformation onto this generation of adolescents while they themselves try to make sense of and find their own comfort zone socially amongst the chaos of a history of imposed segregation and a current idealized view of a completely integrated rainbow nation.

It is hoped that this research makes a contribution to the existing body of research on the micro-ecology of contact, both in terms of the qualitative description of spaces of social interaction in schools, and in terms of a much needed look at the meaning of these social interactions for the adolescents who participate in them.

REFERENCE LIST

- Allport, G.W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley.
- Ansell, A. (2004). Two nations of discourse: mapping racial ideologies in post-apartheid South Africa. *South African Journal of Political Studies*, 31(1), 3-26.
- Billig, M., Condor, S., Edwards, D., Gane, N., Middleton, D. & Radley, A. (1988). *Ideological dilemmas: A social psychology of everyday thinking*. London: Sage.
- Billig, M. (2002). Henri Tajfel's 'Cognitive aspects of prejudice' and the psychology of bigotry. *British Journal of Social Psychology* 41, 171-188.
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2003). *Racism without racists: color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in the United States*. Lanham: Rowan & Littlefield Publishers Inc.
- Bonilla-Silva, E., Goar, C. & Embrick, D.G. (2006). When whites flock together: The social psychology of white habitus. *Critical Sociology*, 32(2-3), 229-253.
- Branch, C.W. & Newcombe, N. (1986). Racial attitude development among young black children as a function of parental attitudes: A longitudinal and cross-sectional study. *Child Development* 57, 712-721.
- Brown, S.D. & Locke, A. (2008). Social Psychology. In C. Willig and W. Stainton-Rogers (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research in psychology*. (pp. 373-389). London, SAGE Publications.
- Buttny, R. (1999). Discursive constructions of racial boundaries and self-segregation on campus. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 18(3), 247-268.
- Calhoun, C. (1991). Indirect relationships and imagined communities: Large-scale social integration and the transformation of everyday life. In P. Bourdieu and J.S. Coleman (Eds.), *Social theory for a changing society*. (pp. 95-121). Boulder: Westview Press.
- Calhoun, C. (1995). *Critical social theory*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers.
- Carr, J.H. (1998). The complexity of segregation: why it continues. *Vital Speeches of the Day*, 64(20), 627-630.
- Carrim, N. (1998). Anti-racism and the 'new' South African educational order. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 28(3), 301-321.

- Christopher, A. J. (2005). Further progress in the desegregation of South African towns and cities, 1996-2001. *Development Southern Africa*, 22(2), 267-276.
- Clack, B., Dixon, J. & Tredoux, C. (2005). Eating together apart: Patterns of segregation in a multi-ethnic cafeteria. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology* 15, 1-16.
- Cockcroft, K. (2002). Theories of cognitive development: Piaget, Vygotsky, and information-processing theory. In D. Hooks, J. Watts, and K. Cockcroft (Eds.), *Developmental psychology*. (pp. 175-199). Landsdowne: UCT Press.
- Collins, A. (2004). Social psychology and research methods. In K. Ratele, N. Duncan, D. Hook, N. Mkhize, P. Kiguwa and A. Collins (Eds.), *Self, community and psychology*. (pp. 3.1-3.20). Landsdowne: UCT Press.
- Connolly, P. (2001). Qualitative methods in the study of children's racial attitudes and identities. *Infant and Child Development* 10, 219-233.
- Cowan, G. (2005). Interracial interactions at racially diverse university campuses. *The Journal of Social Psychology* 145(1), 49-63.
- Dawes, A. & Finchilescu, G. (2002). What's changed? The racial orientations of South African adolescents during rapid political change. *Childhood*, 9(2), 147-165.
- Dixon, J. & Durrheim, K. (2003). Contact and the ecology of racial division: Some varieties of informal segregation. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 42, 1-23.
- Dixon, J. & Tredoux, C. (2006). Off-space and on the sidelines: A reply to Marx and Feltham-King. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 36(3), 458-462.
- Dixon, J., Tredoux, C. & Clack, B. (2005). On the micro-ecology of racial division: A neglected dimension of segregation. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 35(3), 395-411.
- Dolby, N.E. (2001). *Constructing race: Youth, identity and popular culture in South Africa*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Dubow, S. (1989). *Racial segregation and the origins of apartheid in South Africa, 1919-36*. Oxford: Macmillan.
- Durington, M. (2006). Race, space and place in suburban Durban: an ethnographic assessment of gated community environments and residents. *GeoJournal*, 66, 147-160.

- Durrheim, K. & Dixon, J. (2004). Attitudes in the fibre of everyday life: the discourse of racial evaluation and the lived experience of desegregation. *The American Psychologist*, 59(7), 626-637.
- Durrheim, K. & Dixon, J. (2005a). *Racial encounter: The social psychology of contact and desegregation*. New York: Routledge.
- Durrheim, K. & Dixon, J. (2005b). Studying talk and embodied practices: Toward a psychology of materiality of 'race relations'. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 15, 446-460.
- Durrheim, K. (2005). Socio-spacial practice and racial representations in a changing South Africa. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 35(3), 444-459.
- Elkind, D. (1967). Egocentrism in adolescence. *Child Development*, 38, 1025-1033.
- Erikson, E. (1950). *Childhood and society*. United States of America: W.W. Norton & Co. Inc.
- Finchilescu, G. (2005). Meta-stereotypes may hinder inter-racial contact. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 35(3), 460-472.
- Fisher, R. (2007). *Race*. Auckland Park: Jacana Media.
- Flick, U. (1998). *An introduction to qualitative research*. London: Sage Publications.
- Foster, D. (1991). 'Race' and racism in South African psychology. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 21(4), 203-209.
- Foster, D. (2005). Racialisation and the micro-ecology of contact. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 35(3), 494-504.
- Foster, D. (2006). Theoretical and metatheoretical frames in inter-group psychology: Three competing perspectives. In K. Ratele (Ed.), *Inter-group relations: South African perspectives*. (pp 21-65). Cape Town: Juta & Co. Ltd.
- Goldberg, T. (1998). The new segregation. *Race and society*, 1, 15-32.
- Hammond Stoughton, E. & Sivertson, C. (2005). Communicating across cultures: discursive challenges and racial identity formation in narratives of middle school students. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 8(3), 277-295.
- Holtman, Z., Louw, J., Tredoux, C. & Carney, T. (2005). Prejudice and social contact in South Africa: A study of integrated schools ten years after apartheid. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 35(3), 473-493.

- Hook, D. (2006a). Psychoanalysis, discursive analysis, racism and the theory or abjection. In G. Stevens, V. Franchi and T. Swart (Eds.), *A race Against time: Psychology and challenges to deracialisation in South Africa*. (pp. 171-201). Pretoria: University of South Africa.
- Hook, D. (2006b). Racial stereotyping, fetishism, fantasy, racism. In K. Ratele (Ed.), *Inter-group relations: South African perspectives*. (pp. 300-335). Cape Town: Juta & Co. Ltd.
- Hook, D. (2006c). (Post)colonial racism: racial Otherness, the colonial stereotype and the model of fetishism. In G. Stevens, V. Franchi and T. Swart (Eds.), *A race against time: Psychology and challenges to deracialisation in South Africa*. (pp. 203-226). Pretoria: University of South Africa.
- Hook, D. & Vrdoljak, M. (2006). 'Fortress society': The 'gated community' and the politics of space, exclusion, privilege. In K. Ratele (Ed.), *Inter-group relations: South African perspectives*. (pp. 235-254). Cape Town: Juta & Co. Ltd.
- Holtman, Z., Louw, J., Tredoux, C. & Carney, T. (2005). Prejudice and social contact in South Africa: A study of integrated schools ten years after apartheid. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 35(3), 473-493.
- Kallaway, P. (2002). Introduction. In P. Kallaway (Ed.), *The history of education under apartheid, 1948-1994*. (pp. 1-36). Cape Town: Pearson Education South Africa.
- Karlson, J. (2002). Looking at apartheid school spaces. In P. Kallaway (Ed.), *The history of education under apartheid, 1948-1994*. (pp. 337-355). Cape Town: Pearson Education.
- Lea, S.J. (1996). 'That ism on the end makes it nasty': talking about race with young white South Africans. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 26(3), 183-190.
- Marx, J. & Feltham-King. (2006). Space-off: A critical commentary on the special focus section 'Racial isolation and interaction in everyday life'. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 36(3), 453-457.
- Moody, J. (2001). Race, school integration, and friendship segregation in America. *American Journal of Sociology*, 107(3), 679-716.
- Noble, T. (2000). *Social theory and social change*. New York: Palgrave.
- Pillay, N.S. & Collings, S.J. (2004). Racism on a South African campus: A survey of

- students' experiences and attitudes. *Social Behaviour and Personality*, 32(7), 607-618.
- Potter, J. & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Discourse and social psychology: Beyond attitudes and behaviour*. London: Sage.
- Prestwich, A., Kenworthy, J.B., Wilson, M. & Kwan-Tat, N. (2008). Differential relations between two types of contact and implicit and explicit racial attitudes. *British Journal of social Psychology*, 47(4), 575-588.
- Rattansi, A. (1992). Changing the subject: Racism, culture and education. In J. Donald and A. Rattansi (Eds.), *'Race', culture and difference*. (pp. 11-48). London: Sage Publications.
- Reid, K.S. (2002). Righting race. *Education Week*, 22(14), 28-35.
- Richards, G. (1997). *'Race', racism and psychology: Towards a reflexive history*. London: Routledge.
- Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in social context*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sadock, B.J. & Sadock, V.A. (2003). *Kaplan and Sadock's synopsis of psychiatry* (9th Ed.). Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.
- Soudien, C. (2007). The asymmetries of contact: an assessment of 30 years of school integration in South Africa. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 10(4), 439-456.
- Straker, G. (2004). Race for cover: Castrated whiteness, perverse consequences. *Psychoanalytic Dialogues*, 14, 405-422.
- Stevens, G. (1998). 'Racialised' discourses: understanding perceptions of threat in post-apartheid South Africa. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 28(4), 204-213.
- Swartz, L. & Rohleder, P. (2008). Cultural psychology. In C. Willig and W. Stainton-Rogers (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research in psychology*. (pp. 541-553). London: Sage Publications.
- Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Terre Blanche, M. & Durrheim, K. (1999). Social constructionist methods. In M. Terre Blanche and K. Durrheim (Eds.), *Research in Practice: Applied Methods for the Social Sciences*. Cape Town: UCT Press.

- Thompson, J.B. (1990). *Ideology and modern culture: Critical social theory in the era of mass communication*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Tihanyi, K. (2007). Racial integration in the USA and South Africa: lessons in a comparative perspective. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 11(2), 177-197.
- Tinberg, H. & Weisberger, R. (1998). In over our heads: Applying Kegan's theory of development to community college students. *Community College Review*, 26(2), 43-56.
- Tredoux, C., Dixon, J., Underwood, S., Nunez, D. & Finchilescu, G. (2005). Preserving spatial and temporal dimensions in observational data of segregation. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 35(3), 412-432.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (1999). Discourse and the denial of racism. In A.Jaworski and N. Coupland (Eds.), *The discourse reader*. (pp. 541-558). London: Routledge.
- Welman, J.C. & Kruger, S.J. (2001). *Research methodology*. (2nd Ed.). Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Wetherell, M. (1996). Group conflict and the social psychology of racism. In M. Wetherell (Ed.), *Identities, groups and social issues*. (pp. 175-234). Milton Keynes: the Open University.
- Young, G. (1997). *Adult development, therapy and culture: A postmodern synthesis*. New York: Plenum Press.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Letter Requesting Permission from the School for Part One of the Research

Dear Sir/Madam

My name is Anastasia Keizan and I am a postgraduate psychology student at the University of the Witwatersrand. As part of the Masters course in psychology, all students are required to conduct a research project.

My personal interest in South Africa's social transformation has led me to a research topic that focuses on issues of social interactions, integration and segregation among post-apartheid adolescents. My research will take two parts. The first part involves observations of adolescents in a natural social environment and the second part involves focus group discussions with a total of twenty adolescents. I would like to request permission to conduct the first part of this research at your school.

The first part of the research involves observing adolescents in a natural social space, to note patterns in their social interactions. The data gathering process will involve naturalistic observations of adolescents in a 'free' space during break for 5 consecutive days, preferably from a place where the learners will not be highly aware of our presence. I would personally be doing the observations with a colleague, during a week that suits you, your staff and your learners. I would also like to request permission to take photographs of the observed patterns of interactions. These photos will be used for data analysis and for the second part of the research (the focus group discussions), which will be conducted at another high school. The faces in the photos will be blurred to hide the identity of the participants and to ensure confidentiality. All photos and notes will be kept in a locked office and will be destroyed on completion of my degree. While there will be no direct risks or benefits of this study for your school or participants, I hope that this study will contribute to our understanding of social change in South Africa.

Thank you for taking the time to consider this request and I look forward to a response.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any concerns or questions.

Sincerely,

Anastasia Keizan
Masters Student
University of Witwatersrand
082 925 2907
stacey@myisp.co.za

Appendix 2: Letter Requesting Permission from the School for Part Two of the Research

Dear Sir/Madam

My name is Anastasia Keizan and I am a postgraduate psychology student at the University of the Witwatersrand. As part of the Masters course in psychology, all students are required to conduct a research project.

My personal interest in South Africa's social transformation has led me to a research topic that focuses on issues of social interactions, integration and segregation among post-apartheid adolescents. My research will take two parts. The first part involves observations of adolescents in a natural social environment and the second part involves focus group discussions with a total of twenty adolescents. I would like to request permission to conduct the second part of this research at your school.

The second part of the research involves two focus group discussions with two separate groups of adolescents. The data-gathering process will involve gathering information from approximately 20 adolescents between the ages of thirteen and eighteen years old about the meanings they attach to patterns of social interactions, integration and segregation. The 20 participants will be randomly selected from one or two class lists, with an attempt being made to sample for diversity. The participants will then be divided into two groups of 10 and will be invited to participate in the focus group discussion. One focus group discussion will be conducted per group over two consecutive days. I will personally conduct the focus group discussions, which will last 90 minutes each -during times that suit you, your staff and your pupils. I will also cover all issues of consent and confidentiality. All audio recordings and notes will be kept in a locked office and will be destroyed on completion of my degree. While this study will be not entail any direct risks or benefits for your school or participants, I hope that the study will contribute to our understanding of social change in South Africa.

Thank you for taking the time to consider this request and I look forward to a response.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any concerns or questions.

Sincerely,

Anastasia Keizan
Masters Student
University of Witwatersrand
082 925 2907
stacey@tarloy.co.za

Appendix 3: Information sheet for parent/guardian of potential participant

Information Sheet

Dear parent/guardian,

My name is Anastasia Keizan and I am a postgraduate psychology student at the University of Witwatersrand. As part of the masters course in psychology, all students are required to conduct a research project in partial fulfilment for the degree of Masters in Psychology.

My personal interest in South Africa's social transformation has led me to a research topic that focuses on issues of social interactions, integration and segregation among post-apartheid adolescents. My research will look specifically at relations and patterns of social mixing among teenagers between the ages of thirteen and eighteen years old and how they make sense of these patterns. I would like to invite your child/ward to participate in this study.

The procedure involves watching adolescents interact in a natural social environment, followed by two group discussions with a total of twenty adolescents, who have been selected as potential participants in this study, based primarily on their age, their gender, and the fact that they attend an integrated school. The potential participants have been selected by the researcher from a class list, based on their gender, age and their race (as the study requires a group of participants that are relatively representative of the South African population). The focus group discussions will be conducted by myself and will last approximately ninety minutes each. The focus group discussion is structured around a number of photos of social interactions, which have been selected to facilitate relevant questions and discussions on social interactions, integration and segregation. Questions and discussions may touch on potentially sensitive issues, such as race. However, the aim of the focus group is to explore the adolescents' opinions as opposed to any potentially sensitive experiences. There will therefore be no direct risks or benefits for the participants. Participants in the study will face no negative consequences if they refuse to answer questions that they feel are sensitive or that they do not want to answer. They also have the right to withdraw from the study at any point. While I, and the other focus group members, will know the names of the participants in the study, their names will not be documented on transcripts. Focus groups will be audio recorded (see consent forms attached), however I will ensure that the content of the discussions will not be heard by or discussed with anyone, other than with my research supervisor and in my final research report –where no names will be used. While direct quotes may be used in the final research report they will not be accompanied by the participant's name or any identifying information. All audio tapes and transcripts will be kept in a locked cupboard in my office and will be destroyed after completion of the degree.

Even though it will be emphasized to all participants that comments made during the focus group session should be kept confidential and all participants will be asked to sign a confidentiality agreement, it is possible that participants may repeat comments made in these discussions outside of the group. Therefore, I must point out my limits in protecting confidentiality.

Lastly, participation in this research is entirely voluntary. There will be no negative consequences if you do not want your child to participate, and participants may withdraw from the study at any time with no penalty. Please feel free to contact me at 082 925 2907 or via e-mail at stacey@tarloy.co.za if you have any further questions or if you would like an electronic summary of the research results at the end of the research process. Thank you for taking the time to consider the participation of your child/ward in this study.

Sincerely
Anastasia Keizan

Appendix 4: Information sheet for potential participants

Information Sheet

Dear learner,

My name is Anastasia Keizan and I am a postgraduate psychology student at the University of Witwatersrand. As part of the masters course in psychology, all students are required to do a research project in partial fulfilment for the degree of Masters in Psychology. The purpose of my research is to study social interactions and relations and their meanings for teenagers.

I would like to invite you to participate in this study.

The procedure involves a group discussion which will be guided by myself. Your participation in this study will last about ninety minutes and we will be taking two ten-minute breaks. The discussion is structured around a number of photos, which have been selected to encourage relevant conversations and debates. There will be no direct risks or benefits of participating in this study for you. You will face no negative consequences if you do not want to answer any questions or make any comments. You have the right to withdraw from this study at any point. While I, and the other focus group participants, will know your name, your name will not be documented on the notes. This discussion will be audio recorded (see assent form attached), however I will ensure that the content of the discussions will not be heard by or discussed with anyone, other than with my research supervisor and in my final research report –where no names will be used. While direct quotes may be used in the final research report they will not be accompanied by your name or any identifying information. All audio tapes and notes will be kept in a locked cupboard in my office and will be destroyed after completion of the degree.

Even though it will be emphasized to all participants that comments made during the focus group session should be kept confidential and all participants will be asked to sign a confidentiality agreement, it is possible that participants may repeat comments made in these discussions outside of the group. Therefore, if you choose to participate I encourage you to be as honest and open as you can, but be aware of the researcher's limits in protecting confidentiality.

Lastly, participation in this research is entirely voluntary. There will be no negative consequences if you do not want to participate, and you may withdraw from the study at any time with no penalty. Please feel free to come and talk to me if you have any questions or concerns or if you would like an electronic summary of the research results at the end of the research process. Thank you for taking the time to consider participation in this study.

Sincerely
Anastasia Keizan

Appendix 5: Consent form to participate

CONSENT FORM

I..... (Parent/Guardian) have discussed the study (described in the Information Sheet attached) with my Child/Ward and hereby give consent for his/her participation in the research to be undertaken by Anastasia Keizan with the full understanding that the participation is voluntary, and refusal to participate will involve no penalty. I understand that there will be no risks or benefits of the research for my child/ward. I give consent for direct quotes to be used in the final research report, with the full understanding that no identifying information will accompany these quotes. My Child/Ward may refuse to answer any questions and may withdraw from the study at any time.

Signature of Parent/Guardian:

Date:

Appendix 6: Consent form to record

CONSENT FORM FOR RECORDING

I..... (Parent/Guardian) hereby give consent for the focus group discussion involving my Child/Ward in the research (described in the Information Sheet attached) by Anastasia Keizan to be recorded onto audio tape with the full understanding that the tapes will not be heard by any person other than the researcher, and that no identifying information will be used in the transcripts or the research report. Audio tapes and transcripts will be kept in a locked cupboard in the researchers office and will be destroyed after the completion and marking of the research.

Signature of Parent/Guardian:

Date:

Appendix 7: Assent form to participate

ASSENT FORM

I..... hereby agree to participate in the research to be undertaken by Anastasia Keizan with the full understanding that the participation is voluntary, and refusal to participate will involve no penalty. I understand that there will be no risks or benefits of the research for me. I give consent for direct quotes to be used in the final research report, with the full understanding that no identifying information will accompany these quotes. I may refuse to answer any questions and may withdraw from the study at any time.

Signature of Participant:

Date:

Appendix 8: Assent form to record

ASSENT FORM FOR RECORDING

I..... hereby agree for the focus group discussion, which I have assented to participate in (described in the Information Sheet attached) conducted by Anastasia Keizan to be recorded onto audio tape with the full understanding that the tapes will not be heard by any person other than the researcher, that they will be kept in a locked cupboard in the researchers office and will be destroyed after the completion and marking of the research. No identifying information will be used in the transcripts or the research report.

Signature of Participant:

Date:

Appendix 9: Researcher's descriptions of patterns of integration and segregation observed in phase one of the research

- Day One:
 - Field
 - Large group of 'white' learners –four males and four female- sitting in the sun talking
 - One group of 'black' and 'coloured' learners integrated sitting under shade cloth –six females and two males ('black' and 'coloured')
 - Two 'black' males sit and talk together
 - Next to them is a group of two 'black' females and one 'Indian' female
 - Males of all 'races' played rugby together –approximately two 'black', one 'Indian' and three 'white'
 - Group of five 'white' females stand next to group of all 'white' males and females
 - Two of these 'white' females join the large group of 'white' males and females and the other three go and sit together under the shade cloth
 - One group integrated on the basis of 'race' and gender sat in the middle of the field –approximately three 'black' females, two 'coloured' females, two 'black' males, one 'white' male and one 'white' female
 - Apart from one group and the male learners playing rugby, all other groups were self-segregated to some extent on the basis of 'race' with most groups being integrated on the basis of gender. While the groups of 'white' learners were completely segregated, 'black', 'Indian' and 'coloured' learners seemed to integrate with relative ease.
 - Approximately 41 learners
- Day Two
 - Playground
 - Group of seven 'white' females at table under a tree talking and eating –later joined by three more 'white' females

- Group of two 'black' females, one 'black' male, one 'coloured' male and one 'coloured' female sitting at table under shade cover, talking and eating –later joined by another two 'black' males and one 'coloured' male
- The same two 'black' males and 'coloured' male then start throwing a rugby ball around with another 'coloured' male
- Two 'black' and one 'Indian' female sit together at a table under the trees
- Group of males –two 'white', one 'Indian', and two 'black' playing cricket
- 'Black' and 'Indian' males leave together and the two 'white' males leave the playground together
- Approximately 27 learners
- Day Three
 - Playground
 - Group of males –one 'Indian' male and four 'white' males playing cricket
 - Three 'white' females talking as they walk through the playground
 - Two 'black' males walk through the playground together
 - Two females –one 'black' and one 'Indian' talking and eating walk through the playground
 - Three females –one 'black', one 'Indian' and one 'coloured' sitting on the periphery
 - Two 'white' females and one 'white' male sit under thatch together –later joined by another 'white' male
 - Two 'white' males talking casually
 - Two males –one 'black' and one 'coloured' in a heated discussion
 - 'White' female sitting alone eating –later joined by three 'white' females and a 'white' male
 - Two females –one 'coloured' and one 'black' - talking with three males –two 'black' and one 'coloured'
 - The two 'black' males walk over to the table of 'white' learners (male and female) sitting under the thatch –talk to them for approximately two minutes and then walk away
 - Approximately 33 learners

- Day Four
 - Field
 - Boys of all races playing rugby –four ‘white’, one ‘black’, one ‘coloured’ and one ‘Indian’
 - Three ‘black’ males sitting eating and talking
 - Large group of nine ‘white’ females sitting eating and talking under shade cover –joined by two more ‘white’ females
 - Four of the ‘white’ females walked over to the three ‘black’ males –spoke to them, shared some food and then walked away (+/- 5 minutes)
 - Same four ‘white’ females a minute later joined by two ‘black’ males. The three ‘black’ males in the middle of the field were joined at the same time by one ‘coloured’ male. As the group of ‘black’ males and ‘white’ females went their separate ways one ‘white’ female continued speaking to one ‘black’ male, who later joined the group of ‘black’ and ‘coloured’ males in the middle of the field
 - Two ‘black’ females came onto field talking
 - Two ‘black’ females and one ‘coloured’ female stand in a semi-circle talking and eating
 - A few metres away three ‘white’ females stand in a semi-circle eating and talking
 - Males slightly more spread out on the field.
 - A group of ‘black’ and ‘coloured’ males stand in a group eating and talking
 - A group of males of all four racial categories play cricket together
 - Two ‘black’ males and one ‘white’ female walk down to the field together while they talk, one ‘Indian’ male walks alone a few metres in front of them
 - ‘Indian’ male turns around and talks to ‘black’ male and ‘white’ female while eating and walking
 - Behind them another ‘black’ male and ‘white’ female casually talk to each other on the steps while eating before going their separate ways

- 'White' female walks with the 'black' male and 'Indian' male to the centre of the field and stands eating on the outskirts of a circle of learners made up of 'black', 'Indian' and 'coloured' males, most of whom have their backs to her
- The group is then joined by two 'white' males and is now made up of eleven learners in total. The two 'white' males talk briefly to a 'black' male and then converse mostly with each other
- The 'white' female talks to the 'Indian' male and two 'black' males and the group becomes slightly more spread out as a cricket ball comes there way
- The group splits into two groups. One group made up of three 'black' males and one 'coloured' or 'black' male, and the second group is made up of three 'black' males, one 'Indian' male, two 'white' males and one 'white' female
- Five 'black' females and one 'Indian' female walk down the stairs and onto the field talking to each other, while some drink cold drink
- The group casually split into two with some of the girls being joined by one 'black' male and the other girls joining a group of two 'white' females
- Two groups of 'white' females and one group of 'black' females continue to sit separately under the shade cover while they eat
- The two 'white' females that were joined by the group of five 'black' females and one 'Indian' female continue to sit together but converse very little. The 'black' and 'Indian' females talk to each other while the two 'white' females, who are sitting slightly outside of the group observe another group of learners on the field while they eat. One of the 'white' females seems to be studying from a textbook
- A 'white' male teacher comes onto the field and observes the males (four 'white' and one 'Indian') playing cricket.
- A number of different groups are now spread out over the field. The three largest groups are:
 - Group of five 'black' and one 'coloured' males

- Group of five ‘black’ females, one ‘Indian’ female and two ‘white’ females
 - Group of two ‘black’ males, two ‘white’ males, one ‘Indian’ male and one ‘white’ female
- The rest of the groups on the field are smaller (made up of two to four learners each) are racially divided with the groups being either exclusively ‘white’ or exclusively ‘black’
- These groups are positioned on the outskirts of the field
- The group of ‘black’ and ‘coloured’ males after a few minutes merge with the group of learners that is integrated on the basis of ‘race’ and gender
- A ‘black’ male talks to a group of four females (three ‘black’ and one ‘coloured’) on the outskirts of the field
- The racially integrated groups, particularly the group integrated on the basis of ‘race’ and gender are constantly moving and shifting in terms of composition of learners and space used
- The racially segregated groups remain relatively static in terms of members and position
- Learners leave the field primarily in the groups in which they were sitting. Females mostly leave first followed by males. Group integrated on the basis of ‘race’ and gender leave last.
- Approximately 53 learners
- Day Five
 - Field
 - Learners are dressed in casual wear (not school uniforms)
 - Limited number of learners on the playground initially
 - Group of three ‘black’ females sit together under the shade cloth
 - Group of four males –three ‘black’ and one ‘coloured’ walk across the field into the shade
 - Five ‘white’ females come onto the field in groups of two and three and then sit in a group under the shade cloth
 - ‘White’ male plays alone with rugby ball

- Two 'black' females and one 'Indian' female walk across to the far end of the field and sit on the periphery of the field
- 'Black' male joins the existing group of 'black' males
- Three 'white' males come onto the field and start to play cricket
- The rugby-playing 'white' male is joined by two 'black' males and the two sports playing groups slowly integrate
- 'Black' male and 'coloured' male go over to group of 'white' females and talk to them for a few minutes
- Group of 'black' and 'coloured' males that were sitting in the shade come to the centre of the field and observe the males playing rugby and cricket
- 'White' male, 'black' male and 'Indian' male walk onto the field together talking. They are then joined by a 'black' male who was playing cricket
- Males of all 'races' spread out over the field either playing sports or talking but constantly shifting in groups, spaces and activities
- Hot day and the need for shade brings the different racial groups in close proximity to each other under the shade cloth. Hard to see where one group ends and the other begins as they're constantly moving.
- Three 'black' males sharing cold drink stand in a group in the shade with 'black' female and 'Indian' male next to the group of 'white' females
- Two 'black' females and 'Indian' female on the far end of the field joined by another 'black' female
- Two 'black' females, 'coloured' female, 'Indian' male, 'black' male and 'white' male stand in a circle in the shade and talk
- A number of males continue to play sports with cricket being dominantly 'white' males (approximately five 'white' males and one 'coloured' male) and rugby dominantly 'black' males (approximately four 'black' males and one 'white' male –later joined by a few more 'black' and 'coloured' males)
- 'White' male later leaves field with the rugby ball and this is followed by what looks like a brief 'play fight' between two 'black' males, which is observed by the remaining rugby-players

- Learners all leave the field slowly, primarily staying in the groups they were sitting or playing with
- Approximately 34 learners

Appendix 10: Semi-Structured Focus Group Schedule

- Introduce myself and my research
- Outline the order of events for the focus group
- Explain confidentiality and request that all participants keep the contents of the discussions confidential. Get all participants to sign a confidentiality agreement.
- Icebreaker –go around the group and get everyone to say their name, their age and one thing about their background or context
- Explain that I'm going to put up some photos and I'd then like to get their views on the photos:

PAGE ONE (Photo 1):

Group of teenagers on a sports field socialising.

- I'd like you all to look at this photo and just describe to me what you see?
- Can you point out any patterns you notice in the way people are sitting or socialising? Any friendship patterns?
- Why do you think this pattern is occurring?

PAGE TWO (Photos 2, 3 and 4):

Group of teenagers in a school setting self-segregated on the basis of 'race'.

- Describe to me what you see in this photo?
- Can you tell me a little bit about any patterns you notice in the way people are sitting or socialising? Any friendship patterns?
- Why do you think this pattern is occurring?

PAGE THREE (Photos 5, 6 and 7):

Group of adolescents in a social setting racially integrated.

- Describe to me what you see in this photo?
- How is this photo different or similar to the last one?
- Can you tell me a little bit about any patterns you notice in the way people are sitting or socialising? Any friendship patterns?
- Why do you think this pattern is occurring?

- Do you think the people in the photo have chosen to sit like that?
- Why?

PAGE FOUR (Photos 8 and 9):

Group of boys racially integrated playing sports together.

- Describe to me what you see in this photo?
- Tell me a little bit about the pattern you see in this photo?
- Why do you think this is occurring?

Put all photos up together.

- Which photo best depicts your experience of social interactions or friendship patterns at your school?
 - Why?
 - Which photo do you think depicts most people's experiences of social interactions in South Africa?
 - Why?
 - Do you think that boys or girls are more likely to integrate?
 - Do you think South African society is fully integrated?
 - Why do you think it is or isn't?
-
- Lastly, if you had to use the apartheid system of racial classification to classify yourself racially ('black', 'white', 'Indian' or 'coloured'), what 'race' would you say you belong?
 - Final comments or questions?
 - Basic summary of things discussed
 - Extend invitation for individual debriefing or counselling should anyone wish to discuss any of the issues discussed in the focus group privately
 - Thank them for participation –remind them about confidentiality

Appendix 11: Confidentiality agreement for focus group participants

CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT

I..... hereby agree to keep all comments made in this focus group discussion confidential. I will not repeat any comments made by any participant in the course of this focus group discussion outside of the group at any time in the future.

Signature of Participant:

Date:

Appendix 12: Photographs used in the focus group discussion



PHOTO ONE



PHOTO TWO



PHOTO THREE



PHOTO FOUR



PHOTO FIVE



PHOTO SIX



PHOTO SEVEN



PHOTO EIGHT



PHOTO NINE