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ABSTRACT

The need for an effective group programme to improve Black-White relations on desegregated university campuses in South Africa was identified as the focal area of concern of this study. A particularly urgent need to address the issue of Black-White relations in the University of Natal was shown to exist in view of its rapidly increasing multiracial student composition relative to other South African university campuses. Local and international literature was reviewed to provide guidelines for the construction and evaluation of appropriate programmes that reflected the dominant approaches that characterise group therapeutic strategies of improving intergroup relations. A significant absence of rigorous scientific evaluation of intervention strategies was noted.

Two longitudinal, biracial group programmes were selected for evaluation viz. Group Programme A and Group Programme B. Programme A was reflective of a confrontational approach and Programme B was reflective of a non-confrontational approach. The programmes were based on the assumptions of humanistic psychotherapy, social psychological and sociological theories of prejudice formation and racism, and social learning theory.

The project utilised an experimental before and after control group design. Forty five Black and 45 White students were randomly selected from a pool of first-year university students who fulfilled designated selection criteria. Fifteen Black and 15 White students were randomly assigned to Groups A, B and C. Groups A and B were subjected to Programmes A and B respectively while Group C was used as the control.
Four evaluation measures were used pretest and posttest viz. the Philosophy of Human Nature Scale, Heimler Scale of Social Functioning, Racial Discomfort Questionnaire and a Behavioural Interaction Change assessment.

All four research hypotheses adopted were confirmed by the data analysis. The study highlighted the effectiveness of Group Programme A in improving Black-White relations. It was demonstrated that contact per se was not sufficient to improve race relations among university students. The central importance of developing insight into barriers in interracial communication was emphasised. While both Black and White students benefitted significantly from their participation in the Group Programmes, Black students derived fewer benefits than White students.

Several recommendations were made for the utilisation of the research findings in university and wider communities. Further research possibilities arising from the present study were explored.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1. PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION

Desegregated universities in South Africa are presently encountering the phenomenon of intergroup tensions (Leon and Lea, 1988; Louw-Potgieter, 1987; "Perceptions of Wits", 1986). An urgent need exists for effective social change programmes to manage this phenomenon as these tensions, consciously and unconsciously, affect the well-being of all victims of such tensions (Katz, 1979).

To date only one report (Bernstein and Gray, 1989) has emerged on the management of intergroup tensions in desegregated South African universities by means of a social change programme. This appears to be an understandable situation since desegregation, at university only, became a reality six years ago with the acceptance of the new Educational Policy in 1984 (White Paper, 1983). In 1983, the Extension of University Education Act of 1959 was repealed (Webb, 1987). It was hence no longer necessary for Black (African, Indian and "Coloured") students to obtain ministerial permission in order to register at so-called "White" universities except in certain specified fields viz. Medicine, Pharmacy and Surveying. In 1985 the remaining restrictions were relaxed. The Minister of Education retained the right to impose racial quotas in respect of Black admissions to White universities. Universities which have adopted the option to have a non-racial admissions policy are referred to as "open" universities.

It is possible that the previously small numbers of Black students at open universities and the continued legalised discrimination against Blacks have deterred social scientists from addressing intergroup tensions with greater vigour. However, it is the author's opinion that with the present and growing numbers of Black students at open
universities the fact that these students continue to live under conditions of social and political segregation confronted with ambivalence, could potentially lead to an exacerbation of existing tensions.

1.1 University Enrolment Figures

A survey of enrolments at desegregated universities provided the following information:

University of Natal

At the University of Natal, of a total enrolment of 12,724 students in 1988, African students constituted 1,442 (11%), Indians 2,075 (16%), "Coloureds" 268 (2%) and Whites 8,939 (71%). The overall growth rates in this same period were African (15.9%), Indian (8.2%), "Coloured" (2.3%) and White (2.2%). The bulk of the variance in growth was due to the rapid growth of African and Indian enrolments at two campuses of the university viz. Howard College and Pietermaritzburg (See Table 1). The 1990 student statistics revealed increases for the Black groups and decreases for Whites (Student Affairs, 1990). Of a total enrolment of 13,630, African students constituted 1,953 (14%), Indians 2,654 (20%), "Coloureds" 294 (2%) and Whites 8,729 (64%). Black students evidently constitute 36% of the student enrolment of University of Natal at present. The Medical School campus is a Blacks only campus. This is a legally imposed restriction (Simpson, 1987). Black students have been resisting recent attempts to lift this restriction. They are of the opinion that until the six other predominantly White medical faculties in the country have a non-racial admissions policy the Natal Medical School should be restricted to Blacks only.
## Table 1
Comparative Registration Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CENTRE</th>
<th>YR</th>
<th>AFRICAN</th>
<th>COLOURED</th>
<th>INDIAN</th>
<th>WHITE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOWARD COLLEGE</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1025</td>
<td>5006</td>
<td>6903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>4875</td>
<td>6515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>4736</td>
<td>6125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>4790</td>
<td>6064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>4779</td>
<td>5760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>4524</td>
<td>5216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECHNIKON</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDGECWOOD</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDICAL SCHOOL</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIETERMARITZBURG</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>3502</td>
<td>4450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>3414</td>
<td>4216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>3310</td>
<td>3953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>3280</td>
<td>3902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>3130</td>
<td>3548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>3125</td>
<td>3470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1442</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>2075</td>
<td>8939</td>
<td>12724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1244</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>8744</td>
<td>12168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>8509</td>
<td>11540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>1580</td>
<td>8434</td>
<td>11247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>8228</td>
<td>10479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>7928</td>
<td>9800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Student Affairs, 1988
The University of Natal comprises three campuses viz. Howard College, Pietermaritzburg and Medical School campuses. However, certain students of the Faculty of Education and the Faculty of Science at the Howard College Campus are placed at the Edgewood College of Education and the Natal Technikon primarily for the purposes of practical work. It is apparent from Table 1 that placement of University of Natal students at these institutions is limited. Change in Black:White university student ratios in these institutions is insignificant as they are still predominantly White because of their admission restrictions.

An examination of the enrolment statistics from 1983 to 1988 reveals that the two campuses with non-racial admissions policies, viz. Howard College and Pietermaritzburg, have rapidly increasing Black enrolment figures relative to a trend towards a decrease in White enrolment figures. It is noteworthy that the student enrolments of these two campuses constituted 89% of the total University of Natal student enrolment in 1988.

**University of Witwatersrand**

At the University of Witwatersrand, of a total enrolment of 18 718 students in 1988, African students numbered 1 987 (11%), Indians 1 316 (7%), "Coloureds" 259 (1%), Chinese 205 (1%) and Whites 14 951 (80%) (Computer Centre, 1988). Black students evidently constituted 19% of the student enrolment of the University of Witwatersrand.

**University of Cape Town**

Van der Merwe (1987) reported that Black students made up 20% of the student body of the University of Cape Town.
University of Durban-Westville

At the University of Durban-Westville, a previously Indian university, of a total enrolment of 6,734 students in 1988, Africans constituted 1,551 (23%), Indians 4,728 (70%), "Coloureds" 174 (3%) and Whites 281 (4%) (Computer Records, 1988).

It is evident from these figures that a significant degree of interracial contact is occurring at university level and that the tensions arising from such contact need deliberate intervention. This situation is particularly true, with regard to Black-White contact, for the University of Natal with its present 36% Black enrolment.

1.2 The University of Natal: Its response to the needs of its changing student population

The University of Natal, the campus on which the present study was conducted, has recognised the fact that significant changes in the racial composition of its student population is a reality as is illustrated by the following extract from the principal's letter to the staff in October 1988:

"...numbers of White school leavers will decline over the next twenty years and the numbers of Black (African) school leavers will increase dramatically over this period. The consequences of this for the university with an open, nonracial admissions policy is that the racial mix of our student population will continue to change."

In fact, it has now been predicted that by the year 2010 Blacks will constitute 80% of student enrolments and Whites 20% (Robbins, 1990).
In accordance with these anticipations and the recognition that Black students have been disadvantaged by deprived economic and educational backgrounds, the University is attempting to respond to the challenge. Its primary focus has been financial and academic, with peripheral attention to the social environment of students. The Student Support Services unit has been instrumental in acquiring funds for the sponsorship of disadvantaged students, the provision of tuition and an experimental research "Teach-Test-Teach" (TTT) programme. The TTT programme is a research response to the Black (African) students' disadvantaged educational background. It is an endeavour to develop a dynamic assessment procedure of Black students' potential to engage effectively in university studies, as an alternative to selection based on matriculation examination points. It has a broader purpose of investigating the learning-teaching situation once Black students are at university, in order to develop the necessary educational foundations for successful study. TTT participants are required to fulfill the following criteria:

(a) Their matriculation results must be insufficient for normal university entry.
(b) They must have already completed matric and have a matriculation exemption, or qualify for a conditional exemption.
(c) They must have a direct link to a community-based project/organisation from which they can be nominated and to which they could in turn give their services during university vacation.
(d) They must be able to secure their own funds for university studies.

Thus far the programme has been restricted to candidates interested in Arts and Social Science. It is envisaged that, in the near future, TTT will be extended to students interested in Law and Commerce. At present the Engineering, Science and Commerce Faculties have developed their own faculty-specific bridging programmes which allow Black students who have not met the present selection criteria for admission to attend a one-year bridging course which leads to the first year of university study.
Participants in TTT are exposed to a two-week programme which has the following aims:

(a) To give students an experience of university learning and teaching and to develop their understanding of the way education at university works
(b) To provide students with guidance to reveal their academic potential
(c) To assess and monitor students' increasing ability to benefit from and contribute to learning opportunities

These aims are achieved through:

(a) Lectures, assignments, and tests given by university lecturers on topics and problem-solving situations typical of university studies
(b) Educational development workshops and expert guidance on the consolidation of lecturing inputs
(c) Opportunities for self-study and group learning with the assistance of senior students

At the end of the two-week programme, selections are made on the evidence of an increasing ability during the two-week period to learn how to engage appropriately in the problem-solving tasks typical of Arts and Social Science studies at university. On admission to university, the selected students are given extensive foundation courses on a reduced credit course load i.e. fewer courses are attempted for examination purposes.

This ambitious academic programme has an ambitious social expectation. It is anticipated that TTT students will play the role of agents of change. It is hoped that
the students will function as mediators between the university and its Black community. It is envisaged that discussions on the following issues will occur:

(a) The type of education needed and the most suitable way for this to happen

(b) The types of careers which are needed and whether university is necessarily the right place for those who want to further their education

In order for the university to become an integral part of the communities it serves, especially its massive Black community, it needs to be involved in various outreach efforts. The TTT programme is one such endeavour. Webb (1987) suggested that other endeavours should include:

(a) Restructuring of courses and the redesigning of syllabi to meet the needs of an African milieu

(b) Conducting in-service training and development programmes for lecturers and tutors

(c) Providing guidance to assist White students to adjust to the racial change of student bodies on open campuses

(d) Conducting extensive research in the field of educational planning and policy

(e) The establishment of consultative structures through which the university can be informed of Black community aspirations and needs

With regard to the University's social environment, attempts have been made to alert administrative services to potentially disruptive interactions with different race groups. The staff was exposed to a comprehensive client relations training programme in 1987 (Tyrrell, 1987). However, minimal attempts have been made by the university as a whole to respond to the need for resolution of intergroup tensions among students in student-student interaction. Certain departments have attempted to relate to this issue. The Student Counselling Centre has offered an optional personal growth programme once a semester since 1987. This service has been utilised primarily by White students. In 1988, the Centre ran a workshop to explore racial tensions in residences. The Social Work Department initiated two proactive...
programmes for students in that department viz. the Working Together Programme and the Buddy System (Welch, 1988). Bernstein and Gray (1989) have produced a comprehensive description of the Working Together Programme. This was an experiential programme which was aimed at improving interracial relationships within a social skill-learning context. The Buddy System was designed to socialise incoming disadvantaged students into the reality of university life and provide learning skills to keep the failure rate of disadvantaged students at a minimum.

Welch (1988) argued that harmonious intergroup relations are a continuous, cumulative process. No single programme can be expected to eradicate intergroup tensions completely. Instead, a variety of programmes can provide positive working together experiences for members of racially different groups. Such experiences are hypothesised to begin the process of extinction of racially negative attitudes.

It is evident from the above review that social change efforts are at a rudimentary level at the University of Natal. In view of the fact that this university has the highest proportion of Black students (36%), it is imperative that it extends its outreach efforts to include effective social change programmes.

The findings and recommendations of the Main Committee of the Human Science Research Council (HSRC) (formed to co-ordinate a nation-wide investigation into intergroup relations in South Africa) highlighted the importance of social change efforts in all sectors of South African society. In 1980, the Research Priorities Committee of the HSRC identified "intergroup relations" as the most important problem area for research in view of its critical psychosocial and political implications for all inhabitants of South Africa. A massive research project was designed to identify a wide range of factors related to peoples' quality of life and means of fulfilling their aspirations. A large team of 208 contract researchers was utilised, while a further 150 persons contributed from their fields of expertise. Among the
various findings and recommendations described in the final report of the Main Committee (Main Committee: HSRC Investigation into Intergroup Relations, 1985), the following are pertinent to the present project:

(a) Among other factors, comparison of one's own group with other racial groups is a vital contributory factor in people's evaluation of their quality of life.

(b) From the analysis of interpersonal contact, it was concluded that "a primary condition for contact to result in more positive attitudes is that such contact must occur spontaneously, informally between people of equal status and on a friendly basis" (p. 91).

(c) "Anything that institutionalises, and thus perpetuates prejudice and stereotyping in education should be eliminated. Education should be aimed at cultivating better understanding between groups" (p. 169-170).

(d) "Communication channels should be created between members of all the population groups and, in cases where such channels already exist, they should be used effectively" (p. 171).

2. THE SEARCH FOR AN APPROPRIATE SOCIAL CHANGE PROGRAMME

In an effort to develop a social change programme appropriate to the present South African context, the author reviewed South African and international literature on social change programmes for the improvement of intergroup relations. In South Africa, although scientific interest in intergroup relations has been recorded since 1930, only four group programmes directed at social change have been reported on. Lever (1965) successfully manipulated social distance in a sample of White university students by using three methods of teaching about "race and intelligence". Louw-Potgieter (1982) studied the effects of an emotional compensatory type programme in a sample of Black university students. Forgus and Forgus (1983) utilised multiracial groups to study the effects of skilled mediation on interracial communication.
Bernstein and Gray (1989) reported on a Working Together Programme which was successfully used with a group of multiracial, multicultural first year Social Work students. The issue of interracial contact has been addressed in a few ex post facto studies (Foster and Finchilescu, 1986; Luiz and Krige, 1981; Mynhart, 1982; Russel, 1961; Spangenberg and Nel, 1983 and Watson, 1970). In the main, South African literature on intergroup relations dwells on racial attitude studies (Edwards, 1984; Lever, 1980; Louw-Potgieter, 1982; MacCrone, 1975; Mann, 1971; Rajab and Chohan, 1980).

While research efforts have been limited, a variety of reformist organisations, such as Women for Peace, Kontak and The Youth Leadership Forum, as well as certain industries, have been showing increasing interest in targeting Black-White encounters for social change (Geldenhuys, 1985). Concern for interracial harmony in South Africa was expressed as early as the 1920s. Several local bodies were formed by liberal-minded and philanthropic Whites to improve race relations (Hellmann, 1980). These were referred to as Joint Councils of Europeans and Africans, Europeans and Indians and Europeans and Coloureds. These bodies failed in their main field of endeavour viz. combating racial discrimination because their modus operandi was criticised by conservative Whites and some radical Blacks and Whites.

In 1929, the South African Institute of Race Relations (SAIRR) was formed to coordinate the activities of these local councils and to intensify their efforts. The impetus for these activities is apparent in the following observation by Hellmann (1980):

..in the twenties the predominant characteristic of the White group, secure in its hegemony and cushioned in its relative isolation, was its unawareness of the conditions of life under which the other racial groups lived. This unawareness was particularly manifest in the towns where, despite the growing townward flow of
Africans, the majority of Whites remained largely oblivious of their presence and their needs. (p. 3)

It is indeed remarkable that this observation still holds true sixty years later in the 1990s. The main objectives of SAIRR were:

(a) To work for peace, goodwill and practical co-operation among the various sections of the populations of South Africa

(b) To initiate, support, assist and encourage investigations that may lead to greater knowledge and understanding of the racial groups, and of the relations that subsist or should subsist among them

The bulk of the work of the SAIRR appears to have been focused on producing information about racial attitudes in South Africa. With due credit for the importance of scientific evidence, programmes focusing directly on racism and racial prejudice were absent until 1977 when the Human Awareness Programme (HAP) was founded on the initiative of Archbishop Hurley. While the HAP was initially associated with the SAIRR it developed into an independent organisation. Its central aim was to reach wider circles of the White power structure and to express the urgent need for change, particularly in current attitudes towards power-sharing (Heilmann, 1980). According to van der Merwe, Nell, Weichel and Reid (1980), the activities of the HAP are centred around three main areas:

(a) Matters related to employment practices in general and the Code of Employment Practices in particular

(b) Specific change-oriented groups with a view to devising group techniques aimed at combating personal and institutional racism

(c) Setting up of pace-setter groups that encouraged community members to take action and responsibility for their own future by forming interest groups to examine societal problems and search for structures that might help to speed up change
Noteworthy among the HAP's publications is a handbook, Challenge to Change (1983), which contains a wide variety of practical change strategies which could be used by both experienced and inexperienced community workers. While most of the exercises have been designed for use with White groups, some exercises are highly suitable for Black-White groups. To date, none of these strategies has been integrated into a programme for evaluative purposes. This change-strategy handbook represents a highly valued contribution towards interracial harmony in South Africa.

Another umbrella body viz. the Centre for Intergroup Studies (CIS) was established in Cape Town in 1968 to co-ordinate the work of smaller intervention groups. For the first five years of its existence it was called the Abe Bailey Institute for Inter-Racial Studies. It is highly likely that this organisation derived its momentum from the Civil Rights Movement that was at its peak in the United States at that time. The CIS identified its main goal as that of contributing towards peace in South Africa by enabling and empowering conflicting groups to handle their differences constructively, creatively and co-operatively. It has sought to achieve this goal at community, regional and national levels. In its twenty first anniversary review (Centre for Intergroup Studies, 1990), its main activities are listed as being in the following four areas:

Mediation and Facilitation as a third party in community and political disputes

Training of potential third parties and of those involved directly in disputes, to build their negotiation and mediation skills

Education of the general public as to the potential of negotiation and mediation as constructive tools for conflict handling

Research, focused primarily on ways of promoting communication between conflicting groups, and reducing violence (p. 3)
In a society as divided as South African society, the CIS has a vital role to play in opening doors of communication between various political groupings and in keeping existing doors open. However, the work of this organisation does not attack the nub of racism and racial prejudice in any concerted way. Thus far the CIS has sponsored only one published interracial experimental programme viz. the study by Forgus and Forgus (1983).

It is apparent that the subject of interracial harmony in South Africa has received the attention of social scientists for several decades. However, the development of anti-racism and anti-racial prejudice programmes is highly limited. Although South African society is racially divided at both legal and social levels, it is likely that varying perceptions of racial problems and political priorities in South Africa have diffused any concerted effort to confront the question of racism and racial prejudice. However, it is beyond the scope of this thesis to expand on this wide-ranging sociopolitical phenomenon.

Turning to international literature, especially American literature, in a comprehensive review, Simpson and Yinger (1985) identified five categories of social change programmes viz. exhortation, propaganda, contact, education and tolerance through therapy (individual and group therapy). Group intervention, the focus of the present study, has been utilised in forms such as groups dealing with school integration problems, encountertape groups, biracial groups not directly oriented to racial problems and biracial groups to reduce interracial tensions (Samuels, 1972). According to Samuels (1972), groups function best when they meet once weekly for one and a half to two hours for a period of about 12 weeks. It is theorised that through group therapy members would develop greater insight into themselves and sensitivity to the needs of others and this in turn would lead to reduction in prejudice (Khan, 1963, cited in Rubin, 1967). While group therapy as a whole has been found
to have positive results, Samuels (1972) noted that evaluation efforts are limited. Rubin (1967) and Katz (1979) reported successful outcomes in the use of group therapy to reduce racial prejudice. However, according to Lieberman (1973), group therapy is only effective in biracial groups and has an outcome similar to that for contact studies. Lieberman, hence contended that it may be unnecessary to use the skills of encounter group leaders to bring about change in racial attitudes. Analyses of practices in desegregated educational institutions provide evidence to support Lieberman's contention. Programmes involving co-operative interactions between students of different races have been found to be most likely to improve race relations (Slavin and Madden, 1979; Forehand, Ragosta and Rock, 1976). Welch (1988) and Bernstein and Gray (1989), in a similar vein, contended that co-operative interracial interaction in self-awareness training and skill development can improve interracial relationships.

Group programmes appear to be based on two broad approaches. First, there is the confrontational approach which involves interracial encounter and catharsis for the mutual goal of eroding racial prejudices, racism and racial antagonism, and recognition of the other race member as an individual. Secondly, there is the non-confrontational approach which involves interracial working together on one or more issues of mutual interest. The co-operative experience and the opportunity for the establishment of familiarity is expected to erode racial prejudices, racism and racial antagonism, and foster non-prejudiced relationships. The confrontational approach has its origins in the theory and assumptions of humanistic psychotherapy (Samuels, 1972). The non-confrontational approach is based on the theory and assumptions of social psychology, sociological theories of prejudice formation and social learning theory. However, the theoretical underpinnings of these approaches do tend to overlap significantly as will be seen in the discussion of theoretical rationale of intergroup relations programmes in Chapter Three.
Like Samuels (1972), Simpson and Yinger (1985), reported that only a small proportion of time and energy spent in trying to improve intergroup relations is devoted to research on issues such as the effectiveness of specific programmes. It follows that further research would provide answers related to the effectiveness of programmes and the nature of successful programmes.

With regard to the question of evaluation, Katz (1979) recommended the use of the Steckler Anti-Black and Anti-White Scales and the Attitude Exploration Survey to assess attitude change and the Behavioural Rating Scale to measure behaviour change. Rubin (1967) used the Sentence Completion Test to measure self-acceptance, the Human-Heartedness Scale to measure acceptance of others and the Psychological Anomie Scale to measure anomie in their programme evaluation. In a review of group therapy methods to reduce interracial prejudice and tension, Samuels (1972) cited the usage of the following tests for programme evaluation: the Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale, the Steckler Anti-Negro Scale, the Steckler Anti-White Scale, the Ford Personal Contact with Whites Scale, the Rosander Anti-Negro Scale, the Ford Negative Personal Contacts with Negro Scale and the Kelly Desegregation Scale. It is evident that in general these studies utilised one or more measures of social distance and one or more measures of personality variables that are reactive to personal growth programmes. However, for the purposes of a study in a non-American culture, these instruments are limited in that the social distance scales have a strong American bias and the personality measures are not standardised for non-American cultures.

Overall, in both South Africa and the USA, while fairly active attempts are being made in the community to promote harmonious intergroup relations, research is extremely limited. Rigorous experimental control is generally lacking in the reported studies. However, building blocks do exist on which a programme relevant to the South African university situation could be developed.
2.1 Programme Proposal for Present Study

The South African context is unique in that university students experience interracial contact in a non-contact society. Hence, on a daily basis the potential experience of a student would be stereotype reduction through contact on campus and stereotype reinforcement through non-contact in the social environment and through vicarious family reinforcements. The socio-political life experience of Black and White students inevitably makes them wary of each other. The question to ask is whether group therapy programmes that are successful in facilitating intergroup relations in a completely desegregated society would work effectively in a population which is limited to university desegregation. A related question is whether a confrontational or non-confrontational approach is more applicable in the South African situation.

To answer these questions, the author utilised two types of programmes, one based on a confrontational approach and one based on a non-confrontational approach. In both instances the composition of participants was biracial. Programmes differed only in terms of focus. Programme A was confrontational in that it had a racial focus and Programme B was non-confrontational in that it had a life theme focus. Both programmes had the potential to facilitate intergroup relations. While A assumed insight into interpersonal racial issues and intimate interracial sharing experiences as the basis for improved intergroup relations, B utilised insight into the intrapersonal issue of values clarification and intimate interracial sharing experiences to be the basis for improvement in intergroup relations. Programme A was an adaptation of a race relations programme designed by Parker (1979) and Programme B was a life theme programme designed by Judy Marsh (cited in Drum and Knott, 1977). Both programmes utilised a structured group approach to cater for their application to group sizes of 30. Each comprised six once-weekly one and a half hour sessions. The time-limited nature of the programmes and the number of participants included made them highly attractive in terms of cost-effectiveness - a critical variable in the
light of the high demand for the limited health services that exist at present. The choice of group programmes will be motivated in greater detail in Chapter Two.

Improvements in race relations were measured in terms of Philosophy of Human Nature (PHN) ie. perceptions of Blacks/Whites of each other, Social Functioning (SF), Racial Discomfort (RD) and selected small-group Behavioural Responses. Improvement was thus measured in terms of a comprehensive range of variables using instruments most suitable to the South African context. The choice of evaluation instruments will be motivated in Chapter Two.

3. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

3.1 Aim

The aims of the research were:

(a) To investigate whether Black-White relations among university students would change along selected psychosocial dimensions subsequent to exposure to group therapeutic programmes

(b) To investigate whether specific group therapeutic programmes effect greater change in Black-White relations along selected psychosocial dimensions among university students
3.2 Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were tested:

(a) Experimental Group A will show significant posttest changes in Philosophy of Human Nature, Racial Discomfort, Social Functioning and selected Behavioural Responses.

(b) Experimental Group B will show significant posttest changes in Philosophy of Human Nature, Racial Discomfort, Social Functioning and selected Behavioural Responses.

(c) There will be no significant differences between the posttest changes in Philosophy of Human Nature, Racial Discomfort, Social Functioning and selected Behavioural Responses of Groups A and B.

(d) There will be no significant posttest changes in Philosophy of Human Nature, Racial Discomfort, Social Functioning and selected Behavioural Responses in Control Group C.

4. DESCRIPTION OF TERMS

In the context of the present study, the terms Philosophy of Human Nature, Social Functioning, Racial Discomfort and Black were defined as follows:

(a) Philosophy of Human Nature (PHN)

Philosophy of Human Nature was defined in terms of eight dimensions described by Wrightsman (1974), viz. Altruism, Trustworthiness, Strength of Will/Rationality, Independence, Complexity, Variability, Cynicism and Belief in Conventional Goodness.
(b) **Social Functioning (SF)**

Social Functioning was defined in terms of the following indices generated by analyses of item responses of the Heimler Scale of Social Functioning (Van Zyl, 1986) viz. Satisfaction Index, Frustration Index, Positive Uncertainty Index, Negative Uncertainty Index, Least Frustration Index during highest satisfaction, Highest Frustration Index during least satisfaction, Satisfaction Index at least satisfaction, Satisfaction Index at highest satisfaction and the Optimism/Pessimism Index.

(c) **Racial Discomfort (RD)**

Racial Discomfort was defined in terms of three indices derived from the responses of the Racial Discomfort Questionnaire, viz. Feeling Index, Action Index and Total Discomfort Index.

Further details on the above terms will be given in Chapter Three where measuring instruments are described in detail.

(d) **Black**

The term Black was used to describe members of three population groups which had undergone chronic political oppression in South Africa viz. Africans, Indians and "Coloureds". Black is the official term utilised on the University of Natal campus to describe these groups. In South Africa this broad definition of Black has been previously adopted by Tyson Schlacter and Cooper (1988). The authors acknowledge that Africans, Indians and "Coloureds" are culturally and attitudinally different. However, they argue that the major dichotomy in South Africa is a Black-White dichotomy, and that as a result of the rejection of ethnicity by many politicised "Blacks" a unity has developed among them. The authors noted that the results of their study of racial prejudice suggested that their use of this broad generic term was appropriate. The Minority Rights Group Report (Whitaker, 1985) cited Quintin Kynaston Comprehensive School policy on racism and sexism. This
school used the term "Black" to refer to both Afro-Carribbean and Asian people. The use was justified in terms of the common experience which both Afro-Carribbean and Asian people have of being victims of racism and their common determination to oppose racism.

5. SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS

In this section the potential practical and theoretical value of the research is explored. Further, attention is focused on limitations that need to be considered in interpreting the research findings.

From a professional ethical point of view, it is unsound mental health practice to ignore the alienation of Black students, the guilt of White students and the denial of social realities by some Black and White students. Such professional blindness serves to perpetuate individual, institutional and cultural racism. Dominelli (1988) identified seven strategies employed by White society to avoid confronting racist practices:

(a) Denial. This refers to the refusal to accept that racism exists, especially in its cultural and institutional forms. Racism is thought of as personal prejudices held by a few extreme and irrational individuals.

(b) Omission. This refers to the ignoring of the racial dimension in social interactions. The relevance of race is not seen in most situations, and social interaction occurs as if racism did not exist.

(c) Decontextualization. This is a refusal to accept that racism permeates everyday activities. Racism is seen to exist elsewhere eg. in America.

(d) The Colour-Blind Approach. Black people are treated as if they were the same as Whites. The Black person’s experience of racism is negated.

(e) The "Dumping" Approach. This refers to the placing of the responsibility for the creation of racism and its elimination on Black people. Black people are viewed as poor and lacking in skills and in need of upliftment. Hence Blacks are held responsible for racist perceptions of them.
(f) **The Patronising Approach.** White ways are treated as the standard and Black ways are perceived as "quaint" and requiring tolerance.

(g) **Avoidance.** This refers to the avoidance of confronting racism although an awareness of the phenomenon exists. For instance, the individual may flinch at racist behaviour but does not do anything about it.

Within the university context, with its multiracial body of students, an exciting opportunity exists for social scientists to break through such non-productive societal strategies by active use of anti-racist, anti-prejudice programmes. Such action would be in keeping with the perception that a university which is truly concerned with education needs to "liberate, to open up the mind, to prepare people to create, to reform culture, to change, to question.... (and) to act" (Meerkotter, 1987, p. 40). The following extract by Gray and Bernstein (1989) aptly elaborates the role of the university in facilitating social change:

> Universities are an integral part of the wider community and must be responsive to social needs. This does not mean, however, that they only respond to needs as society expresses them but are also able to make projections of future trends and requirements. Universities have a moral obligation to lead rather than follow, to innovate, to question and debate social issues, and through relevant research to find possible solutions to societal dilemmas. Universities in South Africa have a special responsibility to work towards the dismantling of apartheid and the achievement of a fair and just society. (p. 39)

Implicit in Gray and Bernstein's argument is the need and obligation for the university to relate to racism and associated phenomena inherent in apartheid society in a productive way. Educated guidance for such action can emanate only from rigorous research of intervention strategies. The present research is a response to this vital need. It is a pioneering effort to address individual racial prejudice, racism and antagonism concretely. The programmes under investigation provide Black and White students with the unique opportunity to confront the chronic, divisive social
pathologies of racial prejudice, racism and antagonism under the supervision of a social scientist. This systematised confrontation is designed to facilitate trust, acknowledgement of racially separate identities, intimate awareness of both Black and White sociopolitical and personal realities, cathartic expressions of antagonisms and guilt, identifying of change strategies and commitment to personal change in interracial interaction. These broad experiences are expected to play a significant role in the process of conscientisation. Freire (1970) described conscientisation as the process whereby individuals make connections between the social relations they endorse and perpetuate through their attitudes, values and behaviour, and the social positions they occupy. This process is vital in South Africa for both Black and White people. Segregation of races encourages acceptance and accommodation of unjust practices. Conscientisation empowers both Black and White people to act productively towards a just society. It is evident that a proactive stance, on the part of the university, towards the phenomena of racial prejudice, racism and racial antagonism will foster much needed social change in the wider community.

Theoretically, it is unclear whether a confrontational (CA) or a non-confrontational approach (NCA) would be more effective and practical in the South African context. Neither does theory provide guidance as to when either approach is of greater use. It is the author's impression that while similar mechanisms are at work in both approaches, in CA an active breakdown of defenses is facilitated and in NCA an atmosphere conducive to the breakdown of defenses is created. It is within this conducive atmosphere that individuals are expected to drop their defenses naturally and address issues of mutual racial concern. It would appear that CA is more threatening to participants and hence requires professionally trained facilitators. Further, Black people perceived themselves as being used to teach Whites about racism in CA (Katz, 1979). It is likely NCA was adopted to avoid the threatening nature of CA and to cope with both the shortage of professionally trained facilitators and the Black criticism of CA. In summary, it would appear that the use and
adoption of NCA was simply expeditious. These are the author’s speculations. The present research will provide an answer as to whether the confrontational aspect of social change programmes is crucial to the goal of interracial change. Without such guidance, defensive facilitators may simply adopt NCA because it is more comfortable.

A perplexing issue is whether social change efforts would be equally beneficial to both Black and White individuals. It has been argued by Katz (1979) that Blacks have been used in interracial groups to teach Whites about racism. She concluded that this was further exploitation of Blacks by Whites. She contended that it would be more just and appropriate for Whites to work among themselves and own their problem of racism. In the South African context, to commence interracial work in university settings may be premature in view of legal segregation of the races residentially and at pre-university levels of education. While interracial work may be beneficial in various ways to White students, it may not be beneficial to Black students who may regard associating with White students as fraternising with the oppressor. Black students may perceive interracial work as weakening their defenses against the harsh social realities of the wider community. In describing the Working Together programme, Bernstein and Gray (1989) mentioned that Black students resisted involvement because they considered the programme irrelevant to their needs and they did not consider it their function to teach White students about discrimination. To contend with such issues the views of Black and White student representative bodies were canvassed to ascertain their perceptions of the usefulness of interracial work on the University of Natal campus. No resistance was encountered.

Answers to the various issues associated with the question of mutual racial benefit of interracial programmes cannot be readily and comprehensively elicited through questionnaires and surveys. While students may express various concerns, they would
not be able to say to what extent these concerns would affect their involvement in interracial work. It is only through the experience of participating in interracial work that the nature and extent of these concerns can be elucidated.

In summary, this study has the potential to:

(a) Provide the vital impetus for much needed social change in both the university and the wider community

(b) Guide practitioners as to whether a confrontational or a non-confrontational approach is more appropriate in the South African setting

(c) Guide practitioners in the field of intergroup relations as to whether intergroup programmes based on programmes devised in non-segregated societies are useful in the South African setting

(d) Provide evidence to establish whether intergroup relations programmes have differential value for Blacks and Whites

(e) Provide much needed corroborative evidence in the field of intergroup relations improvement strategies.

The present study is limited in that:

(a) Generalisability of the findings is restricted by the sample selection criteria of the investigation. This limitation is unavoidable in an experimental study.

(b) The Black sample constituted two legal categories of people (Indian and African) who are culturally and attitudinally different. A non-alignment of these two categories of individuals in the Black group and a failure on the part of the White group to perceive this alignment may blur the focus on Black-White relationships. However, the successful use of this definition by Tyson et al (1988) is a reasonable basis for optimism.

(c) The six-week period may be insufficient for the participants to assimilate and integrate their programme participation benefits. This is an unavoidable limitation in that a longer programme would increase the risk of drop-out.
(d) Generalisability is restricted to groups run by a Black facilitator as the facilitator was Black in this investigation. The fact that the facilitator has been providing psychotherapeutic services for several years to a predominantly White student body would facilitate an equal acceptance by both Black and White students. This would lower the significance of this limitation.

(e) A significant extraneous variable not within experimental control is that of the enthusiasm of the facilitator.

Despite the limitations identified, this investigation will provide a much needed basis for future research in which a variety of manipulations of independent variables can be used to verify the findings of this research. From a practical perspective, this investigation will provide applied social scientists in educational institutions with both a rigorously evaluated programme and an informed frame of reference to manage intergroup tensions within the student bodies they service. At a wider societal level, similar programmes could be used in industrial and community settings. Such interventions have the enormous potential to awaken the social consciences of people and to equip them with the necessary skills to assert their rights and exercise their interpersonal influence in the performance of valued social roles (Solomon, 1976).
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In this chapter all the literature relevant to the investigation has been reviewed. The majority of the references were obtained via Dialog Searches viz. PSYCHINFO (1967-1990), ERIC (1966-1990), SOCIOLOGICAL ABSTRACTS (1963-1990) and a Human Science Research Council computer search (1969-1988). The review begins with a description of the effects of racial desegregation in universities in both South Africa and abroad. Thereafter, a description of responses to the outcome of university desegregation in South Africa and abroad is given. The subsequent sections on intergroup relations programmes and the theoretical rationale for such programmes lead on to the justification of the design and method of the present investigation.

1. THE EFFECTS OF RACIAL DESEGREGATION IN EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

1.1 The South African Context

A few quasi-experimental and survey studies have addressed the question of the effects of racial desegregation in educational institutions in South Africa. These studies appear to fall into two categories viz. those that focus on prejudice reduction among White students and those that focus on the problems experienced by Black students in open universities.
In an extensive study of prejudice reduction, Mynhart (1982) tested 972 English-speaking White schoolgirls. The students were drawn from ten different Roman Catholic private schools. The sample was divided into a group which had no institutional contact (ie. contact in institutions such as schools and places of worship) and a group which had contact. Contact conditions were favourable in that institutional support was strong and attendance was voluntary. Using several attitudinal measures, girls in the contact group were found to be significantly more prejudiced towards Africans, Indians and Afrikaners than non-contact girls. Both groups had similar attitudes to Coloureds. In another contact study of 113 trainee nurses by Finchelescu (cited by Foster and Finchelescu, 1986) positive results were obtained. Fifty six nurses were drawn from two hospitals with integrated nurse training programmes (contact conditions) and 57 nurses were drawn from two hospitals with non integrated programmes (non-contact condition). Contact in the hospital situation was considered to be co-operative, frequent and intimate. The within-situation status was similar in terms of qualification, job, position and duties. In terms of social-structural status identity or political category, Black nurses were regarded as low-status and White nurses were regarded as high-status. Dependent measures included: (a) ratings of the advantages of integrated training, (b) salience of race in determining how nurses are treated in hospitals and (c) evaluations of hypothetical target nurses of different race groups in terms of "personality" and "work ability" (measures of ingroup and outgroup bias). Beneficial effects of contacts were true for Whites in that their ingroup bias was lower and there was greater support for integrated training. For Blacks, ingroup bias increased and salience of race categorisation was higher. The researchers explained this racial difference in outcome in terms of Whites' high-status position and their secure intergroup position.
From the above two studies, it is apparent that contact resulting from desegregation in educational institutions creates racially harmonious attitudes in certain groups in certain situations only. In other words, interpersonal contact between people of different race groups is not a sufficient condition in itself to improve race relations. This is a widely accepted finding (Allport, 1954; Amir, 1969; Carithers, 1970; Cook, 1962; Foster and Finchelescu, 1986; Sherif and Sherif, 1953; Simpson and Yinger, 1985).

The range of studies dealing with problems experienced by Black students on open campuses is as scant as the first category. Honikman (1982) conducted the first major study that focussed on the problems of Black students. She investigated the experiences of first year students at the University of Cape Town in an attempt to identify factors that influence students' well-being and academic performance. A significant focus was on the problems experienced by Black students. For Black students, transition to university stresses were compounded by inadequate educational background. Experience of initial confusion and alienation was greater for these students. In addition problems of accommodation, transport and finance were critical. Honikman explained this finding in terms of her proposal that the university is a micro-society which is experiencing problems generated by the macro-society of apartheid South Africa. This study demonstrated that Black and White students experience differential effects of the apartheid society. Leon and Lea (1988), in a report of their research, cited papers presented at conferences describing the socio-emotional experiences of Black students on open campuses. Reference was made to the finding of alienation in 90% of Black students at University of Cape Town and difficulties in adjusting to the 'Whiteness' of campuses. In their own study these researchers interviewed 10 Black and 10 White students from the University of Cape Town. They reported from quantitative and qualitative analyses of their data that Black students experienced far greater alienation than White students. The data
was gathered by means of semi-structured interviews which were taped. Alienation was reported to have stemmed from three broad categories:

(a) Material i.e. accommodation, transport and finance

(b) Academic i.e. feeling underprepared for university

(c) Social i.e. not feeling integrated into the university which was perceived as catering for the interests of Whites

The authors claimed that their findings suggested that for students at University of Cape Town, the socio-political goals of liberation took preference over the personal individualistic aspirations of Black students, whereas White students had predominantly personalised goals. This assertion has been made by other workers who have researched Black pupils viz. Danziger (1975) and Du Preez, Bhana, Broekman, Louw and Nel (1981). The following quotation epitomises the Black students' sense of alienation, struggle and aspiration:

We are still hoping that the administration will do something in the near future that will make us not to view our presence here as torture but as a forum through which we can facilitate our efforts to bring about change in this country.

University of Natal Forum Lecture:
Chairperson of AZASO, 1986

Closely associated with the Black students' experience of alienation is the Black students' experience of racism on open campuses, both overt and covert. Louw-Potgieter (1987) cited unpublished reports of racism on three open campuses viz. University of Witwatersrand, University of Cape Town and Rhodes University. This researcher studied covert racism at the University of Natal by use of Essed's Attributional Approach. She utilised a sample of 29 Black students. Data was gathered by student interviewers by means of unstructured interviews which were taped. The results of this study confirmed the existence of covert racism at the University of Natal. It was found that Black students did not react in an
oversensitive, intolerant manner by construing all unacceptable and disruptive behaviours as racist. Instead, their experiences were valid and authentic. Students reported racism at all levels of contact with staff and fellow students.

Tyson, Schlachter and Cooper (1988) used a behavioural measure to study racial prejudice in South African students. They used the playing strategy in the Prisoner's Dilemma Game¹ (see footnote) as an unobtrusive measure. The degree of cooperation between players was used as a behavioural measure of discrimination. Competitive choices were regarded as discriminatory. It was argued that the use of paper and pencil tests to measure racial prejudice was problematic in that factors such as social desirability concerns of White subjects and suspiciousness of Black subjects could significantly influence responses on these tests. The sample studied comprised 30 Black and 30 White male university students. While racial prejudice was demonstrated in five Black students, the phenomenon of reverse discrimination was demonstrated among seven White students. Paternalistic co-operation was defined as reversed discrimination. The authors speculated that this phenomenon may be a characteristic of South African Whites who are brought up in a more liberal tradition. No conclusion was made about the usefulness of the game playing strategy as an unobtrusive measure of racial prejudice.

¹ The Prisoner's Dilemma Game is a laboratory technique used by social psychologists to study conditions under which people compete or co-operate (Khan, 1984). The game is played in pairs. Seated on opposite sides of a board, subjects may choose to press either of two buttons on the board in front of them. They make their choices simulatneously and are given a payoff in accordance with a system known to them. Each push of a button constitutes one trial of the game. Normally the game consists of many trials.
It is clearly evident from this review that studies of the effects of desegregation in educational settings in South Africa are extremely limited. This position may, to a large extent, be related to the fact that universities have only been permitted by law to have racially open admission policies since 1984 and that such permission has been granted in isolated cases at secondary school level. Given this limitation, the findings and assertions of this neophyte body of information are in keeping with the literature. Contact is evidently not a sufficient condition in itself to improve race relations. Instead, a predictable replay of the macro socio-political scenario appears to be occurring on university campuses.

1.2 The International Context

International desegregation research is dominated by work done in the United States of America and the United Kingdom. Research in these countries on the effectiveness of educational desegregation in achieving integration in the form of interracial mixing and prejudice reduction will be reviewed.

According to Schofield (1986), much progress has been made in America since the late 1960s towards achieving the goal of racial desegregation of schools. She noted that the proportion of Blacks in 90 - 100% minority schools (i.e. schools attended predominantly by Blacks) had been reported by the US Commission on Civil Rights to have been halved between 1968 and 1980. However, old attitudes and habits persist as is evidenced by the fact that after many high schools had been racially desegregated for nearly a decade, they were not necessarily racially integrated (Parker, 1979).
Slavin and Madden (1979) noted that "many advocates of school desegregation have always expressed the hope that students of different races attending school together would learn to get along with each other, and that the ultimate outcome of integrated schools would be a truly integrated society, without prejudice or interracial hostility" (p. 169). However, it is evident from the literature that students' learning to get along together has not necessarily occurred. Schofield and Sagar (1977) studied seating patterns in desegregated schools. They found that students chose their seatmates according to race (i.e., Blacks usually sat next to Blacks and Whites next to Whites). Wellisch, Marcus, MacQueen and Duck (1976) found that schools with segregated seating patterns in classrooms were less likely to have students mixing across racial lines during recess and lunch than those with mixed seating patterns. Evidently, these workers considered seating preferences to be an index of racial integration. Schofield (1986) reported that students voluntarily resegregated themselves in a variety of situations, from eating lunch to participating in extracurricular activities. An extensive, two-year study of seating patterns in the cafeteria of a school with an equal Black-White enrolment epitomises the extent of this segregation. It was found that on a typical day when the seating positions of approximately 250 students during any particular lunch-period were recorded, fewer than 15 of them sat next to someone of the other race (Schofield and Sagar, 1977). Schofield (1986) asserted that the more personal the nature of a task-oriented academic interaction was, the more White and Black students tended to choose to work with peers of their own race. This assertion is in keeping with the finding that in the wider society, interracial contact is minimised in situations which require intimate contact (Brooks, Sedlacek, and Mindus, 1973; Triandis and Davis, 1965).

Together with the phenomenon of voluntary segregation by students, resegregation has occurred as a result of White parents preferring to send their children to private schools (Banks, 1986; Schofield, 1986). Banks (1986) cited a report by the American
Council on Education that, in 1984, Black ethnic minorities constituted the majority of public school enrolments in 23 out of 25 of the nation's largest cities. This situation emphasises the White parental contribution to the phenomenon of resegregation.

To investigate the general effects of desegregation, St John (1975) examined over 40 studies conducted between 1954 and 1974. No consistent pattern emerged. Reviews by Cohen (1975) and Carithers (1970) produced similar findings. Carithers (1970) cited two studies that described the Black experience in previously White tertiary institutions. The first was a study by Bindman (1965). Black students were reported to be isolated and alienated by the university's bureaucracy, staff and administration and by White students. This experience appeared to reinforce their suspiciousness of Whites. The second was a study by Graham (1967). In a programme designed to assist disadvantaged students, Black students were found to have the ability and desire, but little will, to learn. They were reported to be wary of authority and suspicious of White middle class. Black males, in particular, were found to be preoccupied with identity crises. In her extensive review of the literature, Carithers (1970) concluded that the question, "What are the effects of desegregation?" is too broad and vague. She suggested that future research should take into account environmental factors, such as social life of a given school and what activities a school fosters, when addressing this question.

Slavin and Madden (1979) went a step further in that they shifted the emphasis from effects to variables which could be manipulated and which determined whether the outcome was positive or negative. They used questionnaire data collected by the Educational Testing Service in 51 high schools. The practices of assigning students of different races to work together and to participate in a sports team with students of another race produced strong, positive effects on racial attitudes and behaviours for
White students. Assigning students of different races to work together and providing teacher workshops on race relations had limited behavioural effect for Blacks. In addition, individual participation in biracial work groups or sports teams had strong positive effects on racial behaviours and attitudes. Slavin and Madden concluded that programmes involving co-operative interactions between students of different races are most likely to improve race relations in desegregated schools.

In the course of just over three decades of research, the questions asked by researchers have become more refined and directed towards providing guidelines for institutions as to which activities facilitate integration. This is indeed a long way from expecting contact per se to result in harmonious interracial behaviour. However, experimental evaluative studies of programmes are necessary for more sophisticated management of interracial issues.

2. RESPONSES TO THE OUTCOME OF RACIAL DESEGREGATION IN EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

2.1 The South African Context

It is evident from the previous section that published work on responses to the effects of desegregation in universities in South Africa is limited. Published work on efforts to improve intergroup relations is equally sparse. To provide a perspective on the beginnings of this fledgeling discipline in South Africa, all relevant works will be described.

In the era of segregated education at university, Henry Lever produced two publications on intergroup relations. In 1965 he conducted the first experimental study in the area of intergroup relations in South Africa. He attempted to demonstrate that the attitudes of Whites towards Blacks was not natural as was
commonly believed among laymen in South Africa. He utilised a pretest-posttest research design with three experimental groups and one control group. The total research sample of 210 White university students was divided into four groups matched on sex, religious affiliations and social distance in respect of Africans. Social distance was measured by the Bogardus Social Distance Scale. The groups were randomly assigned to the three experimental treatments. Treatments constituted a live lecture on "Race and Intelligence" (Lecture Group), self-study and discussion of the same lecture in print (Discussion Group) and self-study of the lecture in print alone (Reading Group). Posttesting 12 weeks later revealed that all treatments produced a reduction in Social Distance, - the Lecture and Discussion being equally effective and Reading being least effective.

In 1972 Lever published a highly comprehensive article on a programme to reduce intergroup tensions. He described 13 practical approaches which were directed at broad societal change. These approaches ranged from education to organised religion. He suggested that the primary base for work was the Church and its congregations. The active participant in the change process was seen to be White.

A decade later Forgus and Forgus (1983) published the first report of an evaluative study of an intergroup relations programme in a community setting in South Africa. They used skilled mediation to facilitate and improve communication between members of three racial categories. The sample constituted 15 males and 12 females of whom seven were African, eight Coloured and 12 White. On the basis of their rating of speed of desired change they were divided into four groups: slow, conservative change (N = 6); fast change (N = 6); moderately fast change (N = 7); moderately slow change (N = 8). In selecting the sample of 27, only people who were committed to ending racial discrimination were invited to participate. The groups participated in discussions to find ways of effectively changing practices of racial
discrimination in South Africa. The groups met once a week for two, one-hour sessions for the first two weeks. To obtain heterogeneity in group compositions, some members were swapped between Groups 1 and 2 to form Groups 1a and 2a. The same was done with Groups 3 and 4 to form 3a and 4a. The new groups met for a further two weekly meetings. The aim of this step was to create two situations, the first to enhance "within-group communication" and the second to enhance "between-group communication". Techniques utilised in family and group therapy, creative problem-solving groups and mediation were employed. Responses were recorded along eight categories by the use of audiotapes for each session. The response categories viz. seek information, give information, lead, follow-through, agree, disagree, positive affect and negative affect were decided on after a careful analysis of group themes and styles. This study demonstrated that communication transmission in the area of sociopolitical problems can be facilitated by the application of group dynamic and mediation principles and the use of techniques developed in clinical and experimental psychology. The effects were greatest for the fast-change group and the moderately heterogenous group. Changes were reflected in the increase in total number of responses per group, and particular increases in information-seeking and follow-through and decreases in leadership and disagreement responses. While this pioneering study by Forgus and Forgus (1983) is comprehensive it has the serious flaw of lacking controls.

At a Black university campus, Louw-Potgieter (1982) developed a programme for victims of racial prejudice and discrimination in South Africa. To test the programme, she used 13 Black undergraduates, aged 21-57 years. The programme entailed: (a) a group discussion of the wider social setting of racial prejudice and discrimination in South Africa, (b) exercises in recognising and describing emotions, (c) a lesson on the concepts of self image and ideal self, (d) lectures on positive
personality development despite frequent exposure to racial prejudice, and (e) an evaluation of the programme. Thirteen of the original 25 subjects gave positive feedback on the outcome of the programme.

Bernstein and Gray (1989) published the first report on the use of an intergroup relations programme in an open university setting. This programme, the Working Together Programme was devised in response to the need of the university "to restructure and redesign courses and curricula, and to assist students to adjust to their new environment and each other in an informed and sensitive way" (p. 23). The authors give recognition to the fact that students (Africans, Indians, Coloureds and Whites) on open campuses come from separated residential, social and educational existences prior to university. Hence, they do not automatically interact freely.

The programme was developed within the Social Work curriculum to facilitate co-operative problem-solving, through self awareness training and skill development, in the context of small groups. The broad aim was to create an ethnically sensitive practitioner. Theoretically, the programme emanated from the cognitive social learning theory approach. It comprised five stages viz. (a) Beginning awareness and behaviour observation, (b) Clarification of discriminatory behaviour and knowledge development, (c) Development of behavioural skills, (d) Application of appropriate problem-solving behaviour and (e) Transfer of knowledge and skills. This highly comprehensive programme employed a wide variety of techniques to achieve stage objectives such as video taped problem-solving exercises, class quiz, role playing and the use of rating scales. A multi-racial, multi-cultural group of first year undergraduate Social Work students was exposed to this programme in groups of 12 members. The subjective final self-report evaluation elicited positive feedback from the participants. Black students made special mention of their confidence to express their views and participate in discussions. The authors noted that objective
evaluation of this programme was an important area for future research and development.

The work of Bernstein and Gray (1989) is indeed pioneering work in South Africa. Like the research by Forgus and Forgus (1983) their work demonstrated the potential for active facilitation of social change among progressive individuals and within progressive organisations. Although these studies represent only beginnings in the virgin territory of intergroup relations in South Africa, they represent a quantum leap from the essentially academic manipulation of social distance by Lever (1965).

2.2 The International Context

Banks (1986) referred to the demands for social change in the ethnic minorities in the United States, Canada and United Kingdom as ethnic revitalisation. In examining the responses made by educational institutions to this phenomenon in these countries, he identified 10 response paradigms of which racism was one. In the racism paradigm school programmes and practices include intergroup relations or prejudice reduction workshops for pupils and teachers and the development of multi-cultural curricula. This section of the review will focus on intergroup relations programmes in secondary and tertiary levels of educational institutions.

Desegregation and intergroup relations efforts in education have been undertaken for approximately three decades in the United States. Intergroup relations efforts in education in Canada and the United Kingdom are approximately a decade old (Banks, 1986). Efforts in the United States have been both proactive and reactive upon the advent of desegregation. In Canada and the United Kingdom anti-racist efforts are essentially reactive to the increasing numbers of ethnic minorities and the increasing educational and racial difficulties of such people.
In the United States the Educational and Testing Service collected the most extensive data on factors affecting race relations outcomes in desegregation (Forehand, Ragosta and Rock, 1976). Ninety six elementary schools and 72 high schools were surveyed. Five major factors were found to contribute to positive race relations:

(a) **Teaching Methods directed at improving race relations:** The methods included multi-ethnic curricula, teaching of minority history and culture, systematic use of projects on social and attitudinal issues related to race and assignment of Black and White students to work and play together.

(b) **Evaluation of Principal:** High schools with good race relations tended to have principals who were highly rated by, and supportive of, their teachers and who were influential in their districts.

(c) **Teachers' Racial Attitudes:** In high schools, teacher and principal attitudes were strongly related to attitudes of Whites only. In elementary schools, Black students perceived racial attitudes in schools to be positive when teachers' racial attitudes were positive.

(d) **Support for Integration:** The degree to which administrators, teachers and students communicated support was taken as a measure of institutional support.

(e) **Low Conflict and Tension:** This variable was consistently associated with positive race relations.

In order to identify operationally defined variables that could be effectively manipulated to improve race relations, Slavin and Madden (1979) analysed the Educational and Testing Service data gathered from 51 high schools. The assignment of students of different races to work together, individual participation in biracial work groups, participation in sports teams with students of another race and teacher workshops on race relations were identified as having positive effects on racial
attitudes and behaviours. Racial behaviour was assessed in terms of three questions relating to frequency of interracial conversations, interracial telephonic contact and desire for more friends of a different race. Racial attitudes were assessed in terms of three questions relating to preference for desegregated schools, relationship between race and intelligence and comfort in interracial encounters.

Programmes actively dealing with the problems of racism and racial prejudice in schools may be termed working together programmes. They are essentially non-confrontational in nature in that participants acquaint themselves with each other through working closely on a given project. In this atmosphere of co-operation, personal information is obtained about the other race, feelings of trust are engendered and positive interracial experiences are acquired. In this way racial prejudices and racism are challenged.

Jigsaw, Student-Teams-Achievement Divisions (STAD) and the Teams-Games-Tournament (TGT) are working together programmes more specifically referred to as co-operative learning strategies (Khan, 1984). These programmes are designed to facilitate interracial harmony in the course of academic learning experiences. They were constructed to counter the competitiveness that exists in the classroom setting. In the Jigsaw technique, students are placed in small cross-ethnic, interdependent learning groups. Each student is required to learn one part of a subject under study and is then required to teach it to other members of the group. The procedure equalises status by giving each student equal responsibility for teaching other members of the group. Individual testing is conducted at the end of the teaching sessions as is done in the traditional classroom setting. According to Khan (1984) evaluative studies of the Jigsaw technique indicate that, although the findings are not consistent, increases in self-esteem and cross-racial liking do occur.
STAD consists of five interrelated components: class presentations, teams, quizzes, individual improvement scores and team recognition. Academic material is presented in a variety of ways to heterogenous teams of four or five members. Each team then prepares its members for individual quizzes. Each member has an equal role in that each has to learn the given material. Individuals are rewarded for improvement on past performances. Improvement scores are translated into team scores. Both team and individual scores which are above the base score are published in a class newsletter or bulletin board. Evidence of improved cross-racial attitudes has been produced by evaluative studies of STAD (Kahn, 1984). A finding of note is that by Slavin and Oickle (1980). They found that Whites' attitudes to Blacks improved significantly as a consequence of STAD, while Blacks' attitudes towards Whites did not improve. It would appear that Blacks and Whites do not necessarily benefit equally from STAD. TGT is identical to STAD in basic rationale and methodology. It is different from STAD in that it replaces the quizzes and improvement scores with academic game tournaments. In these tournaments there is intragroup competition between team members who achieve the same level of past performance as they try to contribute to their team scores. As with the Jigsaw and STAD, while evaluative studies do show increases in cross-racial liking, this is not a consistent finding (Devries, Edwards and Slavin, 1978; Cooper, Johnson, Johnson and Wilderson, 1980; Weigil, Wiser and Cook, 1975).

Kahn (1984) suggested the following reasons for negative findings in the evaluation of co-operative learning strategies:

(a) Socioeconomic heterogeneity

(b) Opposing goals in different integration efforts

It would appear that the differing perceptions of the exercises by the different races may also have played a role in negative outcomes.
Relatively few studies of programme details are available in published form. These will be discussed in section 4 which deals with studies of group programmes designed to improve intergroup relations in educational settings and in the community.

3. INTERGROUP RELATIONS PROGRAMMES IN THE WIDER COMMUNITY

3.1 Introduction

In view of the relative dearth of published programmes in the educational setting, it was considered necessary to review interracial programmes in the community to provide guidelines for the construction of programmes to be used in the present investigation. There was a similar lack of published material on community programmes.

Before discussing group programmes per se, it is relevant to place these efforts in the context of the various responses to racial prejudice and discrimination in the wider community. Simpson and Yinger (1985) described five kinds of approaches to changing persons who show prejudice and discrimination. These are:

(a) Exhortation

This is essentially an appeal to people's better selves. In other words if one changes people's hearts they will change their ways.

(b) Propaganda

This refers to the use of mass media to persuade people to act in certain desired ways. This is essentially a manipulation of behaviour through appeal to the needs of people.

(c) Contact

This relates to association between people irrespective of race at all levels of social interaction.
(d) **Education**

This relates to the provision of information and facts to counter the stereotype phenomenon and misinformation that results from negative propaganda and non-contact between people.

(e) **Tolerance through Therapy**

The value of individual therapy is based on the assumption that emotionally healthy individuals will not evidence prejudice. However, group therapy has broader influences on individuals. These broader influences viz. contact with others, intimate sharing, opportunity for new information, and personal insight jointly account for the effectiveness of group therapy in reducing racial prejudice.

An analysis of interracial group therapy that is of particular note is that by Samuels (1972). His work is important for its comprehensive attention to the theory of interracial work, significant influencing factors and the main group processes and techniques. Samuels based his analysis on experiential group programmes. In interracial work, he viewed the essential goal of authenticity in the therapeutic encounter as being the same for encounters between individuals of different races. Using Martin Buber's conceptualisation of meaningful human encounters, he described the core goal of interracial group programmes as follows:

If one allows the other person to be different and still accepts and confirms him, then the first will have helped him to realise himself as he could not have done alone. (p. 215)

Closely allied to the group therapeutic approach to improving intergroup relations are race awareness training, racism awareness training and anti-racism awareness training. Dominelli (1988) described racism awareness training as being a development on race awareness training and anti-racism awareness training as being
a further development. These were programmes designed specifically for Whites.

Race awareness training developed as a result of Black criticism of White involvement in the Civil Rights Movement in the USA. Black militants accused White liberals of being racist and becoming involved in anti-racist struggles to assuage their feelings of guilt and blame. Subsequently, Blacks-only organisations replaced mixed ones. White progressives reacted by examining themselves and social relationships mediating their interactions with Blacks. Judy Katz's book, White Awareness, was amongst the first American publications in the race awareness training field. Katz (1979) described White Awareness training as being directed towards the acceptance of racism as a White problem and a definition and recognition of the meaning of being White. Racism awareness training identified racism as the problem and focussed on the social processes and power differentials existing between ethnic minority groups (Dominelli, 1988). Anti-racism awareness training is purported to go a step further to legitimate combining action aimed at eradicating racism with an appreciation of its effects. Gurnah (1984) criticised racism awareness training for:

(a) Diverting the energies of Black activists

(b) Being used by the state to give an illusion of responding to the issue of racism when it is actually giving priority to controlling Black and White opposition to racism

(c) Failing to initiate change which would benefit Black communities

(d) Reducing racism to an abstract entity contained within the person: This implies that there was a failure to link individual racism with institutional and cultural racism.

Gurnah's criticisms do not undermine the usefulness of racism awareness programmes. Instead they alert the user to political realities and encourage the user to avoid the pitfall of a limited view of racism as an individual problem only. Further, the user is encouraged to adopt the anti-racist, holistic perspective of racism as an
interrelationship of individual, institutional and cultural racism. This holistic
definition of racism will be discussed in section 6 of this chapter.

Samuels (1972) outlined four variables which should be taken into account in
intrerracial work viz. race of the leader, group composition and goals, group size and
duration and group processes and techniques. He drew his conclusions from his own
experiences in leading interracial groups and the experiences of other therapists. The
following sections represent a summary of the treatise by Samuels.

3.2 The Race of the Leader

When the group leader is of a different race, participants erect barriers to
spontaneity in communication. Personal issues are dealt with mechanically. To
counter this difficulty, co-therapists of different races may be used. This situation
engenders new difficulties such as the projection of group interrace struggles onto the
two leaders. However, it seems that it is easier to work through these types of
conflicts than the barriers that are erected when the group leader is not of the same
race as the participants. White leaders have more difficulties relating to Black
members of the group than to White members. Leaders may be blocked by personal
stereotypes, prejudices, guilt and discomfort. Their responses to various issues are
hence contaminated by distorted perceptions of reality situations. It is therefore
essential for White leaders to attempt to familiarise themselves with Black culture,
both experientially and educationally.

Black leaders have to deal with their own stereotypes of Whites as discriminating and
prejudiced. They have to overcome the often realistic perception of the White as
prejudiced. Black leaders have serious difficulties in handling their own anger
towards Whites who speak as if they are all-knowing. Black leaders appear to
overreact to this situation relative to their White counterparts. The Black leader may have the prejudiced perception that this behaviour is reflective of White participants trying to assert their superiority as White people. Another important problem faced by Black leaders is their overprotectiveness towards Blacks. Black leaders find it difficult to help Blacks overcome their prejudices towards Whites. Black members may be considered weaker than Black leaders and may hence need protection. The protection may take the form of rejecting the presence of prejudice or the insistence that weakening their defensive prejudice will have a crippling effect on their ability to cope with the everyday world.

Black leaders may also experience racial identity problems. These may take the form of prejudice towards Black members, overidentification, intolerance of passivity, intolerance of acting White or problems associated with being light skinned and having "made it" and by having achieved professional status:

(a) **Prejudice towards Black members.** Black leaders may be more prone than White leaders to misjudge and be offended by certain aspects of Black behaviour. This may be true of middle-class Black leaders who have taken over White perceptions and evaluations of Black behaviour. They may wish to distance themselves from their pasts.

(b) **Overidentification.** A particular advantage a Black leader has is the ability to empathize with Blacks because of their common experiences. However, Black leaders may use Blacks as their ego extensions and may thus use them to vent their own anger towards Whites. The obvious consequence of this would be failure on the part of Black participants and Black leaders to achieve insights into their behaviour.
(c) **Intolerance of Passivity.** Any tendency towards docile behaviour is regarded by the Black activist as self-degrading and incompatible with a new Black image. The Black leader may be unrealistically demanding of the Black participants to be assertive. Hence, there would be a failure to encourage a permissive attitude in the group which is essential for participants to express anger and acceptance freely.

(d) **Intolerance of "Acting" White.** Black leaders may be particularly antagonistic towards a Black member who tries to "act" White because of their own tendency to deny their Blackness.

(e) **Light-skinned Black Leaders and Blacks who have "made it".** A particular type of prejudice exists among some Blacks who are light-skinned or have achieved success such as attainment of professional status. They choose to reject the past and to identify with open aggressiveness and manipulativeness of racist Whites towards Blacks. These Blacks cannot experience themselves positively, but perceive themselves as White imitations. They adopt a derogatory attitude towards Blackness and a paternalistic attitude towards other Blacks. With the advent of the Black Power Movement, these Blacks were faced with the task of reintegrating the previously denied portion of their identity. In an effort to deal with consequent feelings of guilt for their previous lack of authenticity, they may become violently anti-White. Alternatively they may deny their guilt by asserting that others should work as hard as they did to get what they got. A third style of handling the guilt may be to project guilt onto others, accusing them of not being active enough in the Black Movement. This type of prejudice is particularly difficult to deal with in interracial groups. The Black person's integration of his/her newly found Black identity may be so tenuous that it may be threatened by any meaningful contact with Whites. If this individual should occupy a position of leadership it will have serious repercussions. Such persons may be completely bent on setting up destructive aggressive expressions between Blacks and Whites in their struggle with their own racial identity problem.
3.3 Group Composition and Goals

It is important to have an approximately equal number of Black and White members. If more than 70% of the participants are of one race, then free exchange diminishes. Varying personalities, both sexes, varying ages and socio-economic groups provide the group with a rich heterogeneity that serves as a source of a diversity of experiences.

Wilkinson (1973) cautioned that negative attitudes are more apparent when the status (socioeconomic, educational) of White members is higher than that of Black members. He contended that there is greater probability of the development of favourable attitudes towards one another when members are of equal status. From his review of interracial studies, Wilkinson concluded that in groups where Black membership consists solely of persons lower in status than their White counterparts, there was a greater likelihood of polarisation, categorical accusations of racism and formulations of demands.

Groups may have a racial or non-racial focus. Both produce racial attitude changes. However, it is doubtful whether change is carried over outside the group where non-racial foci are used.

3.4 Group Size and Duration of Sessions

Group sizes appear to range from 8 to 30. However, for encounter groups, the optimal size is 12. Duration of group sessions is usually one and half hours to two hours once-weekly. Depending on the depth of goals, group programmes may run for approximately 12 weeks.
3.5 Group Processes and Techniques

3.5.1 The Role of the Group Leader

The leader must at all times support and guide stereotype clarification through confrontation between members. At the same time the leaders must model openness by expressing their conflicts and resolutions. To fulfill their role appropriately, in addition to being skilled, leaders should have been exposed to several interracial groups as participants (Cobb, 1970). Personal participation would assist leaders to work through their own racial feelings and conflicts. Wilkinson (1973) suggested the use of Black and White co-leaders as an alternate method of resolving this issue.

3.5.2 Resistance to Personal Involvement

Often members of interracial groups are active workers in the area of interracial issues. The group may be used as a forum to express intellectualisations. While initial expressions of this nature may be necessary for reducing initial anxieties, the introduction of open expression of feelings must be sensitively timed as early as possible. Some members may rush into angry outbursts from the very beginning. These members need to recognise the importance of developing relationships before such emotional expressions become appropriate.

3.5.3 Dealing with Prejudice in the Community

Sometimes reports of instances of prejudice outside the group may shock members into initial sympathy and a general discussion of discrimination. Members need to recognise that the group can at best offer some advice about how these experiences can be dealt with and that their primary agenda is to improve feelings between group members.
3.5.4 Using Personality Differences

From time to time personality differences override racial differences. In recognising and accepting personality differences between members, racial differences can be resolved.

3.5.5 Physical Activity in the Group

Occasionally lack of experience in verbal expressions of emotions may pose a serious barrier to communication. Initiation of physical activity can provide a much needed breakthrough. Samuels described a sensitivity technique that could be successfully used after a group has met for several weeks. The leader directs a biracial pair to look into each other's eyes in an attempt to see the other as a person, both of whom need the warmth of wholehearted acceptance. Then each member is required to take the other's hand and note its details, differences and beauty. Each member then feels the other's arms, shoulders and head in a slow and deliberate manner. Members are then asked to share feelings that were aroused by the contact experience.

3.5.6 Racial Identity, Black Separatism and Group Cohesiveness

A major fear of Blacks entering an interracial group is that their identity as Blacks will be endangered. The heightened fear of identity loss arises from the belief that hostility towards Whites is essential for Black pride. The group by its emphasis on affection between members hence poses a threat. The leader needs to explore this issue sensitively and assist members to recognise when separatism is constructive and when it is not. The leader also needs to inculcate in White members an understanding of the Black needs for separatism. Separatism allows Blacks the
possibility of developing pride in themselves and their actions without the impediments of White racism.

According to Wilkinson (1973), the ideal interracial group could be conceived as having the following goals:

(a) Opening of new levels of communication: This would entail the exchange of information regarding the other group which has been previously repressed, by-passed or suppressed by both Blacks and Whites.

(b) The establishment of personal acquaintances and friendships which can be maintained

(c) The fostering of a realistic action orientation in Blacks and Whites to work towards understanding, acceptance, co-operation and communication

(d) The development of planned activities to produce institutional changes that would foster high levels of Black-White understanding

From observations in personal group leadership experiences, Wilkinson (1973) identified two significant problems encountered in interracial groups viz. varying expectations of participants and resistance to indepth work on racism. He listed the following examples of problematic expectations:

(a) White persons may wish to operate comfortably within their own racism. Relief of some guilt and the establishment of several superficial friendships with Blacks may achieve this goal.

(b) Jewish participants may wish to air the "Jewish story" in an attempt to alleviate Black anti-Semitism.

(c) Black persons may view the group as an opportunity for releasing years of anger and frustration. White participants may experience overwhelming guilt and anger upon such confrontation.
Wilkinson identified three levels of behavioural characteristics which each individual brings to the group:

(a) Those things that are apparent to the individual and also to the group
(b) Those things that are not apparent to the individual but are apparent to the group
(c) Those things that are not apparent either to the individual or to the group

The third level represents unconscious conflict-ridden issues. In the event of defenses being sufficiently lowered, third level material may threaten to emerge to consciousness. Insecurity at this point may initiate resistance with rigid defenses. The end result may be polarisation.

Both Samuels (1972) and Wilkinson (1973) have attempted to guide practitioners in the field of interracial group work by elucidating dynamic issues and processes which they have observed in their work. While hard-core statistical evidence has its place in research, documentations such as these provide invaluable insights that cannot be achieved by quantitative research.

3.6 Limitations of Experiential Groups in Interracial Work

While Samuels (1972) and Wilkinson (1973) presented positive accounts of the effects of experiential groups in interracial work, Lakin (1972) pointed to several limitations. These were:

(a) Confrontational and analytic procedures that are typical of experiential (training) groups are insufficient in themselves to ameliorate severe intergroup conflict.

(b) Motivation for change and psychological mindedness (belief in the importance of understanding oneself and others and a willingness to learn new ways of doing so) pose serious limitations.
(c) Self-insight and insight into the other's group do not generate empathy unless identification with one's group and the resultant non-generation of self-esteem are at issue. In other words group dynamics need to be altered to a significant extent.

(d) Superordinate goals of aversion of a catastrophe generate collaboration between groups more quickly than goals of better services and improvement of quality of life. Hence, effective superordinate goals which are necessary to motivate people to work together are often determined by external events which are beyond the control of the change agent.

(e) A clearer, more accurate image of the other group probably does not in itself create sufficient conditions for acceptance and empathy. New information could possibly be used to justify hatred rather than acceptance.

Having reviewed a few intergroup conflict amelioration efforts, Lakin (1972) concluded that rigorous experimentation was needed for refinement of conflict amelioration efforts. Such a conclusion is still true almost two decades later (Simpson and Yinger, 1985).

4. STUDIES OF GROUP PROGRAMMES DESIGNED TO IMPROVE INTERGROUP RELATIONS: AN EVALUATION

Published research studies of intergroup relations programmes in educational settings and in the community are summarised in Table 2. It is evident from this summary that:

(a) The number of explicitly described programmes that have been subjected to vigorous evaluation is extremely limited.
### TABLE 2

STUDIES OF INTERGROUP RELATIONS PROGRAMMES: A SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>SAMPLE</th>
<th>DURATION</th>
<th>MODEL/PURPOSE</th>
<th>TRAINING METHOD/DESIGN</th>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Rubin, 1967.</td>
<td>50 participants.</td>
<td>2-week residential programme</td>
<td>Experiential. Sensitivity Training. To test if self-acceptance leads to prejudice reduction.</td>
<td>Sensitivity Training. Subjects were their own controls. Sentence Completion Test - Self-Acceptance, Human-Hearted Scale - Acceptance of Others, Guttman Scale - Psychological Anomie</td>
<td>No conclusive positive outcome. Authors concluded that prejudice reduction may be possible in low psychological anomie groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Sessions</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Control Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. McArdle &amp; Young, 1970</td>
<td>12 participants</td>
<td>One and a half hours daily</td>
<td>Experiential</td>
<td>Subjective evaluation</td>
<td>No control group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black-White composition</td>
<td>Session number not specified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Berzon, Pollard &amp; Mermin, 1971</td>
<td>Size not specified</td>
<td>5 one and a half hour sessions/ day encounter/ once-weekly</td>
<td>Experiential</td>
<td>Leaderless encounter groups using taped instructions</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black-White composition</td>
<td>Taped instructions</td>
<td>Encounter group model</td>
<td>Programme description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Samuels, 1972
80 participants.
Black-White composition.

12 weeks. Once-weekly sessions of one and a half hours.

Experiential. To improve interracial relationships.

Experiential group. Control group used.
Steckler Anti-Negro Scale, Ford Negative Contact with Negroes Scale, Ford Negative Personal Contacts with Whites Scale, Rosander Anti-Negro Behaviour Scale Kelley Desegregation Scale, Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale.

Decreases were noted in the Steckler Scales only. Valid conclusions not possible because of control group's failure to complete the posttesting.
5. Lieberman, 1973

210 undergraduates.
25 Blacks & 185 Whites.

Quarter of an Academic year

Experiential. Relative influence of Encounter Groups on attitudes of Whites towards Blacks under eight conditions

(1) All White Groups; (2) Black-White Groups; (3) Black leader; (4) White leader; (5) Much race content; (6) Little race content; (7) High learning groups; (8) Low learning groups; (9) Control Group. Race questionnaire measuring Authoritarianism, Militancy, Suspiciousness, Separatism /Black Power, Personal Responsibility, Mistrust & Liberalism.

Only mixed racial composition proved effective. Increased support for separatism. Blacks increased in Mistrust.
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Sedlacek et al, 1976</td>
<td>1900 undergraduates.</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>Systematic Approach. To compare three methods designed to eliminate racism and sexism in university students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95 Blacks, 1748 Whites, &amp; 57 other minorities.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Model Workshop; (2) Starpower Workshop; (3) Movie Workshop. * Workshop details given at end of Table 2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. Parker, 1979</th>
<th>30 participants per workshop. Black-White composition.</th>
<th>7 sessions of one and a half hours each.</th>
<th>Systematic Approach. Programme Description</th>
<th>Not specified</th>
<th>Not specified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. Forgus &amp; Forgus, 1983</th>
<th>27 participants. 12 Whites &amp; 15 Blacks i.e. Africans &amp; “Coloureds”. 6-8 member groups.</th>
<th>4 once-weekly sessions of 1 hour each.</th>
<th>Systematic Approach. To Improve interracial relationships using mediation skills.</th>
<th>Wide range of facilitative techniques. No control group. Subjects grouped by their reported desired speed of socio-political change. Two sessions with homogenous groups and two with heterogenous groups to enhance 'within group' and 'between group' communication respectively. Transcripts from audiotapes of sessions used to assess behavioural change.</th>
<th>Fast-change and moderately heterogenous groups displayed greatest change. Increases in information-seeking and follow-through and decreases in leadership and disagreement responses.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


* Details of workshops mentioned in 6:

(1) **Model Workshop.** Six stages. Entails information-giving, change and change activities.

(2) **Star Power Workshop.** Simulation game where bargaining and trading results in a three-tiered society. One group receives preferential treatment and is allowed to alter the rules of the game.

(3) **Movie Workshop.** Participants saw one of three films viz. The Prejudice Game, Bill of Rights in Action or Eye of the Storm. Film viewing was followed by a discussion.
(b) Where evaluations have been done, Black-White proportions in samples have been extremely unbalanced, with the Black sample being frequently small.

(c) The common evaluation strategy is a battery of psychological tests relating to racial prejudice and personality variables. The use of behavioural measures is uncommon.

(d) Evaluative studies on programmes using a structured systematic approach are uncommon.

It follows that ongoing rigorous experimentation is still very much needed to direct practitioners in the field of intergroup relations. Systematic approaches would be particularly useful for the purposes of replication and controlled modification of programme structure. Such control would allow for the isolation of effective techniques and foci in these programmes. Racial disharmony is an international problem that significantly influences the quality of life of people. This social pathology is worthy of more than scores of hastily planned "one-off" attempts at conflict amelioration.

5. PREJUDICE: DEFINITION AND THEORIES

A discussion on the causes of prejudice is essential to the justification and exposition of the theoretical rationale of intergroup relations programmes. It is obvious that there should be a congruence between the understanding of the causes of racial prejudice and the rationale for racial prejudice reduction.
5.1 Definition of Prejudice

The literature is replete with definitions of prejudice. In an attempt to synthesise a wide range of definitions, Milner (1981) presented the following essential features that characterise prejudice:

(a) Prejudice is an attitude that predisposes a person to think, feel and act in favourable or unfavourable ways towards a group or its individual members (Secord and Backman, 1964).

(b) It is based upon a faulty and inflexible generalisation (Allport, 1954).

(c) It is a preconceived judgement (McDonagh and Richards, 1953) and is developed before, in lieu of, or despite objective evidence (Cooper and McGaugh, 1963).

(d) It is an emotional, rigid attitude (Simpson and Yinger, 1965), not easily changed by contrary information (Krech, Crutchfield and Ballachey, 1962).

5.2 The Causes of Prejudice

A large body of literature deals with individual personality and social determinants of prejudice. In this section only the essence of significant theories of prejudice will be presented.

5.2.1 Personality Theories of Prejudice

An early influential theory of prejudice was the Authoritarian Personality Theory (Adorno, Fenkel-Brunwik, Levinson and Harper, 1950). According to this theory, prejudice is the outward manifestation of a basic personality type, the Authoritarian Personality. In a review of studies highlighting the shortcomings of this theory, Milner (1981) asserted that the identification of a personality type that is particularly
prone to develop hostile and rejecting attitudes towards various racial and cultural minorities, is a justifiable claim. The shortcomings of this theory lie in its tendency to overgeneralise and its vague psychological origins.

Several authors have proposed the Authoritarian Personality Theory explanation for prejudices among Whites in South Africa (MacCrone, 1930; Mann, 1971; Ray and Heaven, 1984). However, a strong claim has been made by social psychologists that such an explanation is grossly inadequate. Pettigrew (1958) conducted an intensive study of prejudice in South Africa and the United States. He concluded that in instances where historically embedded traditions of racism exist, sociocultural factors are extremely critical and may account for heightened racial hostility. According to Pettigrew, it is within such a context that personality variables need to be understood. From an analysis of South African studies on the Authoritarian Personality, Louw-Potgieter (1988) concluded that "factors such as group membership, identification with a specific membership group, the group's position in society, the group's ideology, the manner in which this ideology is transmitted across generations and so forth would provide a truly social psychological explanation of intergroup relations in South Africa." (p. 83-84). She argued that explanations of prejudice must take into account the fact that South Africa is an apartheid society. Tyson et al (1988) presented a similar argument.

The Frustration-Aggression Theory (Dollard, Doob, Miller, Mowrer and Sears, 1939) is a popular modern psychological explanation of prejudice. Prejudice is purported to result when individuals become frustrated because they are unable to satisfy real or perceived needs. Frustration leads to aggression which is then directed to groups which cannot retaliate. This represents a safe way of displacing aggression.
According to Rose (1962) this theory has two basic weaknesses. First, it fails to explain why certain groups are selected as targets rather than others. Second, it assumes that all frustration must be expressed.

According to the Projection Theory (Dollard, 1937), prejudice represents a faulty attempt to cope with intolerable feelings of self-contempt by directing the hatred away from the despised parts of the self onto another person or group. The individual thus enjoys an illusory feeling of relative superiority. This theory is limited because it fails to explain motives for prejudice or why certain characteristics are attributed to specific groups (Rose, 1962).

Simpson and Yinger (1985) proposed a Field Theory of personality. They asserted that while single-level approaches are still the most common, in the explanations of personality, the developing multilevel explanations have support in the works of many cultural anthropologists, psychiatrists, psychologists and sociologists. According to the field theory, personality may be perceived as a process and not a collection of traits. Within the process paradigm, personality can be understood in terms of the flow of behaviour that comes from an interaction of the individual with the situation. Hence, prediction of behaviour from a range of potentialities requires a knowledge of individuals and their reference groups at a given time. Simpson and Yinger believed that prejudice as a behavioural tendency may be best understood within such a holistic paradigm.

5.2.2 Sociological Theories of Prejudice

A sizeable body of research exists on the identification and exploration of sociological factors that influence attitudes towards members of another race. The following dominant sociological theories of prejudice will be described: Contact Theory;

According to the Contact Hypothesis (Allport, 1958), intergroup contact produces better intergroup attitudes and relations. Amir (1969) conducted a comprehensive review of the literature on contact studies. He found that certain contact situations promoted positive attitudes while other situations promoted negative attitudes. In summary, situations that produce positive attitudes are those where:

(a) Socio-economic status of different ethnic groups is similar or the contact is between the majority group and high status members of the minority group.
(b) Prevailing social climate supports intergroup contact.
(c) Intergroup relations are intimate.
(d) Contact is pleasant or rewarding.
(e) The common goal in coming together is more important than individuals' separate purposes.

In summary, situations that produce negative attitudes are those where:

(a) The contact situation produces competition between the groups.
(b) Contact is unpleasant, involuntary or tension-laden.
(c) The prestige or status of one group is lowered as a result of contact situation.
(d) Members of a group or the group as a whole are in a state of frustration. The frustration could have been produced by recent defeat or failure, economic deprivation or chronic inequities.
(e) The groups in contact have moral or ethnic standards which are objectionable to each other.
(f) Members of the minority group in contact with a majority group are of a lower status or lower in any relevant characteristic relative to the members of the majority group.
The findings of contact studies provide a useful theoretical background for evaluating the problems involved in, and benefits that may be derived from, interracial group programmes (Samuels, 1972).

According to the Reference Group Support Theory (Newcomb, 1961), a major determinant of peoples' attitudes and behaviour towards members of another race is the attitudes and behaviour of their reference support group i.e. people who are close to them (Samuels, 1972). Hence, it follows that racial attitude change and behaviour change must be understood in the context of people's reference support groups. Samuels suggested that interracial groups provide the person with a new reference support group. He proposed that as members become closer to the group, the group's attitudes may become potent enough as determinants to offset the conflicting attitudes of their other reference groups.

According to Allport's Group Relations Theory, people's mode of conduct is determined by their personalities, the manner in which social forces impinge on them and their need to conform (Allport, 1954). The three components of conformity are: a common disposition to prefer what is familiar, an emotional commitment to a particular way of life and a deep-seated insecurity based on status needs. Reduction and retention of prejudice could be explained by the tenets of this theory.

According to Tajfel and Turner's theory (1979) of intergroup relations there is a:

need for every social group to create and maintain a positive social identity vis-à-vis other social groups. Irrespective of the objective characteristics of these groups, some positive evaluation of the ingroup (and, on the other side of the coin, some negative evaluation of the outgroup) can be achieved through the
construction of their relationship as a competitive one and discriminatory behaviour which ensures "superiority" on at least that dimension. (Milner, 1981, p. 111)

It would appear that prejudice is an inevitable phenomenon. However, it is possible to eliminate harmful or unacceptable extremes of prejudices (Hogg and Abrams, 1988). It is evident that prejudice cannot be understood either purely in terms of personality variables or sociological determinants of behaviour. Instead, a complex interaction of both sets of variables are evidently at work. At present, no single theory encompasses this interaction in its entirety.

Each of these personality and broader sociological theories of prejudice will be utilised in the following analysis of theoretical paradigms that form the basis of group work aimed at prejudice reduction.

6. RACISM

According to Kahn (1984), the "problem of the colour line" has gone far beyond the issue of racial prejudice. It is now sustained by political, economic and social factors. In South Africa it is sustained by the law and policy of Apartheid. Discriminatory practices have become accepted ways of behaving. Hence, acts of discrimination can be performed without appearing to be prejudiced. Khan (1984) defined racism as "the cumulative effects of individuals, institutions, and cultures that result in the oppression of ethnic minorities perceived to be inferior" (p. 346). Racism differs from prejudice in that it is the result of a process in which the physical characteristics of a racial group are given a negative value that is presumed to be genetic. Further, the positive characteristics of the in-group are emphasised as much as the negative characteristics of the out-group.
Jones (1972) suggested a model of racism that shifted the focus from concern with the objects or effects of prejudice to the underlying structural factors (causes) and the way they influence a person's behaviour. This theory encompassed individual, institutional and cultural racism.

Individual racism is similar to race prejudice except that in individual racism the negative aspects of the other groups and the positive aspects of one's own group are emphasised and presumed to be a function of biological differences.

Institutional racism is based on objective criteria rather than on attitudes or intentions. For example, evidence of gross racial inequalities in institutional policies and practices (regardless of the reasons or intentions behind those policies) is enough to substantiate the existence of institutional racism. An open university admissions policy which was based on a matriculation points system to attract candidates with the best academic potential, when it was a Whites only institution, would in the current context be an example of institutional racism. Owing to the deprived educational background of Blacks, a point system would exclude the majority of Blacks from university education because their matriculation points on average would be much lower than the average matriculation points of Whites.

Cultural Racism occurs when a dominant culture, through the transmission of values and other practices, ignores or omits significant contributions of other cultural groups or interprets characteristics of other cultural groups in a negative way.

A large number of anti-racism programmes are directed at Whites to relate to the problem of racism which originated and is embedded in White society.
GROUP THERAPEUTIC APPROACHES TO IMPROVING INTERGROUP RELATIONS: THEORETICAL RATIONALE

Most group therapeutic approaches to improving intergroup relations, i.e., reducing prejudice, employ an experiential-learning format. Early programmes used a Training Group orientation, while the current trend is towards an Educational-Experiential structured group format. The focus of the content may be either racial or nonracial. The group composition could be either biracial or uni-racial.

7.1 Experiential Groups

An experiential group is a special kind of group that is ordinarily formed for some explicit purpose that can be achieved through participation in groups (Shaw, 1976). Frequently, participants wish to establish good interpersonal relationships, but are unaware of the reasons for being unable to do so. Experiential groups provide the participants with the opportunity to become aware of how they relate to others and why they act as they do. Such awareness is postulated to produce effective interpersonal relationships.

Experiential groups encompass T-Groups, sensitivity training groups, therapy groups, encounter groups, authentic encounter groups, personal growth groups and human relations groups. Classified according to the motivations of participants, experiential groups fall into three categories: learning, therapeutic and expressive (Lakin, 1972). Effective interpersonal functioning is the goal of learning groups. Sensitivity training groups, T-groups, and human relations groups are examples of this category. Therapeutic groups have the goal of producing reparative change such as change of personality style and correction of emotional experiences. Expressive groups cater for participants who wish to achieve greater emotional expressiveness.
According to Shaw (1976), experiential groups have roots in Social Psychology, Psychotherapy, Industrial Psychology and Psychodrama. Consequently, there is little coherent theory about current practices in experiential work. Nonetheless, the importance of these groups is recognised. The following processes are common to all forms of experiential work:

(a) Facilitating emotional expressiveness
(b) Generating feelings of belongingness
(c) Fostering a norm of self-disclosure as a condition of group membership
(d) Sampling personal behaviours
(e) Making sanctioned interpersonal comparison
(f) Sharing responsibility for leadership and direction with the appointed leader

7.2 Systematic Programmes

Malamud and Machover (1965) predicted that future social necessities would lead to an increasing shift in activity in the mental health field from the function of psychotherapy to that of mental health education. They believed that education would be needed to provide large numbers of relatively normal people with opportunities for confronting themselves in ways which can sharpen their sense of identity, heighten their feelings of self-acceptance and improve their interpersonal relationships. In an extensive review of the literature to identify trends in psychotherapy, Authier, Gustafson, Guerney and Kasdorf (1975) confirmed this prediction. They found that there was a movement from the therapeutic model towards a more educational role and use was being made of systematic training to achieve desired behaviour change. This approach, developed from learning theory, views the helping process as a learning process.
Drum and Knott (1977) surveyed 19 systematic programmes that were used in counselling centres in the United States. They found that all were designed to meet specific behavioural objectives. In addition, these programmes have both
cognitive and affective components. They use an educational-experiential format, goal orientation and systematic-sequential approaches to resolution of a problem situation.

Drum and Knott (1977) identified the following positive attributes of structured groups:

(a) Self-discovery and self-enhancement is demystified and viewed more hopefully because of the goal-directedness of these groups.

(b) Structure makes the process non-threatening and enjoyable. Structured exercises are used to encourage people to increase their ability to try out new behaviours or examine issues they would normally avoid.

(c) Participants have the benefit of both peer and professional feedback relating to a specific interpersonal skill or life issue.

(d) Treatment time is used more effectively than in traditional one-to-one counselling. Common problems of participants are dealt with simultaneously as the group format provides opportunities for one-to-one work, group work and vicarious learning through the experiences of other participants.

(e) Problem solving is active and focussed, as a significant amount of group time is spent practising a skill, actively clarifying an issue and structuring a resolution.

(f) Participants become aware of the pervasiveness of the issue they are attempting to resolve by both the size of their group and the extent to which similar groups are being run.
(g) The educational-experiential format reduces the stigma associated with seeking help.

(h) They counter the anxiety of participants who fear a restructuring of their whole personalities. The clear statement of goal establishes the boundaries of contact between the leader and the participants.

Structured groups are classified into three types viz. Life Skill Groups, Life Theme Groups and Life Transition Groups. Life Skill Groups are designed to help people acquire new skills or complete the development of inadequate skills. Life Theme Groups are designed to develop a sense of personal understanding that leads to greater feelings of freedom and individuation. Life Transition Groups have the goals of helping people restructure the past and adapt to an altered lifestyle.

Drum and Knott (1977) asserted that the phenomenon of theory and practice being more advanced than the ability to assess behaviour change adequately applies to both psychotherapy and structured group methods. In defence of structured group methods they added that this category of help is a fairly recent development. Group counselling, as a whole, has been poorly evaluated. To date, however, although rudimentary, most research done on structured groups is in the area of life skills.

7.3 Theories of Intergroup Relations Programmes using an Experiential Format

The following account is based largely on the analysis conducted by Samuels (1972). He explained the processes that occur in interracial groups in terms of the Contact Hypothesis, the Reference Group Support Theory and Allport's Group Relations Theory.
Studies related to the Contact Hypothesis provide useful theoretical insights into interracial group processes. The finding that positive changes are more likely when the prevailing social climate supports intergroup contact explains why school desegregation programmes work best when there is institutional support. It also explains why a positive attitude by the interracial group leader is one of the major determinants of positive results. Status or prestige threat is inclined to strengthen negative attitudes. This highlights the need for the group leader to value sincerely, the contributions of all members regardless of their status outside the group. One of the most difficult obstacles to constructive interaction in interracial groups is the experience of frustration by one group in broader society. The group situation is inclined to be used to ventilate resentment and blame. Leaders need to deal with consequent feelings of futility by focussing on the value of positive experiences in the group and their enhanced value when carried outside the group.

The Reference Group Support Theory highlights the need for the interracial group to develop a high degree of cohesiveness over a period of time. A cohesive interracial group will provide the necessary support to counter the individual's alienation from friends outside the group. The individual will ally with the group with which less threat is felt.

Samuels (1972) believed that Allport's Group Relations Theory could be used to predict the outcome of interracial group therapy. The interracial group forms a small temporary society with pressures to conform to ideals that differ from those of the broader society. As self-esteem within the group increases, the group ideals become more important to the participant. Simultaneously, the activities of being with and talking to members of another race in a positive environment offsets the pressure to conform to the broader society's ideals. The emotional commitment to stereotypes is
eroded by the group's quest for honesty and recognition of realities in the here and now. Status in the group is based on openness and non-possessive warmth rather than racial affiliation.

It is apparent that an effective interracial group deals directly with two of the three factors cited by Allport as determining conduct. These are the impingement of social forces and the need to conform. The third factor, individual personality, is influenced by these groups in an indirect manner.

### 7.4 A Systematic Approach to Intergroup Relations Programmes

The systematic approach developed from cognitive social learning theory (Katz, 1979). Lieberman (1980) cautioned that psychological theories of change viz. Behavioural, Humanistic and Dynamic Theories which have evolved around change in dyadic systems may not be validly adopted for the group therapeutic context. These theories do not account for the fact that groups are complex social systems with unique properties for change and unique problems. The analysis of change in interracial groups by Samuels (1972), in terms of Allport's Group Relations Theory appears to be the most succinct explanation of fundamental change that occurs in both experiential groups and groups utilising a systematic approach. Dyadic-based explanations could be embedded in Allport's paradigm.

While early interracial groups utilised an experiential group format, the modern trend is the use of the systematic approach. The objectives of the few comprehensively documented programmes using the systematic approach are summarised in Table 3.
### TABLE 3

**STAGE OBJECTIVES OF SYSTEMATIC INTERGROUP RELATIONS PROGRAMMES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Behaviour: what can be done?</td>
<td>Integration through recreation.</td>
<td>Meaning of Whiteness.</td>
<td>Transfer of knowledge and skills.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Behaviour: How it can be done?</td>
<td>Action plan.</td>
<td>Action strategies to combat personal and institutional racism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Follow-up to action plan.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Duration**

|   | Two and a half days. | Seven approximately one and a half hour sessions once-weekly. | Three-hour introductory session to 45 hour-long sessions. | Three days. | Six to seven three hour sessions once-weekly. |
Three of the programmes (Sedlacek and Brooks, 1973; Katz, 1979; Satow, 1982) comprehensively and frankly explore racism and its various ramifications with a view to developing anti-racist strategies and initiatives. Of the remaining two programmes, one (Parker, 1979) focussed on skill development in a racial context with a view to developing strategies to improve race relations, while the other (Bernstein and Gray, 1989) provided skill development in a biracial group to teach social skills and improve race relations. It is interesting to note that these two programmes did not sharply focus on racism. Instead they focussed on improving race relations in an educational context. This approach may be explained by the view that racism in its entirety may not be relevant in student-student interactions as is the case in larger society. While this may be a reasonable hypothesis, a wide scale survey of many undocumented programmes would be necessary to confirm such a hypothesis.

A second feature of note from the summary is that the three programmes with a sharp racial focus are designed primarily for Whites. This is understandable since anti-racism awareness training was developed in response to the criticism by Blacks that White progressives were still essentially racist and the subsequent recognition that racism was essentially a White problem which required extensive introspection by Whites to develop awareness and elimination strategies. This racial specificity, of necessity, limits the use of these programmes.

Thirdly, the programme designed by Parker has some highly noteworthy features:

(a) It has very specific stage objectives and a detailed account is given of programme activities.
(b) It is clearly time-limited.
(c) It appears to approach the racial issue more directly and caters equally for the needs of both Black and White participants. Interracial programmes have been criticized for using the Black person for White benefit (Katz,
1979). In other words Blacks are used to teach Whites about racial realities. With its emphasis on interracial communication, this criticism is not true for Parker's programme.

(d) As a result of its highly defined nature it is particularly suitable for research purposes.

8. CONCLUSION

Evidently, the area of intergroup relations has received the attention of social scientists since the early 20th century. The scientific study of improvement strategies per se began with the advent of National Training Laboratories in 1947 in the United States. However, theoretical sophistication and rigorous evaluative studies in the area of improvement strategies are indeed lacking. The need for controlled experimental studies and comparative method studies using rigorous evaluation procedures is urgent in both educational and community settings. The social pathology of intergroup tensions significantly affects the quality of life of all people. It is hence the responsibility of social scientists to address this issue actively through major research efforts that highlight the nature, the effects and methods of combating this phenomenon.

The literature evidently constitutes a limited body of qualitative and quantitative evidence. Programmes may be categorised into interracial programmes catering for Blacks and Whites and awareness programmes catering for Whites only. Interracial programmes can be further subdivided into confrontational and non-confrontational programmes. These subdivisions constitute experiential and systematic groups. The literature does not provide guidance as to when a particular approach should be adopted and the relative effectiveness of the various approaches.
Intergroup relations programmes do not have an integrated theoretical rationale. Owing to the fact that these programmes emanated in response to a pervasive social problem with major psycho-socio-political implications viz. racism, they originated from various disciplines such as education, social psychology, industrial psychology, humanistic psychology and psychotherapy. Consequently, the major theories of these disciplines form a joint but largely unintegrated theoretical base for intergroup relations programmes.

This review focussed on change strategies at an individual level in keeping with the area of the present research. However, cognisance is taken of the fact that racial prejudice and racism is a three-tiered phenomenon existing at individual, institutional and cultural levels. Hence, improvement strategies need to be directed at all three levels of the problem for effective elimination of the social pathology of racial prejudice and racism.
CHAPTER THREE

METHOD

This chapter will deal with the various aspects of the research methods used viz. experimental design, sample selection, instruments used, administration of instruments, experimental treatments and data analyses.

1. EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

The project utilised an experimental before and after control group design (pretest and posttest) as described by Kerlinger (1972). The design is schematically represented in Figure 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mr</th>
<th>Yb</th>
<th>Xa</th>
<th>Ya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yb</td>
<td>Xb</td>
<td>Ya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yb</td>
<td>(*X)</td>
<td>Ya</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Schematic Representation of Experimental Design

Mr = Random assignment but matched
Yb = Pretest measure of dependent variable
Ya = Posttest measure of dependent variable
Xa = Independent variable viz. Programme A
Xb = Independent variable viz. Programme B
(*X) = No Programme
Three groups of students were utilised viz. two experimental groups (Group A and Group B) and one control group (Group C). Fifteen Black and 15 White students were randomly assigned to each group from a random selection of 45 Black and 45 White students from a total pool of students who fulfilled the designated selection criteria. Four pretest and posttest measures were conducted on Groups A, B, and C. Groups A and B were involved in two different group therapy programmes while Group C received no treatment in the same period.

2. SAMPLE SELECTION

The subjects were randomly selected from the total population of Psychology 1 students who fulfilled a set of selection criteria viz.:

(a) Race : Black and White
(b) Age : 18 - 25 years
(c) Marital Status : Single
(d) Year of Study : First year
(e) Equal Status Black-White experience : Nil
(f) Black language fluency among Whites : Nil
(g) Opinion regarding necessity for sociopolitical change : At least "necessary"
(h) Opinion regarding necessity for Group Work on campus : At least "necessary"
(i) Psychiatric History : Nil

These variables were considered important extraneous variables that could be
controlled by the researcher. For the practical purpose of determining whether the student was available for participation in the study two additional selection criteria were included:

(a) Weekend part-time job : Nil
(b) Course combination : Such that a one and a half hour free period is available on at least two days of the week

The selection of students who fulfilled these criteria was done by means of an analysis of responses to a Biographical Inventory (see Appendix A) which was administered to a lecture group of 537 Psychology 1 students. From the total pool of Black (N=60) and White (N=91) students who fulfilled the selection criteria, 50 Black and 50 White students were randomly selected. The 100 students were notified by means of letters and notices on university notice boards. The first 45 Black and first 45 White students who registered for participation were selected. From these selected groups 15 Black and 15 White students were randomly assigned to Groups A, B and C. Group C was informed that it would be involved in a group programme in the second semester.

3. INSTRUMENTS USED

Three sets of instruments were used. They were:

(a) Screening Instrument : (i) Biographical Inventory (BI) constructed by the researcher (Appendix A)
3.1 Motivation for Choice of Instruments

As mentioned in Chapter One, evaluation instruments used in Intergroup Relations Programmes are cross-culturally limited in that they have a strong American bias and are not standardised for non-American cultures. Hence, for the purposes of the present research, instruments which were valid and relevant to the South African context were identified. In keeping with the literature, instruments measuring personality variables, racial attitudes and social distance were used viz. HSSF, PHNS and RDQ. The measure of Social Functioning viz. HSSF has been shown to be cross-culturally valid for South Africans (Van Zyl, 1986). The measure of racial attitudes to Blacks/Whites viz. PHNS has been successfully used by Edwards (1984)
in a study of perception of personality and social behaviour in 225 Black and 186 White first-year psychology students. The Scale highlighted significant differences in the perceptions Blacks and Whites had of themselves and other races. A social distance questionnaire (RDQ) specific to an educational setting was constructed by the author to elicit change information directly relevant to the university environment. To control for the weaknesses of self-report measures viz. social desirability concerns of the respondent, distrust of the researcher and random answering, a Behavioural Response Change evaluation was included. It has been argued that self-report measures may reflect a change in what is a socially acceptable answer and not a change in racist attitudes (Crosby, Bromley and Saxe, 1980). Behavioural Response Change was evaluated by the use of videotaped recordings of behavioural interaction samples pretest and posttest. This technique was successfully used by Forgus and Forgus (1983) to evaluate behavioural change in an intergroup relations programme conducted in a multiracial South African sample.

3.2 Pilot Study of Instruments Used

The research instruments selected were administered individually and in groups to small samples of students. Comprehension and boredom did not appear to be significant factors. Language changes to the Philosophy of Human Nature Scale made by Edwards (1984) were adopted. Additional language changes found necessary were:

(a) Item 6 : first "impression" was changed to first "view"
(b) Item 9 : make a "move" was changed to make a "decision"
(c) Item 16 : will "act as Good Samaritans" was changed to will "help others in trouble"
(d) Item 31 : "unrealistically" favourable was changed to "over" favourable

(e) Item 46 : is "conceited" was changed to is "a show off"

(f) Item 58 : It is "pathetic" was changed to It is "pitiful"

One language change was made to the HSSF:

Item (c) of the Friendship subsection of the Satisfaction Subscale was changed from "Do you enjoy entertaining and treating people" to "Do you enjoy entertaining and meeting people". Although "meeting" is not a synonym for "treating", it represents a social activity which does not overlap with "entertaining" and at the same time is an associated concept. Hence, the replacement of the word "treating" has a dual function of avoiding the use of a potentially ambiguous term in the South African context and of broadening the scope of the item without significantly altering its meaning. No changes to BI and RDQ were found to be necessary.

3.3 Biographical Inventory (BI)

The Biographical Inventory was designed to elicit biographical details and, inter alia, information regarding previous interracial contact and the students' perception of the need for improvement of student race relations. This instrument was utilised to elicit information on the eleven research selection criteria previously mentioned.

3.4 Heimler Scale of Social Functioning (HSSF)

The HSSF was developed by Eugene Heimler, during the period 1953-1967, to measure Social Functioning (SF). The scale has since been used in a number of countries, including South Africa (Van Zyl, 1986). It is a comprehensive, 55-item instrument.
The HSSF taps a wide spectrum of life areas through each of its three scales viz. the Satisfaction Scale, the Frustration Scale and the Synthesis Scale. The 25-item Satisfaction Scale relates to satisfaction in work, friendship, family, personal-sexual and financial areas. The 25-item Frustration Scale relates to frustration in terms of energy, health, power and influence, moods and habits. The 5-item Synthesis Scale relates to synthesis in terms of achievement of ambition, hope for the future, meaning of life, scope given for self-expression in life and worthwhileness of life's struggle.

3.4.1 Scoring the HSSF

Each question on the Satisfaction (Positive) and Frustration (Negative) Scales is scored 4, 2 or 0 for "yes", "perhaps" or "no" responses respectively. Each area or set of five questions in the two scales generates a "base score" (sum of 4's), and a "gross score" (sum of all scores i.e. 4's + 2's). These base and gross scores for the several areas add up to base and gross scores for each of the respective Satisfaction and Frustration Scales. The total score (base + gross scores) for each of the scales ranges from 0 to 100. The Synthesis Scale contains five questions, each scored 1 to 20, with a total score ranging from 5 to 100. Raw scores calculated on the Satisfaction, Frustration and Synthesis Scales are summarised in Figure 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BASE (Sum of 4's)</th>
<th>GROSS (Sum of 4's + 2's)</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POSITIVE (Satisfaction Scale)</td>
<td>BP</td>
<td>GP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGATIVE (Frustration Scale)</td>
<td>BN</td>
<td>GN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYN (Synthesis Scale)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Raw Scores of the Satisfaction, Frustration and Synthesis Scales
The HSSF has no single summary score or index. Instead, selected scores and indices are computed from the raw scores. The following indices are derived:

(a) **The Satisfaction Index (SI)** : positive mean score (PMS) i.e. 
(Base Positive + + Gross Positive)+2

(b) **The Frustration Index (FI)** : relationship between PMS and the negative mean score (NMS) (Base Negative + Gross Negative)+2

(c) **Uncertainty within the Positive Index (UPI)** : variance or "swing" between the base positive score (BPS) and the gross positive score (GPS)

(d) **Uncertainty within the Negative Index (UNI)** : variance or "swing" between the base negative score (BNS) and the gross negative score (GNS)

(e) **Least Frustration Index at Highest Satisfaction (HSFI)** : relationship of the BNS to the GPS

(f) **Highest Frustration Index at Least Satisfaction (LSFI)** : relationship of the GNS to the BPS

(g) **Satisfaction Index at Least Satisfaction (LSSI)** : base positive score (BPS)

(h) **Satisfaction Index at Highest Satisfaction (HSSI)** : gross positive score (GPS)

(i) **Optimism/Pessimism Index (OPI)** : relationship of the total Synthesis (Syn) to the PMS
3.4.2 The International Norms for Interpreting the HSSF

Heimler (1970) reported that it was possible to make a distinction with the HSSF between three levels of overall satisfaction which correspond to actual levels of social competence. These refer to the levels where the individual functions well, needs therapeutic help in order to function and where the individual can only function within an institution.

3.4.2.1 The Positive Mean Score (PMS)

The average PMS is between 72 and 79. A PMS of 60 and above indicates that a person is able to function in society without the support of professional helpers. If the PMS is between 36 and 60 the person is able to function in society with the support of professionals, family and friends. Where the PMS is between 0 and 36 the individual is in need of concentrated help in an institution.

3.4.2.2 The Relationship between PMS and NMS

The NMS is expected to be 20% to 33% of the PMS. If the NMS is more than 33.3% of the PMS the individual is seen to carry a more than average load of frustration. Likewise, if the NMS is less than 20% of the PMS, the individual is seen to experience too little frustration.

3.4.2.3 Comparison between the Gross Scores (4's + 2's) and the Base Scores (4's)

A difference of 6 - 8 points between the GPS and the BPS or the GNS and the BNS indicates normal uncertainty and flexibility which is within functional limits. A difference of less than 6 points shows a tendency towards rigidity and a difference of
more than 8 points indicates a significant degree of uncertainty or ambivalence and anxiety.

Functioning with most satisfaction and least frustration is seen by comparing GPS to BNS. Functioning with least satisfaction and most frustration is seen by comparing BPS and GNS. Variance of mood of an individual over a period of time is reflected by this comparison which is also known as the "criss-cross".

3.4.2.4 Comparison between the Synthesis Score (Syn) and the PMS

A Syn within 8 points of the PMS indicates a realistic orientation. A Syn above 8 points of the PMS indicates an optimistic orientation and a Syn below 8 points of the PMS indicates a pessimistic orientation.

3.4.3 Reliability of the HSSF

Dodrill (cited by Van Zyl, 1986) tested 61 patients of the University of Washington Hospital Seizure Clinic on both the HSSF and the MMPI and retested a group of 31 patients four months later. Test-retest correlations were computed for each of 13 HSSF scales and each of 14 MMPI scales. The median correlations of the HSSF and the MMPI were .635 and .715 respectively.

Test-retest correlations were .70, .72 and .47 for the satisfaction, frustration and synthesis scales of the HSSF respectively. The greater variability of the synthesis score can be explained by the fact that it represents five items while satisfaction and frustration scores are derived from 25 items each.
Schumann and Ayres (1972) administered the HSSF to a control group of subjects twice, approximately one year apart. T-test differences between group means indicated that neither the satisfaction nor the frustration mean score changed significantly over one year, the changes being 68.4 to 69.8 and 26.1 to 23.0 respectively. However, the synthesis score improved significantly from 69.5 to 76.1.

Dodrill (cited by Van Zyl, 1986) also tested the split-half reliability on data from 36 patients with epilepsy. He used the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula. Reliability coefficients of .76, .80 and .41 were found for the satisfaction, frustration and synthesis scales respectively.

Using White, Indian and African client groups in South Africa, Van Zyl (1986) obtained parallel-form reliability coefficients of .50, .73 and .83 for the satisfaction, frustration and synthesis scales respectively. The author noted that reliability for different racial groups varied considerably, with reliability of the satisfaction scale for Africans being particularly low.

On the whole reliability of the HSSF was considered to be satisfactory.

3.4.4 Validity of the HSSF

Concurrent validity has been reported by several researchers. T-test analyses and correlational analyses of the relationship between the HSSF and Maudsley Personality Inventory, Minnesota Multiphasic Inventory, Schultz Fundamental Interpersonal Relationship Orientation Behaviour, Keresuk's and Sherman's Goal Attainment Scale, and Holmes Schedules of Recent and Anticipated Experiences have shown significant relationships (Bates, 1972; Lawson and Powers, 1973; Maher, 1969).

Pragmatic validity of the HSSF has been demonstrated by Bates (1972) and Cannon (1976). Van Zyl (1986) cited further evidence of pragmatic validity of HSSF which
emanated from the unpublished works of the following researchers: Day (1975), Devish (1975), Fortin (1975), Griswold and Kelly (1977), and McDonald and Griswold (1977).

Predictive validity has been demonstrated by Ross (1973) and Thomas (1974). The unpublished works of Bender (1967), Castle and Copeland (1976) and Griswold and Ross (1977) have been cited by Van Zyl (1986) as evidence of predictive validity of HSSF.

Evidence of cross cultural validity has been demonstrated by Van Zyl (1986). The English version of the HSSF has been found to be valid for South Africans of all nationalities who are fluent in English. A Zulu scale has been developed for Zulu speaking individuals.

In summary the HSSF is considered to have satisfactory validity.

3.5 THE PHILOSOPHY OF HUMAN NATURE SCALE (PHNS)

Lawrence Wrightsman (1974) devised the 84-item PHNS. The scale was based on the assumption that people develop a general construct system or "philosophy of human nature" (PHN). This embodies expectations about what other people are like and is employed to mediate their perception of people and personal activity. Wrightsman identified six widely used dimensions of this construct system and designed the PHNS to measure them. The dimensions are:

(a) Altruism (A) - the extent to which people are believed to be willing to help others without thought of personal gain
(b) Trustworthiness (T) - the extent to which people are believed to be trustworthy and honest
(c) Strength of Will/Rationality (S) - the extent to which people are believed to act rationally and have control over outcomes
(d) Independence (I) - the extent to which people are believed to act in accordance with their own beliefs and to resist group pressure

(e) Complexity (C) - the extent to which people are believed to be complex in their make-up

(f) Variability (V) - the extent to which individuals are perceived to differ among themselves and also in their response from one situation to another

Wrightsman derived two additional scales through factor analysis of the 84 items. These are:

(a) Cynicism (C) - the extent to which the respondent tends to agree with attitude statements which attribute negative characteristics to people. The items of this scale all come from the Altruism and Trustworthiness Scales.

(b) Belief in Conventional Goodness (CG) - the extent to which the respondent tends to agree with attitude statements which suggest that people are basically good in a conventional sense. The items of this scale come from the Altruism, Trustworthiness, Independence and Strength of Will/Rationality Scales.

For the purposes of the present study, the items of the PHNS were modified to refer to Blacks in the form, PHNS-W, which was administered to White students (see Appendix C). The items were modified to refer to Whites in the form, PHNS-B, which was administered to Black students (see Appendix D).

Each of the original six subscales is composed of 14 statements. The additional two subscales, derived from a factor analytic study of the 84 items viz. Cynicism and Belief in Conventional Goodness, are composed of 10 and 12 statements respectively. The statements specific to each of the original six subscales are divided equally into
statements which convey a favourable and unfavourable view of human nature. For instance, in the Altruism dimension half of the statements imply that human beings are willing to help others without thought of personal gain, whereas the other half imply that human beings are unwilling to help others without thought of personal gain. This balancing of items was included to counter the acquiescent-response set which could result in either an overly positive or negative score. It is assumed that the acquiescent-response set does not seriously affect the two factor analytically-derived subscales as they do not include balancing items.

3.5.1 Scoring of the PHNS

The PHNS is a Likert-type scale. Subjects indicate their agreement or disagreement on a 6-point scale by encircling a number from +3 to -3. The six options on the scale are "agree strongly" (+3), "agree somewhat" (+2), "agree slightly" (+1), "disagree strongly" (-3), "disagree somewhat" (-2), and "disagree slightly" (-1). The range of scores possible on each of the original six subscales is +42 to -42. On the Cynicism subscale the range is +30 to -30 and on the Belief in Conventional Goodness subscale the range is +36 to -36. The scoring key is given in Appendix H. The raw scores on each subscale are used for purposes of analysis.

3.5.2 Reliability of the PHNS

Wrightsman (1974) administered the PHNS to previously untested groups of 100 undergraduate and 100 graduate students to determine its reliability. The split-half reliability of each subscale was computed to determine if the subscales were internally consistent. All coefficients of correlation obtained for the undergraduate sample were above .60. The obtained coefficients of correlation for the graduate sample ranged from .40 to .78. Wrightsman retested 35 subjects from his original
sample of 100 undergraduates three months later to determine test-retest stability. All the subscales produced good test-retest stability i.e. above .70. John O'Connor (1971) did a reliability study on the PHNS using 480 cadets at the Air Force Academy. These men were selected randomly from among those freshman cadets who were taking a course in Introductory Psychology during the 1968-1969 academic year. O'Connor used Cronbach's measure of reliability, coefficient alpha, for each subscale. Coefficients ranging from .63 to .80 were obtained.

In summary, it is evident that the PHNS has satisfactory reliability.

3.5.3 Validity of the PHNS

Wrightsman (1974) reported notable relationships between philosophies of human nature and interpersonal behaviour viz. student's evaluations of a particular instructor, teacher's non-verbal communications and behaviour in a mixed-motive game. These findings demonstrate criterion validity of the PHNS.

Wrightsman also reported that construct validity of the PHNS has been demonstrated by three factor analyses of heterogeneous test batteries which agree that a coherent "attitudes-towards-people" factor exists. This factor encompasses measures of the following constructs: philosophies of human nature, Machiavellianism, anomie, alienation, faith in people and suspicion. Separate correlational studies indicate that philosophies of human nature are also related to locus of control, interpersonal trust, attitudes towards desegregation and interpretation of motives towards government policies. Construct validity of the PHNS is also demonstrated by the finding of the following group differences using the PHNS: sex, race, occupation, age and religion. Race and sex differences were demonstrated by Edwards (1984) in his study of racial perceptions of South African university students using the PHNS.
It is evident that the PHNS has satisfactory validity.

3.6 Racial Discomfort Questionnaire (RDQ)

The RDQ is a 44-item questionnaire designed by the researcher to assess students' experience of Racial Discomfort (RD) in terms of feelings towards the other race group and activities in association with the other race group. Two forms were designed viz. the RDQ-W for White students and RDQ-B for Black students (see Appendix E and F). Both forms are identical except that the items of RDQ-W refer to Black students and the items of RDQ-B refer to White students. Twenty eight items deal with feelings while 16 items deal with activities. Feeling items refer to feelings related to associating with the other race group in a wide variety of situations germane to student life viz. studying, seating in lectures, use of library, visits to cafeteria, outings, politics, confiding, dating, friendships and social visiting. The activities items refer to actual participation in some of the situations referred to in the feeling items. The items were derived from the researcher's review of the literature on interracial attitudes and interracial mixing (Brooks et al, 1973; Fang, Covert, Eslinger and Stump, 1987; Human Awareness Programme, 1983; Scott and Damico, 1982; Steckler, 1957).

Three estimates are possible from the RDQ viz. a Feeling Index (RDFI), an Action Index (RDAI) and a Global Index (RDT). The first 28 items relate to the Feeling Index and the remaining 16 items relate to the Action Index. The Global Index is derived from a summation of scores on all 44 items.
3.6.1 Scoring of the RDQ

Likert-type scales are used for responses to the items of the RDQ. Subjects indicate their responses on 5-point scales by encircling a number from 1 to 5. The five options range from positive attitudes to negative attitudes. A low score indicates low Racial Discomfort and a high score indicates high Racial Discomfort. Scoring on items 19, 20, 21, 30, 31 and 33 is reversed as high ratings on these items would indicate low Racial Discomfort. The range of scores possible on each index is 28-140 (Feeling Index), 16-80 (Action Index) and 44-220 (Global Index).

3.6.2 Reliability and Validity of RDQ

This is the first use of the RDQ. No reliability and validity estimates are available at present. The instrument has been piloted on small groups of undergraduate and postgraduate students to eliminate difficulties in administration and to ensure students' comprehension of the items of the RDQ.

4. ADMINISTRATION OF INSTRUMENTS

4.1 The Screening Instrument

The screening instrument ie. the Biographical Inventory, was administered to Psychology 1 students in two lecture groups. Each group was given the following preamble by the Vice Principal of the University of Natal:

The University is attempting to meet the demands for sociopolitical change in our country in as many ways as it can. The students of this campus are obviously its primary focus. We attempt to respond to student needs in every possible way. An area of student need that we are aware of is student-student relationships -
particularly interracial relationships. Coming from a divided society, tensions between groups are understandable. We believe conscious efforts are necessary to alleviate these tensions. One such effort is a pilot social change programme being conducted by the Student Counselling Centre. The programme consists of six once-weekly one and a half hour group sessions. Participants for this programme will be selected from among you. Notices will be put up next week informing you of your selection. Participants stand to gain substantially from this experience. A nominal monetary incentive is available, in addition to a certificate of participation. I strongly urge the selected participants to give their full cooperation. However, should some of you not wish to participate you will not be forced to do so. The questionnaire you received as you entered the lecture theatre is a screening instrument on which selection will be based. The researcher in charge will give you the necessary instructions for the answering of the questionnaire. Your full cooperation will be greatly appreciated.

4.2 Pre and Posttest Instruments

The pre and posttest instruments viz. PHNS, HSSF and RDQ were administered to Groups A, B and C in a single one and a half hour session before and after the experimental phase. Care was taken to administer the instruments in the same order on both occasions.

5. BEHAVIOURAL PRE AND POSTTEST MEASURES

Behavioural measurement was accomplished through the use of video recordings of interactions of Groups A, B and C. Each group was divided into three subgroups of 10 which included equal numbers of Black and White members. Subgroup membership was the same in both pre and posttest situations. Each subgroup
participated in a 10 minute task involving group decision-making. The subgroup was instructed to elect a leader and a scribe and involve itself in group decision-making on the following problem:

You are a team of medical specialists. You have a limited supply of a wonder cure-all drug, Pan-D. You have to choose between using the drug on a ward of AIDS victims and a ward of battle wound victims. Search your consciences and arrive at a joint decision in the next 10 minutes.

For the posttest situation the following problem was utilised:

You are a panel of responsible citizens and you have been assigned the all important task of deciding whether capital punishment should be abolished in South Africa. Your decision is final. The whole nation awaits your decision because of all its implications for society. Search your consciences and arrive at a joint decision in the next 10 minutes.

The 10 minute subgroup interactions were video recorded pre and posttest. In addition to the author, one trained rater independently rated the pre and posttest recordings blind. A scoring manual developed by Forgus and Forgus (1983) was used to rate verbal behaviour along eight response categories:

(a) Seek information : (SR)
(b) Give information : (GR)
(c) Lead : (LR)
(d) Follow-through : (FR)
(e) Agree : (AR)
(f) Disagree : (DR)
(g) Positive Affect : (PAR)
(h) Negative Affect : (NAR)
In addition to the response category ratings, direction of responses was recorded along three categories:

(a) Intercare response : (BRI)
(b) Same race response : (BRS)
(c) Group response : (BRG)

Using a special rating sheet (see Appendix I) and a common scoring procedure, frequency counts were made for each verbal response, direction of response and total number of responses (TR).

6. EXPERIMENTAL TREATMENTS

From the review of the literature it was evident that no specific intergroup relations programmes have been used on a regular basis. Hence, it was decided that researchable programmes representative of the two main approaches viz. the confrontational and non-confrontational approach to improving intergroup relations would be used. The choice of programme was limited by the fact that few have been reported on. Programmes were considered researchable if:

(a) They were clearly time-limited.
(b) They constituted clearly defined stages and objectives.
(c) Activities within each stage were clearly defined.

Using the criteria of representativeness and researchability, a programme utilising a confrontational approach (Programme A) and a programme using a non-confrontational approach (Programme B) were identified. The two programmes had similar formats regarding their length, duration of sessions, group size, biracial participation and intimate sharing of experiences in an atmosphere of trust and openness. Both employed a systematic as opposed to a purely experiential approach.
Programme A was an adaptation of a race relations programme designed by Parker (1979) and Programme B was a values clarification programme designed by Marsh (Drum and Knott, 1978).

The programmes differed only in content in that A had a racial focus and B had a life theme focus. Both programmes had the potential to promote change in the designated dependent variables viz. Philosophy of Human Nature, Racial Discomfort, Social Functioning and Behavioural Responses. The programmes provided an authority-sanctioned forum for students of two racial groups to engage in intimate psychological work. A similar therapeutic style was adopted in both programmes. An insight oriented approach was utilised together with the techniques of clarification, reflection, confrontation and interpretation. The essential goal of the therapeutic process was the facilitation of openness, honesty, expression of feeling and the fostering of trust, respect for self and others and insight into issues central to self growth. Specific issues will be detailed in the description and discussion of the two programmes.

Each programme consisted of six sessions each lasting one and a half hours. The researcher, a Senior Clinical Psychologist of long and varied experience, was the facilitator for both programmes.

6.1 Programme A

Programme A is an adaptation of a race relations programme designed by Parker (1979) to improve integration in high schools in the United States. Like the other programmes reviewed, this programme has not been subjected to rigorous evaluation. However, it did meet the criteria of researchability and representativeness.
6.1.1 Objectives

The objectives of the programme were:

(a) To help participants learn communication skills that facilitate interracial interaction

(b) To help participants become aware of their present attitudes and feelings towards other races

(c) To help participants become aware of the stereotypes they hold and use regarding other races

(d) To increase interracial contact between Black and White participants

(e) To help participants develop an action plan designed to improve the relations between Black and White students

6.1.2 Format

The following 6-session format was used.

6.1.2.1 Session One: Communication Training

Session One was devoted to communication skills training. The simple rationale for commencing with this component was that effective communication was considered to be the means of dealing with the issues of racism as it affected Black and White students. Communication training has been used in a variety of settings to improve interpersonal relations (Arbes and Hubbell, 1973; Archer and Kagan, 1973; Guerney, 1982; Resnick, 1972; Wittmer and Myrick, 1974).

Session One began with the facilitator explaining the value and need for effective interpersonal communication. After a brief discussion, participants were asked to
give definitions and examples of effective and ineffective communication. Each participant then received a handout (see Appendix J) giving several examples of ineffective and effective communication. The group discussed these examples.

For skill-building purposes, each participant practised sending a message that expressed a feeling. The facilitator gave his own examples of such messages. Each participant had a turn to send a message. Thereafter they were given turns to respond to a message. The listener was instructed to focus on the feelings of the speaker and to let the speaker know that he or she was being listened to.

For more indepth experience in the acquisition of communication skills participants were placed in dyads (one Black and one White member). The dyads were instructed to concentrate on speaking and listening for about 30 minutes, taking turns to listen and speak for 15 minutes each.

After members of the dyads had played both roles, a group feedback and discussion exercise was engaged in. At the end of the session participants were told to bring in samples of effective and ineffective communication that they heard among friends.

6.1.2.2 Session Two: Communication in Action

Session Two carried the training in communication skills a step further in that the skills learned in the previous session were consolidated and applied in the context of racial communications.

This session began with a summary of Session One, including a definition of communication and an overview of effective and ineffective communication. Participants then shared some of the examples of effective and ineffective
communication that they had been asked to bring along. These examples were discussed with the aim of refining the participants' understanding of effective and ineffective communication.

The above mentioned activities lasted 40 minutes.

For the next activity, participants were racially segregated and placed in six groups of five members each. Three groups comprised Black students and three groups comprised White students. The groups were provided with sheets of paper and pens. They were instructed to:

(a) Elect a group leader and a scribe
(b) List things that people of other races do that hinder communication between races
(c) List things they thought the other race groups had listed about them

After 15 minutes the participants gathered for a large group feedback of their findings. The reports presented by the scribes were used to illustrate the negative roles of prejudice, stereotyping and value judgements in communication.

The session ended with an evaluation to determine if participants had learned communication skills. This was achieved by asking participants to determine if examples of communication given by the facilitator were ineffective or effective.

6.1.2.3 Session Three: Attitudes and Feelings

The object of this session was to help participants become aware of their attitudes and feelings towards other races. Participants were encouraged to use the communication training given in sessions One and Two. They were also advised that there should be no personal "put-downs" of themselves or others.
Participants were placed in dyads (one Black and one White member) and assigned the task of discussing their past and present experiences with people of the other race. This activity began with dyads and ended in a large group discussion as it was suggested by Parker (1979) that it is generally easier for participants to discuss this topic in small rather than large groups. After 30 minutes the participants in dyads were asked to join others to form groups of six members.

Thirty minutes later all the groups formed one large discussion group. Participants were asked to summarise the main ideas and insights they had gained from the small group discussions.

The facilitator introduced the interpretation that participants' past experiences with Blacks/Whites influenced their present perceptions, attitudes, feelings and behaviours towards them. Participants were encouraged to take a serious look at their present attitudes and feelings towards the other race group and to examine the source of these attitudes and feelings. It was pointed out that the first step towards changing a particular behaviour is to become aware that a problem exists or that a change is needed.

To determine if the objective of this session was accomplished, participants were asked to identify and write down their present feelings towards members of the other race and to identify the source of their attitudes and feelings.

6.1.2.4 Session Four: Awareness of Racial Stereotypes

This session was based on the Human Awareness Programme (1983). The objective of this session was to make participants more aware of the stereotypes they hold and use regarding the other race.
Copies of "Biographies" (Human Awareness Programme, 1983) (see Appendix K) and spare sheets of paper were distributed to each participant. Instructions were given to scrutinise the descriptive vignettes to:

(a) Decide whether the vignette was more likely to be that of a Black person or a White person
(b) Note their choice and the clues they used to make their decisions

After 30 minutes, using the information in "Key to Who's Who" (Human Awareness Programme, 1983) (see Appendix L), the facilitator informed the participants who the vignettes described and distributed copies of the "Key".

Participants were then divided into five groups of six members (three Black and three White members). They were given 30 minutes to respond to four questions presented on a flip chart viz.:

(a) Were you surprised by the identities? If so, why?
(b) Can you identify the stereotypes that made you use the clues you listed?
(c) Has this exercise in any way affected your racial stereotypes?
(d) How often do you meet other races of the same status or higher status than yourself? What effect does this have on your stereotypes?

The groups elected a leader and a scribe for this task.

After this activity, feedback was given in a large group discussion. The facilitator made the following points as presented by the Human Awareness Programme (1983):

(a) The standard of missionary and church education was high.
(b) Bantu education has, since 1954, systematically lowered the standard of Black education.
(c) Black men in the Cape had a qualified franchise until 1936.
Given the opportunity, people learn. "Civilisation", "intellect" and "culture" are not, in any form, the prerogative of Whites, nor does it take centuries for people to acquire the particular form of these attributes peculiar to the so-called Western World.

Until the 1960's, many Black political leaders believed passionately that morality and reason would bring about change. They were moderates, but the lack of response to morality and reason shown by the White Government proved them wrong.

It has been the deliberate policy of the Government to reduce contact between Blacks and Whites, with the result that the labourer or domestic worker stereotype of Blacks is reinforced for Whites.

As a result of the limited educational and job opportunities that were granted to Blacks, even Blacks have the tendency to believe that they do not have the ability to strive for high status jobs.

Socio-economic class does not make people better or worse but often leads to different interests, resulting in difficulties in cross-class communication. Where class differences are equated with race differences, it leads to the false conclusion that "Blacks and Whites can never be comfortable together."

### 6.1.2.5 Session Five: Action Plan

The objective of this session was to help participants develop a realistic plan of action to bring about better relations between Black and White university students.

Participants were placed in five racially integrated groups of six members (three Blacks and three Whites). Each group was asked to develop a plan for bringing about better relations between Black and White students on the campus. The plan had to
be specific enough to include who would be involved in the plan, what would be done, where the action would take place, how the action would be performed and a time schedule for the action. Each group elected a leader and a scribe. Forty minutes were allowed for the small groups to devise their plans. Participants were held accountable for carrying out their part of the group’s plan. Participants had to take home copies of their group’s plans. One week was allowed to accomplish the tasks outlined in their plans. They were to give progress reports in the following session.

The session concluded with a large group discussion of plans arrived at by the various groups.

6.1.2.6 Session Six: Follow-up to Action Plan

The objective of this session was to follow up on the participants’ experiences in carrying out their action plans.

Participants were divided into the same six racially integrated sub-groups as in Session Five. They shared their experiences with a view to confirming effective strategies, rejecting negative strategies and modifying and introducing new strategies.

After 30 minutes a large group discussion was held to give feedback and pool ideas. Participants were encouraged to select a pace that was comfortable for them as they continued to attempt to bring about better relations between Black and White students on the campus.
The session concluded with an evaluation exercise. Participants completed the following sentences:

(a) I learnt......
(b) I relearnt........
(c) It surprised me to see that.............
(d) I see that I need to.............
(e) The highlight of the sessions was.............
(f) The least useful for me was.............
(g) My general feedback to the facilitator is.............

6.2 PROGRAMME B

Programme B was an adaptation of the life theme group designed by Judy Marsh (cited in Drum and Knott, 1977) viz. Clarifying Personal Values. This programme has not been used specifically in interracial work. However, from a structural point of view it appears to be highly amenable to interracial use. None of the interracial group programmes using a non-confrontational approach was structurally suitable for purposes of the present research i.e. in terms of programme stages and length of programme. Moreover, the non-confrontational programmes reported on, have been conducted in course learning contexts (Bernstein and Gray, 1989; De Vries, Edwards and Slavin, 1978; Gonzales, 1979; Slavin and Oickle, 1980). Participation in the present research was an extra-curricular activity.

6.2.1 Objectives

The objectives of the programme were:

(a) To develop trust through self-disclosure
(b) To develop insight into those values related to satisfying activities and relative commitment to these activities

(c) To assist participants to evaluate their usage of time with a view to contracting for change towards a more satisfying allocation of time

(d) To develop insights into value positions regarding important contemporary issues relevant to participants

(e) To identify one value of central significance to each participant

(f) To provide participants with an opportunity to synthesise insights acquired in the course of the programme

6.2.2 Format

6.2.2.1 Session One: Name Tags

This exercise was chosen because it is an easy way to help members of new groups relax and get acquainted. It is also a way of initiating the process of identifying what participants value in their own lives and affirming values of other participants.

Each participant was given a 20cm x 12cm card, a safety pin and a pen. They were instructed to:

(a) Write their names in the centre of the card.

(b) Mark off a section at the righthand top corner entitled "favourites".

(c) List three favourites in this section viz. favourite song, favourite way to spend Saturday night and favourite food.

(d) Mark off a section at the righthand bottom corner entitled "places".

(e) List three favourite places viz. warmest, most comfortable room in your home when you were seven, the warmest, most comfortable room in your present living space and your favourite vacation place.
(f) Mark off a section at the lefthand bottom corner entitled "people".

(g) List the names of people in three categories viz. the three most nourishing (make you feel good) people in your life, the name of the most toxic (make you feel bad) person in your life, the name of the person in your life from whom you need more validation.

(h) Mark off a section at the lefthand top corner entitled "me".

(i) List three important issues in your life viz. three qualities you like about yourself, one new thing you have done to make your life better this past year, and one thing you could do to enrich your life more in the next six months.

After all the participants had finished this exercise, they pinned their cards onto themselves and walked around silently for five minutes, reading each others' cards. They then formed groups of six (three Blacks and three Whites per group), selected an item from their cards and took turns sharing these items for two minutes each. This was followed by two more sharings viz. sharing of one area in the "people" section for three minutes and sharing of their three best liked qualities for two minutes each.

The session terminated with a large group feedback of the sharing experience.

6.2.2.2 Session Two: 20 Loves

The objective of this session was to put individuals in touch with the activities that nourish, energise and relax them.

With the aid of a large sample sheet the facilitator instructed the participants to:

(a) Write down the numbers 1 to 20 in the centre of an A4 sheet of paper.
(b) Draw vertical lines that divided the side to the right of the numbers into seven columns.

(c) Think of things (big or small) they liked to do most and list them on the left side of the numbers.

(d) Insert the following information in column 1: "A" next to those things you like to do alone, "O" next to those things you like to do with others and "A-O" next to those things you like to do alone as well as with others.

(e) In column 2 put a Rand sign "R" for activities that cost you R5.00 or more every time you do them.

(f) In column 3 draw a heart next to those activities you need or want to do with someone you love.

(g) In column 4 put "52" next to those activities you would like to do once a week for the rest of your life.

(h) In column 5 put an "E" next to all the activities that involve exercise.

(i) In column 6 put "80" next to the activities you still will be able to do if you live to be eighty and are in good health.

(j) In column 7 jot down the approximate date you last did each of these activities.

Having completed their sheets participants were divided into groups of six (three Blacks and three Whites) to conduct a 10-minute sharing of what they had learnt in the task. At the end of this discussion each member completed the following sentences:

(a) What I learnt was..................

(b) What I relearnt was............... 

(c) What I was surprised to see was.............

(d) What I need to do is..................
The session terminated with a large group feedback of the experiences of participants.

6.2.2.3 Session Three: The Pie of Life

The object of this session was to help participants develop insight into their use of time.

Using a large sample sheet the facilitator instructed the participants to:

(a) Draw a large circle on sheets given to them (the circle representing a typical day).
(b) Divide the circle into quarters using dotted lines (each quarter representing six hours).
(c) Estimate how many hours or parts of an hour you spend on each of the following areas of activity in a typical day:
   (i) sleep
   (ii) in classes
   (iii) a money earning job
   (iv) with friends, socialising, playing sports etc.
   (v) on homework or preparation for classes
   (vi) alone, reading, listening to music, watching TV
   (vii) on chores, laundry, housework, etc.
   (viii) with family (including mealtimes)
   (ix) on miscellaneous other pastimes
(d) Draw with solid lines the proportional slice within your circle for each of the nine areas and label them.
Having completed the task, participants were paired (one Black and one White member) to engage in answering the following questions for 10 minutes:

(a) Are you satisfied with the sizes of each area slice?
(b) Ideally, how big would you want each slice to be? Draw your ideal pie.
(c) Realistically, is there anything you can do to begin to change the size of some of your slices?
(d) Is there something you would like to make as a "contract" with yourself to change? If you wish to contract use the following format:

I ..................................................................................................TO BETTER MY LIFE

WILL ........................................................................................................(whatever you need to do)

........................................ Your signature
........................................ Signature of a friend or witness
........................................ Reminder date - your friend calls you up and reminds you of your contract
........................................ Date contract is to be completed
........................................ The date and way you and your friend will celebrate the completion and burning of your contract.

The session was concluded with group sharing of participants’ experiences.
6.2.2.4 Session Four: Barometer of Values

The object of this session was to assist participants to acquire insight into their own value positions and awareness of the value systems of others.

For this session seven sheets of paper were stuck onto the floor of the room in a diagonal arrangement from one corner of the room to the opposite corner. The sheets represented a scale ranging from -3 to +3, the scale being representative of the following:

-3 = strongly disagree
-2 = moderately disagree
-1 = slightly disagree
0 = no feeling
+1 = slightly agree
+2 = moderately agree
+3 = strongly agree

The scale ratings were marked boldly on the sheets.

The group was instructed to:

(a) Cluster around the sheet marked "0".

(b) Move to the specific location that best represents each participant's feelings evoked by a value statement that would be read twice.

(c) Take careful note of how they moved and how others moved in response to each statement read out.
The following statements were used:

(i) Premarital sex is okay.
(ii) People learn violence from spanking.
(iii) The father should have the final say in family decisions.
(iv) Women are more effective in dealing with young children than men.
(v) Masturbation is healthy and natural.
(vi) Pornographic materials of any sort should be banned.
(vii) A sex education course, including sexual methods, should be taught to teenagers in schools.
(viii) Birth control pills and devices should be dispensed through schools.
(ix) Formal education is the key to success in life.
(x) Men who cry are weaker than men who don’t cry.
(xi) I support the principles of the women’s liberation movement.
(xii) Divorce laws should be stricter.
(xiii) I support capital punishment for rapists.
(xiv) Parents should be encouraged to stay together for the sake of the children.
(xv) There should be stricter abortion laws.

Participants were then instructed to find four other participants with whom they frequently shared similar positions during the exercise. These small groups were assigned the task of choosing one statement from five selected statements that were read out, and to respond to it in terms of the following questions:

(a) What is your value response to this statement?
(b) What is the source or origin of this value?
(c) How do you act on this value?
(d) What experiences have you had which affirm this value for you?
After 20 minutes the session terminated with a large group feedback and discussion.

6.2.2.5 Session Five: What would you like to say to the World?

The object of this session was to engage each participant in focussing on one important value with a view to developing insight into the chosen value.

Each participant was given a large sheet of paper (100cm x 60cm), several coloured markers and tape. They were instructed to use the sheet as a billboard commissioned by their Town Council. The billboard was used to display a message of their choice, with the knowledge that the billboard would be displayed in the main street of their town. The message was composed in response to the question, "What would I like to say to the world?" They were given 30 minutes for this task. After the billboards were complete, participants taped them up around the room. Several volunteers were requested to identify their efforts and to share their meanings and reasons for their choice.

The session terminated with a large group feedback and discussion of experiences.

6.2.2.6 Session Six: Personal Medallion

The objective of this session was to have participants think about the direction and quality of their own lives. The session provided participants with a personal summarizing activity which drew together the elements addressed in the previous five sessions.
Using a large sheet as an aid the facilitator instructed the group to:

(a) Draw a circle 30cm in diameter.

(b) Draw another circle 10cm in diameter in the centre of the first circle.

(c) Divide the space between the two circles into four equal segments.

(d) Symbolise in the top section of the "medallion" what they would do if given a whole year to do anything they wanted with unlimited funds and guaranteed success.

(e) Symbolise in the section to the right what they considered to have been their greatest personal achievement in their lifetime.

(f) Symbolise in the bottom section three things they wanted to do to re-energise and relax.

(g) Symbolise in the section to the left one thing other people could do to make them happy.

(h) Symbolise in the centre of the small circle three qualities they would like others to remember about them.

While they were instructed to create graphic symbols, words were permitted if no suitable graphic was possible. They were given 25 minutes for this task.

Thereafter the group was divided into small groups of six (three Black and three White members). Participants had turns to explain their medallions and the meaning of each symbol. This segment lasted 20 minutes. The small group discussion was followed by a large group feedback and discussion of the experiences of the participants.
The session terminated with an evaluation exercise. Participants completed the following sentences:

(a) I learnt.............
(b) I relearnt.............
(c) It surprised me to see that I.............
(d) I see that I need to.............
(e) The highlight of the sessions was.............
(f) The least useful for me was.............
(g) My general feedback to the facilitator is.............

7. DATA ANALYSIS

The data obtained by means of paper and pencil tests were treated as normally distributed interval strength data. The behavioural response data were treated as ordinal strength data. Three parametric analyses were conducted viz. One-Sample Analyses, Two-Sample Analyses and Principal Component Analyses (PCA) on the interval strength data. In the PCA, the distribution of the radius of spread data was found to be skewed. Hence, to compare groups and subgroups, a non-parametric test of difference was used viz. the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Two Sample Test. Non-parametric analyses viz. Chi Square Analyses were conducted on the ordinal strength data.

From pretest and posttest data obtained from the paper and pencil measures, group means and standard deviations were calculated. To assess the significance of pretest-posttest changes, difference scores were calculated as the data used was considered to be correlated data. The total frequency scores for each group and subgroup Behavioural Response category and Direction of Response category were calculated.
The obtained descriptive data were subjected to inferential analyses to test the research hypotheses.

8. PERIOD OF STUDY AND PROGRAMME VENUE

The experimental work of the project, including pre and posttesting, was conducted in the period March to May, 1990. This period was considered most suitable as it was approximately a month after the commencement of the first semester and a month before the first semester examinations. This made allowance for the students’ adjustment to the university environment and at same time the group programmes did not encroach on examination preparation time.

The group programmes were conducted in a large, flat lecture theatre on the Howard College campus of the University of Natal. Programme A was conducted on six consecutive Thursdays from 12:30 to 2:00 pm and Programme B was conducted on six consecutive Fridays from 9:30 to 11:00 am.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS OF THE INVESTIGATION

1. INTRODUCTION

Descriptive and inferential statistics were conducted on interval strength and nominal strength data obtained from 90 randomly selected students who were randomly assigned to two Experimental Groups (Group A and Group B) and one Control Group (Group C). Each group comprised 15 Black students and 15 White students. Change i.e. Pretest-posttest difference scores on 20 behavioural dimensions obtained from three measuring instruments viz. Philosophy of Human Nature Scale, Heimler Scale of Social Functioning and the Racial Discomfort Questionnaire, were subjected to Principal Components Analyses and One-Sample and Two-Sample Analyses. Difference scores were used because the research data was correlated data. Chi Square Analyses were conducted on pretest-posttest frequency data on eight Behavioural Response Categories and three Response Direction Categories.

The statistical analyses were conducted to fulfill the aims of the investigation and to test the research hypotheses stated. All analyses were conducted by means of a PC software package viz. Statgraphics Statistical Graphics System, unless otherwise stated.

2. PRINCIPAL COMPONENTS ANALYSIS

Principal Components Analysis (PCA) was applied to the 20 scores of each of the 90 subjects. The aim was to investigate the relationships among the subjects and among the measurement variables.
2.1 Principal Components

The variance contributions of the 20 principal components derived are displayed in Table 4. Approximately 60% of the variance is attributable to the first four components, while approximately 90% of the variance is located in the first 11 components. It is apparent that the spread of variance is relatively diffuse, although a notable clustering did occur in the first four components. This implies that the data is not characterised by a dominant one or two dimensional structure.

2.2 Biplot of First Two Principal Components

To identify the distribution of the main experimental variables contained in Principal Component one (PC1) and two (PC2) and the relationship between these variables, a Biplot of PC1 and PC2 was constructed (see Figure 3).

The following noteworthy features emerge from an examination of Figure 3:

(a) Of the 20 variables, 12 contribute significantly and these cluster radially, into four segments viz. Cluster 1 (RDAI, RDT, RDFI and CYN), Cluster 2 (CG), Cluster 3 (SI, HSSI and LSSI) and Cluster 4 (HSFI, FI and LSFI).

(b) The clusters are meaningfully positioned in relation to each other. Since Cluster 1 is directly opposite to Cluster 2 it can be inferred that these clusters measure the same effects but in a diametrically opposite direction. In other words they are negatively correlated. Similarly it can be inferred that Clusters 3 and 4 are negatively correlated with each other. Cluster 1 is the subjects' experience of Racial Discomfort and tendency to agree with attitude statements which attribute negative characteristics to Black/White people. Cluster 2 is the subjects' tendency to agree with attitude statements
Table 4
Variance Contributions of 20 Principal Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPONENT NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENT OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.44911</td>
<td>22.44911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.94009</td>
<td>37.38920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.83394</td>
<td>50.22315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.43718</td>
<td>60.66033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.92443</td>
<td>67.58475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.65908</td>
<td>73.24383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.29105</td>
<td>77.53488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.80819</td>
<td>81.34307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.39598</td>
<td>84.73905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.20572</td>
<td>87.94477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.98758</td>
<td>90.93235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.17898</td>
<td>93.11134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.86364</td>
<td>94.97498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.67329</td>
<td>96.64827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.49441</td>
<td>98.14269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.94965</td>
<td>99.09233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.38095</td>
<td>99.47328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.25071</td>
<td>99.72399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.19304</td>
<td>99.91704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.08296</td>
<td>100.00000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3. Biplot for First Two Principal Components
which suggest that Black/White people are basically good in a conventional sense. The negative correlation between Clusters 1 and 2 is hence logical. These two clusters appear to form a Positive-Negative Race Relations Continuum. Cluster 3 is a reflection of the subjects' level of Satisfaction (overall, at times of least satisfaction and at times of highest satisfaction). Cluster 4 is a reflection of the subjects' level of Frustration (overall, at times of least frustration and at times of highest frustration). Hence, the negative correlation between Clusters 3 and 4 as suggested by Figure 3 is logical and predictable. Clusters 3 and 4 appear to form a Satisfaction-Frustration Continuum.

(c) Clusters 3 and 4 are both at right angles to Clusters 1 and 2. Hence it can be inferred that the Satisfaction-Frustration Continuum and the Positive-Negative Race Relations Continuum are independent of each other. This finding appears to contradict the theory that personal growth fosters a lowering of racial prejudice. Further comment and discussion of this finding will be dealt with in the Discussion of Results Chapter.

2.3 Biplot Search for Discriminating Component Combinations

A series of two dimensional scattergrams was plotted to identify the most discriminating pairs of principal components i.e. component pairs that discriminated most between the Groups, Races and Race Subgroups of Groups A and B.

2.3.1 PC1-PC2 Plot by Group

The results of the PC1-PC2 Plot by Group are displayed in Figure 4. Features of note are:

(a) Spread for Group C is distinctly greater than that of both Group A and Group B.
(b) Spreads for Groups A and B are similar.
(c) While Group C is spread over all four quadrants Groups A and B are clustered around the zero axis.

2.3.2 PC1-PC2 Plot by Race

The results of the above plot are displayed in Figure 5. Principal component weights for Group A, B and C were included in the Race analysis. Features of note are:
(a) No overall difference in spread for Black and White scores is apparent.
(b) The spread for Black and White is similar.
(c) A relatively diffuse spread is true for both Race Subgroups.

2.3.3 PC1-PC2 Plot by Group and Race

The results of the above plot are displayed in Figure 6. Principal component weights for only Groups A and B were included in this analysis. Features of note are:
(a) No differences in spread are apparent for each group.
(b) While the spreads are similar, White students tend to cluster more closely together.

2.3.4 PC1 and the Remaining 18 Components

The combinations with the remaining components did not reveal greater discriminating power. The spreads merely shifted in terms of centre of gravity, while remaining the same in pattern. On some combinations the initial discrimination potential faded away.

In summary, Group discrimination was greatest and most clearly illustrated by the PC1-PC2 combination.
2.3.5 PC2-PC3 Plot by Group

The results of the above plot are displayed in Figure 7. Features of note are:

(a) Spread for Group C is distinctly greater than for Group A and B.
(b) Groups A and B appear to cluster tightly at the centre of the plot.

2.3.6 PC2-PC3 Plot by Race

The results of this plot are displayed in Figure 8. Principal component weights for Group A, B and C were included in this analysis. Features of note are:

(a) No overall difference in spread for Black and White students is apparent.
(b) The spread for Black and White students is similar.
(c) Both races cluster around the centre of the plot to a greater extent and occupy all four quadrants to a lesser extent.
(d) The spread is similar to that shown by the PC1-PC2 combination.

2.3.7 PC2-PC3 Plot by Group and Race

The results of this plot are displayed in Figure 9. Principal component weights for only Groups A and B were used in this analysis. Features of note are:

(a) No differences in spread are apparent for each group.
(b) While the group spreads are similar, White students tend to cluster more closely together. The effect is more clearly evident in this combination than it is in the PC1-PC2 combination.
(c) The overall clustering is towards the centre of the plot.
Figure 7. Principal Components by Group: PC2-PC3

Figure 8. Principal Components by Race: PC2-PC3

Figure 9. Principal Components by Group and Race: PC2-PC3
2.3.8 Pel and the Remaining 17 Components

The Group discrimination potential was maintained over all 17 components. The Group and Race discrimination potential weakened in the PC2-PC4 combination and remained weak for the rest of the combinations. No significant discrimination power was noted on any of the combinations for Race comparisons.

In summary, as was the case with PC1 combinations, Group discrimination was greatest and most clearly illustrated by the PC2 combinations.

In general PC1 and PC2 combinations are noteworthy. Lower order combinations revealed weak discriminating power. However, in spite of the discriminating potential of PC1 and PC2, the diffuse nature of the variance spread between the 20 principal components and the extent to which discrimination was noted, rendered further pursuit of discriminating factors by way of a Discriminant Analysis unwarranted.

2.4 Analysis of Radius of Spread within the PC1-PC2 Biplot

In order to quantitatively assess the suggestions of discriminant power by the graphic analyses presented in 2.3, a radius of spread score within the PC1-PC2 plane was calculated for each of the 90 subjects by using the following formula:

\[ r = \sqrt{(PC1 - \overline{PC1})^2 + (PC2 - \overline{PC2})^2} \]  

(Piper, pers.comm., 1990)*

- \( r \) = Radius
- \( PC1 \) = Principal Component 1
- \( \overline{PC1} \) = Mean for Principal Component 1
- \( PC2 \) = Principal Component 2
- \( \overline{PC2} \) = Mean for Principal Component 2

A programme written in GWBASIC was utilised to compute \( r \) values. The results of these computations are presented in Table 5.

*Piper, S. E. (1990), Statistician, Dept. of Psychology, University of Natal, Durban.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Radius of Spread Scores (r) of the Total Sample (N=90)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1-15: Group A Black
16-30: Group A White
31-45: Group B Black
46-60: Group B White
61-75: Group C Black
76-90: Group C White
To assess the nature of the distribution of radius scores for Groups A, B and C, Frequency Histograms were plotted for Groups, Races and Race Subgroups within Groups. The results of these plots are displayed in Figures 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 and 22. It is evident that all these distributions are skewed. Hence a nonparametric test of difference viz. the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Two-Sample Test was utilised to compare the various groupings. Table 6 displays the results of the difference testings.

It is evident that:

(a) No significant differences exist between Group A and Group B, the Black Subgroups of Groups A and B, the White Subgroups of Groups A and B, the Black and White Subgroups within each of Groups A, B and C and the Black and White groupings.

(b) On collapsing Groups A and B, the Black Subgroups of Groups A and B and the White Subgroups of Groups A and B, significant differences exist between: Group (A + B) and Group C (p < .001); the Black Subgroup of (A + B) and the White Subgroup of (A + B) (p < .05); the Black Subgroup of Group (A + B) and the Black Subgroup of Group C (p < .05); and, the White Subgroup of Group (A + B) and the White Subgroup of Group C (p < .001).

2.5 Conclusion

The findings of the Principal Components Analysis support the research hypotheses in terms of the composite dependent variables: Philosophy of Human Nature, Racial Discomfort and Social Functioning.
Figure 10. Distribution of Radius : Group A

Figure 11. Distribution of Radius : Group B

Figure 12. Distribution of Radius : Group C
Figure 13. Distribution of Radius: Black

Figure 14. Distribution of Radius: White
Figure 15. Distribution of Radius: Group A+B Black

Figure 16. Distribution of Radius: Group A+B White
Figure 17. Distribution of Radius: Group A Black

Figure 18. Distribution of Radius: Group B Black

Figure 19. Distribution of Radius: Group C Black
Figure 20. Distribution of Radius: Group A White

Figure 21. Distribution of Radius: Group B White

Figure 22. Distribution of Radius: Group C White
Table 6

Kolmogorov - Smirnov Two-Sample Tests for Radius Differences Between Groups and Subgroups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUPS AND SUBGROUPS</th>
<th>KOLMOGOROV - SMIRNOV TEST RESULTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP A vs GROUP B</td>
<td>0.266667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP (A+B) vs GROUP C</td>
<td>0.583333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACKS vs WHITES</td>
<td>0.222222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACK (A+B) vs WHITE (A+B)</td>
<td>0.366667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP A BLACK vs GROUP B BLACK SUBGROUP</td>
<td>0.266667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP (A+B) BLACK vs GROUP C BLACK SUBGROUP</td>
<td>0.433333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP A WHITE vs GROUP B WHITE SUBGROUP</td>
<td>0.333333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP (A+B) WHITE vs GROUP C WHITE SUBGROUP</td>
<td>0.733333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP A BLACK vs GROUP A WHITE SUBGROUP</td>
<td>0.466667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP B BLACK vs GROUP B WHITE SUBGROUP</td>
<td>0.266667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP C BLACK vs GROUP C WHITE SUBGROUP</td>
<td>0.466667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Having looked at global change and the main variables contributing to significant global change, a series of One-Sample and Two-Sample Analyses were conducted to isolate individual behavioural dimensions that changed significantly between pretest and posttest conditions.

3. ONE-SAMPLE ANALYSIS

In view of the fact that data analysis of pretest-posttest differences between scores of the 20 interval strength behavioural data involved the use of correlated data, the difference scores rather than the actual pretest and posttest scores were subjected to tests of significance. A series of one-sample analyses were conducted to assess significance of Change, i.e. pretest-posttest differences, for each research Group and for each Race Subgroup within each research Group.

3.1 Group Change Analyses

3.1.1 Group A

The results of the Group Change one-sample analysis for Group A (see Table 7) indicated that four PHN dimensions significantly decreased and one significantly increased. Further, highly significant decreases occurred in all three dimensions of RD. No significant Change occurred in the SF dimensions.

3.1.2 Group B

The results of the Group Change one-sample analysis for Group B (see Table 8) indicate that significant decrease occurred in one of the PHN dimensions and one significant increase occurred in another. One of the nine SF dimensions showed significant increase. Two of the three dimensions of RD showed significant decreases.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th>One-Sample t Values</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>-2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>-2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>-2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>-4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>-7.40</td>
<td>-6.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYN</td>
<td>-2.37</td>
<td>-10.33</td>
<td>-7.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>10.70</td>
<td>6.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>73.00</td>
<td>74.97</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>38.53</td>
<td>34.80</td>
<td>-3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPI</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>9.93</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNI</td>
<td>13.47</td>
<td>13.27</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSSI</td>
<td>77.47</td>
<td>79.93</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSFI</td>
<td>26.43</td>
<td>22.80</td>
<td>-4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSSI</td>
<td>68.53</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSFI</td>
<td>53.70</td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td>-4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPI</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDFI</td>
<td>48.33</td>
<td>41.93</td>
<td>-6.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDAI</td>
<td>62.97</td>
<td>58.23</td>
<td>-5.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDT</td>
<td>110.57</td>
<td>99.77</td>
<td>-10.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8
Pretest-Posttest Comparisons of Mean Scores of Group B (N=30) on 20 Behavioural Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPENDENT VARIABLE</th>
<th>MEAN SCORES</th>
<th>ONE-SAMPLE ANALYSIS VALUES</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRETEST</td>
<td>POSTTEST</td>
<td>DIFFERENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>-1.23</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>-1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>-1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYN</td>
<td>-3.13</td>
<td>-8.73</td>
<td>-7.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>12.63</td>
<td>6.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>71.20</td>
<td>73.93</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>41.70</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>-5.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPI</td>
<td>10.63</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>-2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNI</td>
<td>12.20</td>
<td>12.53</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSSI</td>
<td>76.53</td>
<td>78.27</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSFI</td>
<td>29.20</td>
<td>24.47</td>
<td>-4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSSI</td>
<td>65.90</td>
<td>69.60</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSFI</td>
<td>57.73</td>
<td>49.10</td>
<td>-8.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPI</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>-3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDFI</td>
<td>44.93</td>
<td>41.40</td>
<td>-2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDAI</td>
<td>63.70</td>
<td>59.97</td>
<td>-3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDT</td>
<td>108.63</td>
<td>101.40</td>
<td>-6.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1.3 Group C

The results of the Group Change one-sample analysis for Group C (see Table 9) indicate that no significant increases or decreases occurred in any of the PHN, SF or RD dimensions.

3.2 Within Group Race Subgroup Change

3.2.1 Group A Black Subgroup

The results of this analysis are presented in Table 10. It is evident that a significant decrease occurred in one dimension of PHN. Significant decreases also occurred in two dimensions of RD. No significant Change occurred in the SF dimensions.

3.2.2 Group A White Subgroup

The results of this analysis (see Table 11) indicate significant decreases in five PHN dimensions and a highly significant increase in a sixth PHN dimension. It is also evident that highly significant decreases occurred in all three dimensions of RD. No significant Changes occurred in the SF dimensions.

3.2.3 Group B Black Subgroup

The results of this analysis are presented in Table 12. It is evident that significant decreases occurred in one PHN dimension and one SF dimension. No significant Changes occurred in the RD dimensions.
Table 9  
Pretest-Posttest Comparisons of Mean Scores of Group C (N=30) on 20 Behavioural Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPENDENT VARIABLE</th>
<th>MEAN SCORES</th>
<th>ONE-SAMPLE DEPENDENT ANALYSIS</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRETEST</td>
<td>POSTTEST</td>
<td>DIFFERENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>-2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>-1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>-1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
<td>-3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYN</td>
<td>-2.10</td>
<td>-5.33</td>
<td>-2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>72.47</td>
<td>73.83</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>41.57</td>
<td>40.80</td>
<td>-1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPI</td>
<td>10.47</td>
<td>9.53</td>
<td>-0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNI</td>
<td>13.47</td>
<td>13.20</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSSI</td>
<td>77.80</td>
<td>78.80</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSFI</td>
<td>26.93</td>
<td>27.33</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSSI</td>
<td>67.33</td>
<td>69.27</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSFI</td>
<td>57.63</td>
<td>56.70</td>
<td>-1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPI</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>-1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDFI</td>
<td>47.07</td>
<td>46.37</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDAI</td>
<td>62.93</td>
<td>62.33</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDT</td>
<td>110.73</td>
<td>108.87</td>
<td>-2.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10
Pretest-Posttest Comparisons of Mean Scores of Group A Black Subgroup (N=15) on 20 Behavioural Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPENDENT VARIABLE</th>
<th>MEAN SCORES</th>
<th>ONE-SAMPLE ANALYSIS</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRETEST</td>
<td>POSTTEST</td>
<td>DIFFERENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
<td>-4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>-1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>-0.93</td>
<td>-2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>11.67</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>-7.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>-5.07</td>
<td>-5.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYN</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>-4.40</td>
<td>-9.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>63.93</td>
<td>65.73</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>55.07</td>
<td>49.27</td>
<td>-5.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPI</td>
<td>12.13</td>
<td>13.07</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNI</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>15.47</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSSI</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>72.27</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSFI</td>
<td>39.07</td>
<td>32.80</td>
<td>-6.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSSI</td>
<td>57.87</td>
<td>59.20</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSFI</td>
<td>76.20</td>
<td>69.40</td>
<td>-6.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPI</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDFI</td>
<td>45.93</td>
<td>39.67</td>
<td>-6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDAI</td>
<td>61.60</td>
<td>58.33</td>
<td>-3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDT</td>
<td>107.53</td>
<td>97.33</td>
<td>-10.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11
Pretest-Posttest Comparisons of Mean Scores of Group A White Subgroup (N=15) on 20 Behavioural Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPENDENT VARIABLE</th>
<th>MEAN SCORES</th>
<th>ONE-SAMPLE ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRETEST</td>
<td>POSTTEST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>-2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>-3.00</td>
<td>-9.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYN</td>
<td>-10.20</td>
<td>-16.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>15.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>82.07</td>
<td>84.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>20.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPI</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>6.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNI</td>
<td>12.40</td>
<td>11.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSSI</td>
<td>84.93</td>
<td>87.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSFI</td>
<td>13.80</td>
<td>12.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSSI</td>
<td>79.20</td>
<td>80.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSFI</td>
<td>31.20</td>
<td>28.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPI</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
<td>-2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDFI</td>
<td>50.73</td>
<td>44.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDAI</td>
<td>64.33</td>
<td>58.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDT</td>
<td>113.60</td>
<td>102.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 12
Pretest-Posttest Comparisons of Mean Scores of Group B Black Subgroup (N = 15) on 20 Behavioural Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPENDENT VARIABLE</th>
<th>MEAN SCORES</th>
<th>ONE-SAMPLE ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRETEST</td>
<td>POSTTEST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>7.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>-1.87</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>8.73</td>
<td>8.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>5.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYN</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>13.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>67.67</td>
<td>71.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>52.67</td>
<td>51.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPI</td>
<td>10.73</td>
<td>8.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNI</td>
<td>12.13</td>
<td>12.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSSI</td>
<td>73.07</td>
<td>75.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSFI</td>
<td>38.47</td>
<td>38.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSSI</td>
<td>62.33</td>
<td>67.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSFI</td>
<td>71.33</td>
<td>66.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPI</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDFI</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>40.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDAI</td>
<td>61.40</td>
<td>60.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDT</td>
<td>104.40</td>
<td>100.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2.4 Group B White Subgroup

This analysis revealed significant decrease in one PHN dimension and significant increase in another (see Table 13). Significant decreases occurred in four out of the nine SF dimensions and two of the three RD dimensions.

3.2.5 Group C Black and White Subgroups

The analyses for both Black and White Group C Race Subgroups are presented in Tables 14 and 15. It is evident that no significant changes occurred in any of the behavioural dimensions in both Subgroups.

3.3 Summary

The Group and Subgroup one-sample analyses revealed several common areas of change for Groups A and B and several areas of change peculiar to certain Race Subgroups of Groups A and B. No areas of significant change were revealed for Group C as a whole and its Subgroups.

Common areas of change for Groups A and B were:

(a) CYN and CG dimensions of PHN
(b) RDAI and RDT dimensions of RD

Areas of change peculiar to Groups A and B were:

(a) Changes in I, V and C dimensions of the PHN and RDFI dimension of RD were peculiar to Group A.
(b) Change in UPI dimension of SF was peculiar to Group B.

Common areas of change for the Black Subgroups of Groups A and B were:

(a) Change in CYN dimension of PHN.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPENDENT VARIABLE</th>
<th>MEAN SCORES</th>
<th>ONE-SAMPLE ANALYSIS VALUES</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRETEST</td>
<td>POSTTEST</td>
<td>DIFFERENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-1.53</td>
<td>-1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>-3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>-1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>-1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>-3.20</td>
<td>-2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYN</td>
<td>-6.20</td>
<td>-14.07</td>
<td>-5.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>12.06</td>
<td>5.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>74.73</td>
<td>77.07</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>30.73</td>
<td>21.33</td>
<td>-9.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPI</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>-2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNI</td>
<td>12.27</td>
<td>12.40</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSSI</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>81.07</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSFI</td>
<td>19.93</td>
<td>11.67</td>
<td>-8.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSSI</td>
<td>69.47</td>
<td>73.07</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSFI</td>
<td>44.13</td>
<td>32.20</td>
<td>-11.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPI</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDFI</td>
<td>46.87</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>-3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDAI</td>
<td>66.00</td>
<td>59.80</td>
<td>-6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDT</td>
<td>112.87</td>
<td>102.80</td>
<td>-10.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 14
Pretest-Posttest Comparisons of Mean Scores of Group C Black Subgroup (N=15) on 20 Behavioural Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPENDENT VARIABLE</th>
<th>MEAN SCORES</th>
<th>ONE-SAMPLE ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRETEST</td>
<td>POSTTEST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYN</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>67.60</td>
<td>67.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>55.73</td>
<td>57.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPI</td>
<td>12.53</td>
<td>10.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNI</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>13.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSSI</td>
<td>73.87</td>
<td>73.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSFI</td>
<td>36.60</td>
<td>40.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSSI</td>
<td>61.33</td>
<td>62.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSFI</td>
<td>75.67</td>
<td>77.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPI</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDFI</td>
<td>43.73</td>
<td>42.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDAI</td>
<td>60.73</td>
<td>60.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDT</td>
<td>105.93</td>
<td>102.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15
Pretest-Posttest Comparisons of Mean Scores of Group C White Subgroup (N = 15) on 20 Behavioural Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPENDENT VARIABLE</th>
<th>MEAN SCORES</th>
<th>ONE-SAMPLE ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRETEST</td>
<td>POSTTEST</td>
<td>DIFFERENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHN</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>-2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>5.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CYN</td>
<td>-10.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CG</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>77.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>27.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UPI</td>
<td>8.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNI</td>
<td>12.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HSSI</td>
<td>81.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HSFI</td>
<td>17.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LSSI</td>
<td>73.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LSFI</td>
<td>39.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OPI</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>RDFI</td>
<td>50.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RDAI</td>
<td>65.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RDT</td>
<td>115.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Areas of Change peculiar to each of the Black Subgroups of Groups A and B were:

(a) Changes in RDFI and RDT of RD were peculiar to Group A Black Subgroup.
(b) Change in OPI of the PHN was peculiar to Group B Black Subgroup.

Common areas of Change for each of the White Subgroups of Groups A and B were:

(a) Changes in CYN and CG of PHN
(b) Changes in RDAI and RDT of RD

Areas of Change peculiar to each of the White Subgroups of Groups A and B were:

(a) Changes in FI, UPI, HSFI and LSFI dimensions of SF were peculiar to the Group B White Subgroup.
(b) Changes in S, I, and C of PHN and RDFI of RD were peculiar to the Group A White Subgroup.

4. TWO-SAMPLE ANALYSIS

To test for significant differences between the Group and the Subgroups, a series of two-sample analyses were conducted. The comparisons yielding significance are presented in Table 16. Group A evidenced significantly greater decrease in RDAI than Group C. This was the solitary significant finding for the Group difference analyses. The Between-Group Same Race comparisons revealed significantly greater Change in the A dimension of the PHN in the Group A versus B and Group B versus C Black Subgroup comparisons. The Within-Group Opposite Race comparisons revealed a significantly greater decrease in RDAI in Group B White Subgroup relative to Group B Black Subgroup.

In general, it is apparent that few significant Change differences existed between the Groups and Subgroups on the 20 behavioural dimensions studied.
Table 16

Summary Table for Group and Subgroup Comparisons (Between and Within)
Showing Significant Differences on Two-Sample Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP AND SUBGROUP COMPARISONS</th>
<th>BEHAVIOURAL DIMENSION</th>
<th>t VALUE</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X1*</td>
<td>X2*</td>
<td>X1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP A vs GROUP C</td>
<td>-5.07</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>-2.0327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP A vs GROUP B: BLACK SUBGROUP</td>
<td>-2.27</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>-2.1555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP B vs GROUP C: BLACK SUBGROUP</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>-3.20</td>
<td>2.2183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP B: BLACK vs WHITE SUBGROUP</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>-6.20</td>
<td>2.7584</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Extensions "1" & "2" refer to the first & second groups mentioned in a comparison.
5. BEHAVIOURAL INTERACTION ANALYSES

Videotaped behavioural interaction was rated independently, both pretest and posttest by two raters along eight categories of response and three categories of response direction. An agreement rate of 85% was obtained between the two raters. The frequency distributions of response categories and response directions for the Groups and Subgroups were subjected to a series of Chi Square Analyses. Owing to an absence of responses in one category (NA) and low frequencies when it did occur, this category was excluded from the analyses. However, its contribution to the Total Response Change was retained.

5.1 Group Analyses

5.1.1 Group A - Response Categories

Group A pretest-posttest responses are illustrated by a histogram plot (see Figure 23). The overall distribution of responses changed significantly (Chi Square = 17.5225; df=6; p<.01). It is evident from Table 17 that the total response category changed significantly. Except for a decrease in category D, all other responses showed an increase. However, only two categories showed significant Change viz. A and D. Both the Changes in A and D were found to be significantly different from the total response Change (see Table 18). It is clearly evident that a response pattern Change occurred in Group A and that A and D Changes were the main contributors to this Change.
Figure 23. Pretest-Posttest Responses of Group A
Table 17

Comparison of Pretest-Posttest Behavioural Response Frequencies of Group A (N=28) Using Chi Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE CATEGORY</th>
<th>PRETEST</th>
<th>POSTTEST</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.1111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>2.4460</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.2407</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12.5185</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.3125</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.1905</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>206</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>4.8044</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18

2 x 2 Chi Square Analyses of Categories of Group A Showing Significant Change by Total Response Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE CATEGORY</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE*</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>6.3340</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.9294</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* using Yates Correction (df=1)
5.1.2 Group A - Response Direction

Group A pretest-posttest response direction frequencies are illustrated by a histogram plot (see Figure 24). The overall distribution of response directions did not change significantly (Chi Square = 2.9465; df=2). It is evident from Table 19 that BRI increased significantly. However, this change was not found to be significantly different from the total response change of Group A (see Table 20). It is of note that relative to BRS, BRI showed a greater change demonstrating a notable shift toward interracial interaction.

5.1.3 Group B - Response Categories

Group B pretest-posttest responses are illustrated by a histogram plot (see Figure 25). The overall distribution of responses did not significantly change at the .05 level of significance (Chi Square = 11.7853; df=6; p<.07). It is evident from Table 21 that, except for an absence of change in category D, all categories showed increases. The increases in S, G, F, A and Total Response were found to be significant. However, when compared to the total response change, none of these category increases were found to be significantly different (see Table 22). It is still noteworthy that F and A combined appear to have made a strong contribution to the overall increase in responses.

5.1.4 Group B - Response Direction

Group B pretest-posttest response direction frequencies are illustrated by a histogram plot (see Figure 26). The overall distribution of response directions of Group B changed significantly (Chi Square = 17.0885; df=2; p<.001). It is evident from Table 23 that BRI and BRS significantly increased. However, only the BRS change was found to be significantly different from the total response change (see Table 24).
Figure 24. Group A: Response Direction
Table 19

Comparison of Pretest-Posttest Direction of Response Frequencies of Group A (N=28) Using Chi Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE CATEGORY</th>
<th>PRETEST</th>
<th>POSTTEST</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRI</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>6.7164</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRS</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.1177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRG</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.8947</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20

2 x 2 Chi Square Analyses of Direction Categories of Group A Showing Significant Change by Total Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIRECTION OF RESPONSE CATEGORY</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE*</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRI</td>
<td>1.3197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* using Yates Correction (df=1)
Figure 25. Pretest-Posttest Responses of Group B
Table 21

Comparison of Pretest-Posttest Behavioural Response Frequencies of Group B (N=26) Using Chi Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE CATEGORY</th>
<th>PRETEST</th>
<th>POSTTEST</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.3634</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>8.3626</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.0500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>20.7069</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11.5200</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.2692</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>78.7488</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Posttest Total Response Category includes one excluded category (f=5)

Table 22

2 x 2 Chi Square Analyses of Categories of Group B Showing Significant Change by Total Response Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE CATEGORY</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>0.3621</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>0.7374</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.5330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.3515</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 26. Group B: Response Direction
Table 23

Comparison of Pretest-Posttest Direction of Response Frequencies of Group B (N=26) Using Chi Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE CATEGORY</th>
<th>PRETEST</th>
<th>POSTTEST</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRI</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>11.9403</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRS</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>46.9469</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRG</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0.3205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24

2 x 2 Chi Square Analyses of Direction Categories of Group B Showing Significant Change by Total Response Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIRECTION OF RESPONSE CATEGORY</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE*</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRI</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRS</td>
<td>4.7390</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* using Yates Correction (df=1)
It follows that the BRS Change contributed the most to the overall distribution of response direction Change. This demonstrates a significant shift toward same race interaction.

5.1.5 Group C - Response Categories

Group C pretest-posttest responses are illustrated by a histogram plot (see Figure 27). The overall distribution of responses changed significantly (Chi Square = 14.5492; df = 6; p < .05). It is evident from Table 25 that the total response, G and A increased significantly. It is also evident that a decrease occurred in one category (F), a notable increase occurred in one category (D) and no Change occurred in one category (L). Relative to the total response Change neither of the two significant category Changes was found to be significantly different from the total response Change (see Table 26). Hence it appears that no clearly discernable response pattern Change occurred in Group C.

5.1.6 Group C - Response Direction

Group C pretest-posttest response direction frequencies are illustrated by a histogram plot (see Figure 28). The overall distribution of response directions significantly changed (Chi Square = 8.1284; df = 2; p < .05). It is evident from Table 27 that BRG changed significantly. However, it was not found to be significantly different from the total response Change (see Table 28). It is of note that relative to a combination of BRS and BRI Change, BRG Change was significantly greater (Chi Square = 5.2273; df = 1; p < .05). This demonstrates a significant shift toward group responses as opposed to one to one responses.
Figure 27. Pretest-Posttest Responses of Group C
Table 25

Comparison of Pretest-Posttest Behavioural Response Frequencies of Group C (N=25) Using Chi Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE CATEGORY</th>
<th>PRETEST</th>
<th>POSTTEST</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.2778</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>5.0909</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.7148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.0000</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.9286</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>6.6207</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26

2 x 2 Chi Square Analyses of Categories of Group C Showing Significant Change by Total Response Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE CATEGORY</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE*</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>0.4477</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2.7562</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* using Yates Correction (df=1)
Figure 28. Group C: Response Direction
Table 27

Comparison of Pretest-Posttest Direction of Response Frequencies of Group C (N=25) Using Chi Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE CATEGORY</th>
<th>PRETEST</th>
<th>POSTTEST</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRI</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2.0984</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRS</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.4638</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRG</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>9.6200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28

2 x 2 Chi Square Analyses of Direction Categories of Group C Showing Significant Change by Total Response Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIRECTION OF RESPONSE CATEGORY</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE*</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRG</td>
<td>2.9172</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* using Yates Correction (df=1)
5.2 Subgroup Analyses

5.2.1 Group A White Subgroup - Response Categories

Group A White Subgroup pretest-posttest responses are illustrated by a histogram plot (see Figure 29). The overall distribution of responses was found to have significantly changed (Chi Square = 13.4301; df = 6; p < .05). It is evident from Table 29 that no significant change occurred in the total number of responses. Further, while minimal change occurred in most categories, a significant increase occurred in A and a significant decrease occurred in D. The noteworthiness of this finding is highlighted by the finding that the D change was significant relative to the total response change and the A change was significant relative to the total response change at the .07 level of confidence (see Table 30). Hence, it is evident D and A Changes contributed significantly to the response pattern change in this Subgroup.

5.2.2 Group A White Subgroup - Response Direction

Group A White Subgroup pretest-posttest response direction frequencies are illustrated by a histogram plot (see Figure 30). The overall distribution of responses was found to have changed significantly (Chi Square = 5.8566; df = 2; p < .05). It is evident from Table 31 that in contrast to the finding of overall distribution change, none of the responses showed individual significant change. At the same time, it is noteworthy that BRI did increase while BRS decreased and BRG showed negligible change. Hence, it is apparent that the BRI-BRS Changes contributed significantly to the Change in direction pattern.
Figure 29. Group A White Pretest-Posttest Responses
Table 29

Comparison of Pretest-Posttest Behavioural Response Frequencies of Group A White Subgroup (N=15) Using Chi Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE CATEGORY</th>
<th>PRETEST</th>
<th>POSTTEST</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.0400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.1111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.3333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.4098</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.4815</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.1429</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.9259</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>0.0153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 30

2 x 2 Chi Square Analyses of Categories of Group A White Subgroup Showing Significant Change by Total Response Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE CATEGORY</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE*</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.1597</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>5.5623</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* using Yates Correction (df=1)
Figure 30. Group A White: Response Direction
Table 31

Comparison of Pretest-Posttest Direction of Response Frequencies of Group A White Subgroup (N=15) Using Chi Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE CATEGORY</th>
<th>PRETEST</th>
<th>POSTTEST</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRI</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.5000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRS</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRG</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.7103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2.3 Group A Black Subgroup - Response Categories

Group A Black Subgroup pretest-posttest responses are illustrated by a histogram plot (see Figure 31). The overall distribution of responses did not change significantly (Chi Square = 6.3371; df=6). It is evident from Table 32 that there was a significant increase in the total number of responses. Further, increases occurred in G, F and A, with categories G and A being significant. However, the G and A changes were not found to be significantly different from the total response change (see Table 33). It follows that while increases in responses occurred, no discernable response pattern change occurred in this Subgroup.

5.2.4 Group A Black Subgroup - Response Direction

Group A Black Subgroup pretest-posttest response direction frequencies are illustrated by a histogram plot (see Figure 32). The overall distribution did not change significantly (Chi Square = 1.8731; df=2). It is evident from Table 34 that both BRI and BRS changed significantly. However, neither of these changes were found to be significantly different from the total response change (see Table 35). It appears that these changes were reflective of the overall increase in the number of responses for this Subgroup.

5.2.5 Group B White Subgroup - Response Categories

Group B White Subgroup pretest-posttest responses are illustrated by a histogram plot (see Figure 33). The overall distribution of responses changed significantly (Chi Square = 15.6537; df=6; p<.05).
Figure 31. Group A Black Pretest-Posttest Responses
Table 32

Comparison of Pretest-Posttest Behavioural Response Frequencies of Group A Black Subgroup (N=13) Using Chi Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE CATEGORY</th>
<th>PRETEST</th>
<th>POSTTEST</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.1667</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.8788</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.6250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.1739</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.0714</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.5556</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.2857</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
<td><strong>121</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.2323</strong></td>
<td><strong>.001</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Posttest Total Response Category includes one excluded category (f=1)

Table 33

2 x 2 Chi Square Analyses of Categories of Group A Black Subgroup Showing Significant Change by Total Response Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE CATEGORY</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE*</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2.0780</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* using Yates Correction (df=1)
Figure 32. Group A Black: Response Direction
Table 34

Comparison of Pretest-Posttest Direction of Response Frequencies of Group A Black Subgroup (N=13) Using Chi Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE CATEGORY</th>
<th>PRETEST</th>
<th>POSTTEST</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRI</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.2647</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRS</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7.1429</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRG</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.1081</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 35

2 x 2 Chi Square Analyses of Direction Categories of Group A Black Subgroup Showing Significant Change by Total Response Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIRECTION OF RESPONSE CATEGORY</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE*</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRI</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRS</td>
<td>0.5224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* using Yates Correction (df=1)
Figure 33. Group B White Pretest-Posttest Responses
It is evident from Table 36 that the total number of responses increased significantly. With the exception of L and D, all categories showed increases - the increases being significant for G, F and A. When compared with the total response Change, none of these significant category Changes were found to be significantly different (see Table 37). However, relative to each category, categories F and A appeared to have undergone the greatest Change. It would follow that the pattern Change that occurred could be attributed largely to the joint contributions of F and A.

5.2.6 Group B White Subgroup - Response Direction

Group B White Subgroup pretest-posttest direction of response frequencies are illustrated by a histogram plot (see Figure 34). The overall distribution was found to have changed significantly (Chi Square = 17.4605; df=2; p<.001). It is apparent from Table 38 that both BRI and BRS increased significantly, the BRS Change being greater than the BRI Change. Relative to the total response Change, neither the BRI nor BRS Change was found to be significant (see Table 39). The pattern Change in direction of responses appears to be one of lowering of BRG and increases in BRI and BRS.

5.2.7 Group B Black Subgroup - Response Categories

Group B Black Subgroup pretest-posttest responses are illustrated by a histogram plot (see Figure 35). The overall distribution did not undergo significant Change (Chi Square = 4.9995; df=6). It is apparent from Table 40 that there was a general increase in the number of responses in all categories. The total number of responses and categories S, L and F increased significantly. However, none of the category Changes were found to be significant relative to the total response Change (see Table 41). It follows that the category Changes were reflective of the total response Change.
Table 36

Comparison of Pretest-Posttest Behavioural Response Frequencies of Group B White Subgroup (N=14) Using Chi Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE CATEGORY</th>
<th>PRETEST</th>
<th>POSTTEST</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.3333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5.4478</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.1250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>16.6154</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.5333</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.0769</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.6000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>25.2957</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 37

2 x 2 Chi Square Analyses of Categories of Group B White Subgroup Showing Significant Change by Total Response Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE CATEGORY</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE*</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>0.2425</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>2.4067</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.6771</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* using Yates Correction (df=1)
Figure 34. Group B White: Response Direction
Table 38

Comparison of Pretest-Posttest Direction of Response Frequencies of Group B White Subgroup (N=14) Using Chi Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE CATEGORY</th>
<th>PRETEST</th>
<th>POSTTEST</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRI</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7.1290</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRS</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>33.9596</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRG</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.3157</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 39

2 x 2 Chi Square Analyses of Direction Categories of Group B White Subgroup Showing Significant Change by Total Response Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIRECTION OF RESPONSE CATEGORY</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE*</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRI</td>
<td>0.2298</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRS</td>
<td>3.0100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* using Yates Correction (df=1)
Figure 35. Group B Black Pretest-Posttest Responses
### Table 40

Comparison of Pretest-Posttest Behavioural Response Frequencies of Group B Black Subgroup (N=12) Using Chi Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE CATEGORY</th>
<th>PRETEST</th>
<th>POSTTEST</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.5714</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.1428</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.4737</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.1667</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>98</td>
<td><strong>20.5352</strong></td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 41

2 x 2 Chi Square Analyses of Categories of Group B Black Subgroup Showing Significant Change by Total Response Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE CATEGORY</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE*</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>0.1921</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.0286</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* using Yates Correction (df=1)
5.2.8 Group B Black Subgroup - Response Direction

Group B Black Subgroup pretest-posttest response direction frequencies are illustrated by a histogram plot (see Figure 36). The overall distribution changed significantly (Chi Square = 6.3246; df=2; p<.05). All categories of response direction increased significantly, BRS showing the greatest increase (see Table 42). However, none of these category changes were found to be significantly different relative to the total response change (see Table 43). The pattern change in direction of response appears to lie in the eight-fold increase in BRS as compared to the two-fold increases in BRI and BRG.

5.2.9 Group C White Subgroup - Response Categories

Group C White Subgroup pretest-posttest responses are illustrated by a histogram plot (see Figure 37). The overall distribution changed significantly (Chi Square = 6.6109; df=6; p<.01). It is evident from Table 44 that negligible change occurred in S, L and PA while notable increases occurred in G, A and D and a decrease occurred in F. Only category G and the total number of responses changed significantly. Relative to the total response change the G change was not significantly different (see Table 45). The pattern change in distribution of responses appears to lie in the F:G ratio which changed from 1:1 to 1:3.

5.2.10 Group C White Subgroup - Response Direction

Group C White Subgroup pretest-posttest response direction frequencies are illustrated by a histogram plot (see Figure 38). The overall distribution of direction frequencies changed significantly (Chi Square = 9.4847; df=2; p<.01).
Figure 36. Group B Black: Response Direction
Table 42

Comparison of Pretest-Posttest Direction of Response Frequencies of Group B Black Subgroup (N=12) Using Chi Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE CATEGORY</th>
<th>PRETEST</th>
<th>POSTTEST</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRI</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4.8919</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.7857</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRG</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.6667</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 43

2 x 2 Chi Square Analyses of Direction Categories of Group B Black Subgroup Showing Significant Change by Total Response Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIRECTION OF RESPONSE CATEGORY</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE*</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRI</td>
<td>0.5370</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRS</td>
<td>3.5285</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRG</td>
<td>0.0097</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* using Yates Correction (df=1)
Figure 37. Group C White Pretest-Posttest Responses
### Table 44

Comparison of Pretest-Posttest Behavioural Response Frequencies of Group C White Subgroup (N=12) Using Chi Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE CATEGORY</th>
<th>PRETEST</th>
<th>POSTTEST</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>11.1860</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.3333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.1481</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.1250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.2727</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>4.4953</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 45

2 x 2 Chi Square Analyses of Categories of Group C White Subgroup Showing Significant Change by Total Response Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE CATEGORY</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE*</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>2.6094</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* using Yates Correction (df=1)
Figure 38. Group C White: Response Direction
It is evident from Table 46 that only BRG changed significantly. This direction change was found to be significantly different from the total response change (see Table 47). It follows that the BRG change contributed significantly to the pattern change in response direction evidenced by this Subgroup.

5.2.11 Group C Black Subgroup - Response Categories

Group C Black Subgroup pretest-posttest responses are illustrated by a histogram plot (see Figure 39). The overall distribution of responses did not change significantly (Chi Square = 3.9100; df = 5). There was no significant increase in total number of responses and in any of the individual response categories (see Table 48).

5.2.12 Group C Black Subgroup - Response Direction

Group C Black Subgroup pretest-posttest direction of response frequencies are illustrated by a histogram plot (see Figure 40). The overall distribution of direction frequencies did not change significantly (Chi Square = 2.3789; df = 2). None of the direction categories showed significant change (see Table 49).

5.3 Summary

(a) Response pattern changes occurred for Groups A and C and the White Subgroups of Groups A, B and C.

(b) A significant change in total number of responses was found for all groups and Subgroups except Group A White Subgroup and Group C Black Subgroup.
Table 46

Comparison of Pretest-Posttest Direction of Response Frequencies of Group C White Subgroup (N=12) Using Chi Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE CATEGORY</th>
<th>PRETEST</th>
<th>POSTTEST</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRI</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.7576</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRS</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.0417</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRG</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13.0000</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 47

2 x 2 Chi Square Analyses of Direction Categories of Group C White Subgroup Showing Significant Change by Total Response Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIRECTION OF RESPONSE CATEGORY</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE*</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRG</td>
<td>4.7879</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* using Yates Correction (df=1)
Figure 39. Group C Black Pretest-Posttest Responses
Table 48

Comparison of Pretest-Posttest Behavioural Response Frequencies of Group C Black Subgroup (N=13) Using Chi Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE CATEGORY</th>
<th>PRETEST</th>
<th>POSTTEST</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.6250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.1429</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.2500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.0625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.6000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.6667</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.4384</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 40. Group C Black: Response Direction
Table 49

Comparison of Pretest-Posttest Direction of Response Frequencies of Group C Black Subgroup (N=13) Using Chi Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE CATEGORY</th>
<th>PRETEST</th>
<th>POSTTEST</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRI</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.4138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRS</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.8571</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRG</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.5417</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(c) Of the seven categories of response, significant Changes occurred in various combinations of S, G, F, A and D for the groups and Subgroups. The Group C Black Subgroup was the only Subgroup that did not evidence any Change.

(d) Response direction pattern Change occurred for both Groups B and C, the White Subgroups of Groups A, B and C and the Black Subgroup of Group B.

(e) One to one response direction Change (BRI and BRS) was dominant for Groups A and B and their Subgroups while group response direction Change (BRG) was dominant for Group C and its White Subgroup.
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

The results reported in Chapter Four will be discussed in this chapter. Interpretations will be related to the aims and research hypotheses of the study. Corroboration with and divergences from the general body of literature on prejudice reduction and elimination of racism will be considered.

1. PRINCIPAL COMPONENTS ANALYSIS

Several findings of this analysis warrant comment and discussion. The most important finding was the significant difference between Groups A and B combined and Group C. This finding provided the expected support for the four research hypotheses. It demonstrated that the group programmes conducted with A and B effected significant behavioural change that could not have occurred as a result of simply attending a non-racial institution.

The change dimensions revealed are particularly noteworthy. A highly meaningful Race-Relations Continuum and a Satisfaction-Frustration Continuum emerged (See Figure 41). A reduction in Racial Discomfort i.e. feeling uncomfortable about interacting with Blacks/Whites and actual interaction with Blacks/Whites was found to be associated with a reduction in negative attitudes towards Blacks/Whites. While both these variables decreased, positive attitudes towards Blacks/Whites increased. The research group programmes were aimed at changes in these directions.

A totally uncorrelated but significant Continuum that emerged was the Satisfaction-Frustration Dimension. Subjects’ experience of Satisfaction was inversely correlated
Figure 41. Schematic Representation of Continua Revealed by Principal Components Analysis
with a reduction in their experience of Frustration. This finding can be explained by the fact that Frustration Indices are computed as a ratio of the Satisfaction Indices. Of greater importance is the fact that these indices emerged as discriminating variables and that they were uncorrelated with the Race-Relations Continuum. The former finding suggests that changes occurred in the subjects' lives that increased their levels of Satisfaction and decreased their Frustration levels. It is likely that the experience of intimacy and trust, the development of personal insights and the opportunity to develop friendships provided by the group programmes were the effective processes at work. If these were indeed the processes at work, then the programmes would to a large extent have similar goals to those suggested for the ideal group by Wilkinson (1973) viz.:

(a) Opening of new levels of communication
(b) The establishment of personal acquaintances and friendships which can be maintained
(c) Fostering of a realistic action orientation in Blacks and Whites to work towards understanding, acceptance, co-operation and communication
(d) Development of planned activities to produce institutional changes that would foster high levels of Black-White understanding

However, the latter finding suggests that the personal psychological gains of the programmes do not have a bearing on reduction of racial prejudice and vice versa. This finding appears to contradict the hypothesis that personal growth derived from sensitivity training should lead to prejudice reduction (Kahn, 1963, cited by Rubin, 1967). This finding is also contrary to the findings of Rubin (1967) that personal growth produced by laboratory training within a biracial context reduces ethnic prejudice. On the other hand, failure of personal change to produce prejudice reduction can be due to the "sleeper effect" described by Katz, Sarnoff and McClintock (1957). These workers reported shifts in prejudice several weeks after experimental self-insight work.
While the continua that emerged from the research findings are revealing, interpretations must be tempered by the fact that they emerged from an analysis of Principal Components 1 and 2 which constitute 37.39% of the total variance of the sample. Other discriminating factors could have been obscured by the diffuse spread of variance. This spread appears to suggest that large variations in change existed between subjects within groups and subgroups. In spite of the fact that the sample used was a highly selected one, many extraneous variables were at play. A significant variable could well have been the fluid political status of the country during the period of the experimental work. Together with political uncertainties, increases in political and criminal violence occurred. Within the University of Natal campus, a Black Consciousness Movement was revived in the student body. Participants could have been directly and indirectly affected by these socio-political variables.

1.1 Principal Components by Race and "Group and Race" Analysis

Although relatively diffuse spreads were noted for Black students belonging to all three groups, no significant differences were found for races within each group. The finding that Blacks of Groups A and B combined and Whites of Group As and B combined both significantly differed from each other, and from the Blacks and Whites respectively of Group C, has two implications. It demonstrates that changes across groups took place, irrespective of racial categories and separately for the two racial categories. It also demonstrates that Blacks and Whites differed in the extent of change achieved. This suggests that both racial Subgroups in Groups A and B benefitted from participation in the Group Programmes, but differently. This finding is in keeping with the findings reported in certain co-operative learning strategies studies viz. Whites benefit more from such programmes than the other race (Slavin and Oickle, 1980; Weigel, Wiser and Cook, 1975).
The diffuseness of the Black Subgroup scores can be attributed partially to the fact that two racial groups with a purportedly common political ideology and experience comprised this Subgroup. Observations of interactions in the Group Programmes demonstrated that the two racial groups viz. African and Indian students did not automatically behave as a common group although they may have had a common political ideal and similar political frustrations. For example, when students were asked to separate into Black and White racial groups for a specific exercise African and Indian students formed separate groups. African and Indian students were included in the Black Subgroup on the assumption that their common political ideologies and experience of political oppression would override their ethnic identities, especially in Black-White interactions. However, in view of the findings of this research, it would appear that African and Indian students do not necessarily identify with each other as Black people in Black-White interactions. This identification may be a function of political conscientisation. In future programmes it may be a useful practice to ascertain African and Indian students' identification with the term "Black" before assigning them to Black Subgroups. In interracial work with students who have low identification with this term, the term Black should not be used. In such groups there should be an equal representation of African and Indian students.

1.2 Summary

The highlights of the Principal Components Analysis were:

(a) Groups A and B benefitted significantly from the Group Programmes.

(b) Group C showed neither losses nor gains from non-participation.

(c) Two change Continua were revealed viz. a Race Relations Continuum and a Satisfaction-Frustration Continuum.

(d) At the time of posttesting the two change Continua were uncorrelated.

(e) Both racial Subgroups of Groups A and B benefitted significantly from the Group Programmes but differently.
2. GROUP AND SUBGROUP COMPARISONS ON DIMENSIONS OF THE THREE COMPOSITE DEPENDENT VARIABLES STUDIED

In this section the results of the Group and Subgroup Change comparisons on dimensions of PHN, SF and RD will be discussed.

2.1 Philosophy of Human Nature Changes

The Change in Philosophy of Human Nature (PHN) evidenced by Groups A and B demonstrated that both Group Programmes A and B were successful in effecting Change in perceptions Blacks had of Whites and vice versa. The absence of significant Change in Group C demonstrated that the Change in Groups A and B was the result of the Group Programmes they were exposed to and not attendance at a non-racial educational institution alone.

The Change demonstrated by Group A and Group B differed appreciably. The breadth of Change of PHN was greater for Group A than Group B in that more dimensions changed for Group A (see Figures 42, 43 and 44). This finding may be explained as follows. Programme A was aimed at exploring interpersonal experiences within a racial context. On the other hand Programme B was aimed at exploring intrapersonal experiences within a personal, non-racial context. It would follow that structured sharing about significant racial interpersonal experiences would foster greater awareness of events in the lives of Blacks/Whites and possibly greater awareness of their psychosocial behavioural determinants. This in turn would directly affect perceptions of Blacks/Whites.

The second finding of note is that Cynicism (CYN) decreased significantly for both Groups A and B and their Race Subgroups. This implies that there was an overall reduction in negative attitudes to Blacks/Whites. The common element of the two
Figure 42. Schematic Representation of PHN Change
Comparisons of Groups A and B

Figure 43. Schematic Representation of PHN Change
Comparisons of Group A and B Black Subgroups

Figure 44. Schematic Representation of PHN Change
Comparisons of Group A and B White Subgroups
programmes, viz. sharing of intimate experiences between races, could have produced this effect. A corresponding increase in positive attitudes towards Blacks was evidenced by Belief in Conventional Goodness (CG) Changes for Groups A and B and their White Subgroups. The absence of CG Change for the Black Subgroups of Groups A and B (see Figures 43 and 44) indicates that Blacks were more resistant to developing a higher level of positive attitudes to Whites. It is possible that Blacks may require longer and more intensive involvement in group work or that there may be a lag in developing more positive attitudes. The resistance displayed by Blacks may be directly attributable to their being "under-dogs" in interracial encounters.

Group A, as a group, showed interesting decreases in Independence (I), Variability (V) and Complexity (C). Changes in these dimensions were significant for Group A Whites only. This Subgroup also showed a significant decrease in Strength of Will (S). The category I reflects people's ability to stand by their convictions in the face of external pressures. The category S on the other hand, reflects people's ability to control their destiny as opposed to being controlled by external forces. The ability to withstand external pressures is common to both variables. It would follow that these two variables would reflect how Whites saw Blacks in their sociopolitical contexts. As a result of their sharing of interpersonal experiences and greater conscientisation about sociopolitical issues through their programme involvement, White students could have become more aware of the Black people's struggle to stand by their convictions and to control their own destiny. In other words, White students could have become more pessimistic about Black people being able to express their strengths in I and S.

The Changes in V and C suggest that White students of Group A saw Blacks as more predictable and less complex as a result of their programme involvement.
In general, while providing insight into the processes at work in the two Group Programmes, the findings of PHN Change strongly support the research hypotheses.

2.2 Racial Discomfort Changes

The Changes in Racial Discomfort (RD) evidenced by Group A and its Subgroups and Group B and its White Subgroup demonstrate that both Group Programmes A and B were successful in achieving Change in Racial Discomfort. The absence of significant Change in Group C indicates that this Change in RD was the result of exposure to Group Programmes A and B and not attendance at a nonracial educational institution alone.

As with PHN Changes, RD Changes for Groups A and B differed appreciably. While Group A evidenced Change for all three indices (see Figure 45), Group B failed to demonstrate significant Change in RDFI, the Feeling Index of RD. The significance of Change for Group B can be attributed largely to its White Subgroup which demonstrated significant Change in RDAI and RDT (see Figure 47). The failure of the Black Subgroup of Group B to demonstrate Change in any of the RD indices (see Figure 46) corresponds with their failure to demonstrate significant increase in positive attitudes to Whites. This implies that the Black Subgroup of Group B maintained its pre-programme attitudes to Whites. This finding appears to support the idea that expression of racial reservations is necessary for a breakdown of racial barriers in the process of integration. In other words a confrontational, as opposed to a non-confrontational approach, was supported. This was the central assumption of Group Programme A. The idea is further supported by the finding that both White and Black Subgroups of Group A showed significant shifts in RD. The results of the Group A Subgroups contrast markedly with the results of the Group B Subgroups.
Figure 45. Schematic Representation of RD Change
Comparisons of Groups A and B

Figure 46. Schematic Representation of RD Change
Comparisons of Group A and B Black Subgroups

Figure 47. Schematic Representation of RD Change
Comparisons of Group A and B White Subgroups
The absence of Change in the Group B Black Subgroup and Change in only RDAI and RDT implies that the Group B participants were more reserved about interracial involvement than Group A participants.

More specifically, the findings for the White Subgroup of Group B suggest that although Whites still felt uncomfortable with Blacks they were associating more with Blacks.

The Group A Black-White comparison (see Figure 46 and 47) shows that the Group A White Subgroup had become less uncomfortable and was associating more with Blacks. On the other hand, the Group A Black Subgroup had become less uncomfortable but was still having reservations about associating more with Whites. This finding corresponds with the failure of the Black Subgroup of Group A to show a significant increase in positive attitudes to Whites.

The Change findings for PHN and RD appear to suggest that Blacks were more guarded about their feelings towards Whites and their freedom to mix with Whites. This phenomenon appears to be more true for the Black Subgroup of Group B than the Black Subgroup of Group A. The White Subgroup of Group A appeared to have demonstrated more Change in Race Relations than the White Subgroup of Group B. Overall, Group A showed more Change in Race Relations than Group B. This finding is directly attributable to the fact that Group Programme A was directly aimed at interracial issues while Programme B was obliquely interracial in that its racial nature was restricted to a biracial mix of participants.

2.3 Social Functioning Changes

The Changes in Social Functioning (SF), as measured by the HSSF, evidenced by Group B and its Subgroups demonstrated that Group Programme B was effective in
producing Change in the personal dimension of SF. The absence of Change in Groups A and C and their Subgroups demonstrated that both participation in Group Programme A and attendance of a non-racial educational institution were not sufficient to produce significant Change in SF. This finding can be attributed to the fact that Programme B was a Personal Development programme which was designed to improve SF.

Interesting differences in Change occurred between the Race Subgroups of Group B (see Figure 48). The Black Subgroup evidenced a significant drop in Optimism as revealed by its lower OPI. This finding possibly links with the absence of Change for this Subgroup in RD and limited Change in Perceptions of Whites (PHN Change). This suggests, globally, that Programme B had limited positive effects for the Black Subgroup of Group B and that Programme B was unsuccessful in achieving positive Change in this Subgroup. It may be that unaddressed racial issues acted as barriers to Change. It is also possible that the life theme chosen for Programme B may not have been highly relevant to Black participants. On the other hand the White Subgroup evidenced significant lowering of its Frustration Indices (FI, HSFI and LSFI) and its Uncertainty Index (UPI) in the area of Satisfaction. It follows that Programme B was highly successful in improving SF for this Subgroup.

2.4 Summary

It is apparent that significant Change did occur in Groups A and B. It is also apparent that the Group Programmes produced specific Changes in the Groups and Subgroups. PHN Changes were greatest for Group A and its White Subgroup. RD Changes were also greatest for Group A and its White Subgroup. The Black Subgroup of Group A evidenced greater Change in PHN and RD than the Black Subgroup of Group B. In general the White Subgroups of Groups A and B appeared
Figure 48. Schematic Representation of SF Changes in Group B and Group B Subgroups
to have benefitted the most and the Black Subgroup of Group B the least. The Programme that appears to have benefitted both White and Black Subgroups the most was Programme A. The findings of this analysis provided interesting insights into the processes at work in the Group Programmes and at the same time confirmed all the research hypotheses.

3. BEHAVIOURAL RESPONSE CHANGE

In this section the results of the Chi Square Analyses of behavioural response Change will be discussed separately for each Group and its Subgroups. This will be followed by an integration of the separate findings. Figures 49, 50 and 51 summarise the most important aspects of Change noted.

3.1 Behavioural Change for Group A

3.1.1 Response Category Change for Group A and its Subgroups

The overall increase in responses suggests that the amount of talking increased markedly. Of note is the finding that this increase in talking was almost entirely due to the Black students of Group A. In fact, from a Black:White response ratio of approximately 1:2 a shift to an approximately 1:1 ratio prevailed posttest. This suggests that Black and White students felt equally free to communicate subsequent to their exposure to Group Programme A. This finding appears to be associated with the Communications Exercise where Black students described White "over-expressiveness" as intimidating and discounting to Blacks.

A high degree of active listening irrespective of race was encountered in the posttest assessment. This was confirmed by the significant increase in agreement responses
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Figure 49. Schematic Summary of Response Category and Response Direction Change of Group A and Its Subgroups
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Figure 50. Schematic Summary of Response Category and Response Direction Change of Group B and Its Subgroups
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Figure 51. Schematic Summary of Response Category and Response Direction Change of Group C and Its Subgroups
and the corresponding decrease in disagreement responses. Many of the agreement responses were acknowledgements of the speaker's contributions. The drop in disagreement responses suggests that Group A participants were more inclined to consider a member's contribution rather than to "square up" for debate. This suggests the development of a higher level of integration. The significant pattern Change in the distribution of responses suggests that new group dynamics, specifically related to active listening, were at work.

A pattern Change similar to the Group pattern Change was true for the Group A White Subgroup. On the other hand there was an absence of pattern Change for the Group A Black Subgroup. However, Black students did demonstrate a strong tendency towards the more integrative responses of Agreement and Follow-through. Change was evidently stronger for White students than for Black students.

3.1.2 Response Direction Change for Group A and its Subgroups

The response direction Change results strongly support the category Change results. Interracial responses increased significantly for the Group and the Black Subgroup and strongly for the White Subgroup. There was a significant increase in same race responses for Black students and a strong decrease for White students. Overall, it appears that a balanced interrace-same race interaction ratio developed for both Subgroups of students. While the shift in direction pattern was significant for White students, it was strong but not significant for Black students.

It would appear from these findings that a significant Change suggestive of highly improved race relations occurred for Group A and its Subgroups. The Change was greater for White students than for Black students.
Forgus and Forgus (1983) used a similar behavioural interaction assessment procedure in their study of the effectiveness of skilled mediation in improving intergroup communication. In addition to significant increases in frequency of participant-contributions, they found progressive increases in agreement and follow-through responses and decreases in disagreement, leadership and negative affect responses. To a large extent the findings of the present study were corroborative. An interesting difference was the lack of negative affect responses in all three research groups in the present study. This category of response was excluded from the final evaluation because of its virtual absence. The explanation for this absence could be that the students were more willing to compromise and less rigid and hence less negatively emotional. The alternate explanation is that the students might have been uncertain as to what extent expression of negative emotions was permitted.

3.2 Behavioural Change for Group B

3.2.1 Response Category Change for Group B and its Subgroups

The overall increase in responses suggests that the amount of talking increased markedly for Group B and its Subgroups. The failure of the Group distribution Change to show significance suggests that no overall shift occurred towards a more integrated or harmonious pattern of functioning for the group as a whole. However, the Subgroup analyses showed that White students evidenced a significant pattern Change. There was a shift towards a higher level of integration as demonstrated by their highly significant increases in Follow-through and Agreement responses. The Black students showed a notable but statistically insignificant shift in a similar direction. This implies that White students developed greater integration than Black students.
Of note is the relatively unchanged Black:White response ratio which was 1:3 pretest and changed to 1:2.5 posttest. This suggests that no major change occurred in interrace group dynamics. Instead, changed dynamics were restricted to within each Subgroup as evidence by separate increased integration levels posttest in each of the Subgroups.

### 3.2.2 Response Direction Change for Group B and its Subgroups

The response direction change results strongly support the category change results. Significant pattern shifts were apparent for the Group and its Subgroups. This shift was largely due to increased same race responses in both the White and Black Subgroups. It would appear that greater cohesiveness developed within each Subgroup of students. However, less marked but significant shifts also occurred in interrace communication. Only the White increase in same race interaction was found not to reflect the increase in total responses. This indicated that a shift towards same race communication was stronger for White students than it was for Black students.

In general it is evident that while significant change in within-Subgroup integration occurred, limited change occurred in the area of race relations subsequent to exposure to Group Programme B.

### 3.3 Behavioural Change for Group C

#### 3.3.1 Response Category Change for Group C and its Subgroups

The overall increase in responses suggests that there was greater talking in the group as a whole and in the White Subgroup. The Black Subgroup did not evidence any significant change. The significant pattern change for this Group appears to be
characterised by significant increases in Information-giving responses and Agreement responses counterbalanced by decreased Follow-through and increased Disagreement responses. Overall, no shift towards integration emerged. A similar situation prevailed for the White Subgroup.

The Black:White communication ratio remained relatively unchanged (1:1.3 pretest and 1:1.6 posttest). Hence, it would appear that no Change occurred in interrace communications.

3.3.2 Response Direction Change for Group C and its Subgroups

The results of the response direction Change support the category Change results. The pattern Change was one of increased group responses as opposed to one to one responses. This suggests that a lower level of integration existed posttest. This direction Change was true for the White Subgroup only. No interrace and same race shifts occurred for Group C as a whole and its Subgroups.

In general, it is evident that extraneous variables, such as attendance of non-racial education institutions, had no notable effect on interracial and same race relations in Group C. There was, however, a tendency towards a lower level of integration in this Group.

3.4 Conclusion

From the separate findings within each group the following highlights emerged:

(a) Group integration is a function of Group Programmes and not attendance at a non-racial educational institution alone.

(b) Interracial integration was largely a function of Group Programme A.

(c) Integration per se was largely a function of Group Programme B.
(d) Increased frequency of communication is not purely a function of Group Programme participation but group dynamics within a given programme and extraneous variables.

(e) The Behavioural Change findings strongly support the research hypotheses. However, the nature of support is of note as indicated in (a) and (b).

4. INTEGRATION OF SEPARATE ANALYSES

The findings of the Behaviour Change Analyses clearly suggest that Groups A and B benefitted significantly from the Group Programmes. Group C showed neither losses nor gains from non-participation. Positive Change on a Race-Relations Continuum was dominant for Group A. Positive Change on a Satisfaction-Frustration Continuum was dominant for Group B. The Behavioural Interaction Change Analyses corroborated these findings. Group A subjects normalised their interracial relationships while Group B subjects retained a dominant White participation. However, Group B did demonstrate the development of integration separately within each of its Race Subgroups.

White students in both Groups showed greater Change than Black students in all variables studied. In view of their "underdog" status in interpersonal interactions, it is predictable that Black students would be more guarded than White students in responding to facilitative efforts in interpersonal functioning irrespective of whether the context is racial or non-racial. Group A students' significant and noteworthy positive Change in race relations may be the result of the Programme A content being perceived as relevant to their sociopolitical aspirations. Local research supports the assertion that for Black students the sociopolitical goals of liberation take preference over their personal individualistic aspirations (Danziger, 1975; Du Preez et al, 1981; Leon and Lea, 1988).
It is clearly evident that both Programmes A and B have specific significant benefits. Group A has a highly significant potential in the area of race relations for both White and Black students. Attendance at a non-racial institution per se has no influence on students, neither in their personal lives nor their interracial relationships. This is in keeping with the assertion of Foster and Finchilescu (1986) that interpersonal contact of different race-groups such as on an open university campus is not enough to improve group relations. They noted that the social reality and group identity of such individuals would remain intact.

In generalising from these findings, note needs to be taken of the fact that these Changes took place in students who had attended university for approximately three months. As such, the participants may have been less resistant to Change facilitation than later-year students. As a result of possible negative interrace contact experiences in their earlier years, later-year students may have developed certain coping mechanisms that they may be unwilling to relinquish. Further, new students may not have defined perceptions of the university as later-year students. Hence, the critical variable of perception of institutional support for the Programmes may have been easier to create in new students. The other selection criteria adopted should also be taken into consideration in a similar vein. Further research possibilities based on variations of the selection criteria are enunciated in the final chapter.

With due recognition to the limitations of the generalisability of the research findings, the results did unequivocally support the research hypotheses. As such, significant directions are provided for proactive efforts in both the university and the wider communities.
4.1 Theoretical and Practical Implications

4.1.1 Theoretical Implications

The results of the research highlighted the relevance of significant postulates in the field of intergroup relations. Some modifications and extensions were also suggested by the research findings.

Strong support was provided for the central theme of the Contact Hypothesis viz. that interracial contact under certain situations would promote interracial harmony and that contact per se cannot achieve this goal. The research programmes fulfilled the suggested facilitative contact conditions to a large extent in that:

(a) Educationally, the status of participants was equal. No attempt was made to equate socioeconomic status as this would have been virtually impossible.

(b) A concerted effort was made to convey the University's support for intergroup contact. The project was introduced to prospective participants by the Vice Principal of the University with a strong message of support. A significant degree of contact with the students was made via the Department of Psychology, thus giving the programmes an academic association. The opinions of the Black and White student representative bodies was canvassed to ensure that programme aims were in keeping with the prevailing sociopolitical climate among students.

(c) There was a clearly defined common goal of improved, harmonious interracial relationships. Among the several selection criteria, two criteria in particular were included to ensure this goal viz. the perception of a necessity for sociopolitical change in the country and the necessity for supervised group work to improve internal relationships on the campus.
(d) Effort was made to ensure that contacts were pleasant and rewarding. Issues were sensitively introduced and students were allowed to take responsibility for the depth of their participation in the group sessions.

(e) Trust and openness was always emphasised and facilitated to develop intimacy and meaningfulness in the interracial contacts.

Of note is the fact that the Contact Hypothesis held true, to a greater extent for the White Subgroups of Group A and Group B and, to a lesser extent for the Black Subgroups of Group A and Group B. The fact that the White Subgroup of Group A evidenced greater Change in race relations suggested that dynamic processes in the confrontational approach of Programme A were additional facilitative variables. This postulate is supported by the fact that the Black Subgroup of Group A also evidenced greater Change in race relations than the Black Subgroup of Group B.

Theoretically, the active processes in the confrontational approach of Programme A were:

(a) The development of insight into barriers in interracial communication.

(b) The active facilitation of awareness of racial stereotypes and the countering of such stereotypes with new information.

(c) Deliberate consideration of strategies to facilitate interracial mixing and awareness.

The processes identified, challenge the Buberian "I-thou" or "we-they" phenomenon that characterises negative interpersonal interaction. All three processes appeared to have been at work for the White Subgroup of Group A. This Subgroup displayed highly noteworthy Change in interracial behaviour. Significantly greater effort was made to interact with the Black Subgroup. A dynamic of active listening also emerged. This appeared to have arisen from the insight that Black students
perceived White "over-expressiveness" as intimidating and discounting. White students acknowledged that their "aggressive spirit of debate" clashed with Black students' "respect for the speaker" i.e. their expectation to speak after a speaker has completed speaking and not to interrupt. It was accepted that the end result of this clash was domination of conversation by Whites and the experience of frustration amongst Blacks who see no opportunity to express their thoughts and opinions. An additional consequence was the reinforcement of the perception by Whites that Blacks were reserved, felt inadequate and were less competent. Further substantiation that processes (a), (b), and (c) were at work was provided by the fact that the White Subgroup of Group A displayed greater Change in perceptions of Blacks (PHN) and Racial Discomfort.

For the Black Subgroup of Group A, processes (a) and (c) might have been active. Greater behavioural interaction might have resulted from the acknowledgement that the White Subgroup did not have negative intentions in their manner of interaction. This acknowledgement may, in turn, have facilitated greater risk taking in the way students expressed themselves. The shift from a position of greater interaction with Whites to equal interactions with Blacks and Whites suggested a dropping of their guard and freer interaction.

In summary, it is apparent that both insight into interracial communication barriers and a commitment to use this insight played a significant role in facilitating Change. It is likely that this insight and commitment countered the "we-they" phenomenon.

The postulate that greater self-awareness leads to greater acceptance of others is central to experiential groups. This postulate appeared to hold true for the White Subgroup of Group B. Significant Changes took place in several dimensions of social functioning and race relations. In the context of the contact experience, the extent of Change in race relations emanating from Change in Social Functioning, is evidently
less than that produced by the confrontational aspects of Programme A. This relationship could not be tested in the Black Subgroup of Group B because this Subgroup did not show any noteworthy positive Change in Social Functioning. As mentioned previously, it is possible that the fact that sociopolitical goals are considered to be more relevant for Blacks than personal, individualistic goals, may have resulted in this outcome.

The following global process scenario emerged (see Figures 52 and 53). The provision of specified conditions of contact facilitated the development of an atmosphere of trust and openness. Hence, an atmosphere most conducive to the lowering of defences and consequent receptiveness to new information was prevalent. Trust and openness were actively facilitated by programme exercises designed for this purpose. Within this context, Programme A actively addressed the development of insight into barriers in interracial communication, awareness of racial prejudice and racism and development of strategies to improve interracial relationships. On the other hand, Programme B actively addressed awareness and clarification of personal values with the indirect intention of: (a) providing participants with the opportunity of developing interracial familiarity and the consequent lowering of racial prejudice and racism; and (b) encouraging acceptance of others through self-awareness.

4.1.2 Practical Implications

From a practical perspective, the following guidelines can be discerned from the research findings and the facilitator's experience in conducting the group programmes:

(a) Programme A is most useful for both Blacks and Whites.
CONTACT
under specified positive conditions

GROUP EXERCISES
  Trust
  Openness
  Lowered defences
  Greater receptiveness to insight into negative interracial behaviour
  Greater receptiveness to new information about the other race provided in group exercises and by contact in Programme
  Development of commitment to change by evolving change strategies
  Behavioural Change and Behavioural Interaction

Figure 52. Significant Change Processes in Programme A

CONTACT
under specified positive conditions

GROUP EXERCISES
  Trust
  Openness
  Lowered defences
  Greater receptiveness to new information about the other race provided by contact in Programme
  Development of awareness and clarification of personal values (self-awareness) through group exercises
  Greater acceptance of others
  Behavioural Change and Behavioural Interaction

Figure 53. Significant Change Processes in Programme B
(b) Programme B is useful for Whites and is marginally useful for Blacks. Personal growth groups with biracial group compositions can be expected to effect interracial change particularly amongst White participants. Black and White participants in these groups may be encouraged to enhance their interracial behaviour through participation in programmes such as Programme A.

(c) While the group size of 30 is practical and feasible, a group size of 20 may be more comfortable and manageable.

(d) The session length of one and a half hours should be increased to two hours as the final aspects of each session tended to be somewhat rushed.

(e) A six-session programme is feasible as there was a zero drop-out rate in both groups.

(f) The programmes did not negatively impinge on time for the participants, all of whom were drawn from the Faculties of Arts, Social Science, Commerce and Law.

(g) It is the facilitator's impression that the use of a co-leader of the opposite race might have provided the opportunity to model appropriate interracial behaviour.

(h) In view of the fact that the RDQ was highly discriminating and relatively quick to administer, it may be used as a useful single evaluation instrument in ongoing programmes.

(i) The exercise in Programme A on interracial communication clearly illustrated that Blacks and Whites need to become aware of their cultural communication styles and the perceptions they have of each other's communication styles. To ignore this issue is to ignore the most basic obstacle in Black-White interaction.

(j) It was evident to the facilitator that ethnocentricism is a significant discounter in Black-White interaction. Courses providing information on
other cultures is not necessarily required. Instead, an attitude of receptiveness to opinions, beliefs and aspirations which cannot be readily identified with, needs to be fostered.

(k) Forums such as interracial group programmes should be actively provided for members of different races to explore communication barriers between them and to develop a commitment to work through these barriers.

(l) Implications (i) and (j) need to be actively and creatively filtered through to students in the course of their studies by lecturers and tutors.

(m) For greater generalisability of the findings of the research and exploration of questions raised by the research findings and observations during the group programmes, several further research projects are indicated. These will be discussed in Chapter Six.

The research findings were highly supportive of the research hypotheses that were adopted. Several additional questions were also raised. Theoretical postulates in the field of intergroup relations were corroborated. In addition extensions and modifications to these postulates were identified. Process elements in the group programmes, as applicable to the present study, were synthesised. Several highly significant practical implications and considerations have emanated from this study.
CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The need for an effective social change programme to improve race relations on desegregated university campuses in South Africa was identified as the focal area of concern of this study. In this chapter, the main findings are summarized and consideration is given to significant conclusions that emerged and recommendations that were indicated by the research findings.

An experimental before and after control group design was utilized to examine the effectiveness of two group therapeutic programmes, Programmes A and B, in improving Black-White relations among university students. The independent variables, Programmes A and B, adopted a confrontational and non-confrontational approach respectively. The dependent variables studied, viz. Philosophy of Human Nature, Racial Discomfort, Social Functioning and Behavioural Interaction were measured by means of the Philosophy of Human Nature Scale, Racial Discomfort Questionnaire, Heimler Scale of Social Functioning and Behavioural Interaction Scoring Manual. A group of 151 first-year students at the University of Natal conformed to specific selection criteria. The research sample was randomly selected from this group. The data obtained were statistically analysed in order to:

(a) Identify the main principal component variables that contributed to Change-data variance in general

(b) Determine between-Group, between-Subgroup, and within-Group-Subgroup differences in terms of the main principal components identified

(c) Determine Group and Subgroup Change on PHN, RD and SF for Groups A, B and C
(d) Determine between-Group, between-Subgroup and within-Group-Subgroup differences in Change on PHN, RD and SF
(e) Determine behavioural interaction Change in terms of response category Change and response direction Change for Groups and Subgroups

1. SUMMARY OF MAJOR EMPIRICAL FINDINGS

For the purposes of this summary, the global findings for each variable are presented. The term "Change" is used to indicate pretest-posttest differences. The following is a summary of the major empirical findings of the research:

(a) Two significant Change dimensions were revealed viz. a Race-Relations Continuum and a Frustration-Satisfaction Continuum
(b) Both Group Programmes A and B effected significant Change
(c) The White Subgroups benefitted significantly more than the Black Subgroups from the Group Programmes
(d) Both Programmes A and B were successful in effecting Change in PHN
(e) Programme A effected greater Change than Programme B in PHN
(f) Programmes A and B effected greater Change in PHN among Whites than among Blacks
(g) The most discriminating PHN dimensions were CYN and CG
(h) Both Programmes A and B were successful in effecting Change in RD
(i) Programme A effected greater Change than Programme B in RD
(j) Programmes A and B effected greater Change in RD among the White Subgroups than among the Black Subgroups
(k) Programme B was unsuccessful in effecting Change in RD in the Black Subgroup
(l) All three dimensions of RD were highly discriminating in Group comparisons and Subgroup comparisons
(m) Only Programme B effected Change in SF

(n) Programme B was successful in effecting Change in SF in only the White Subgroup of Group B

(o) The most discriminating SF dimensions were FI, UPI, HSFI and LSFI

(p) Increased frequency of Behavioural Interaction occurred in Groups A, B and C

(q) Group integration as indicated by increases in Follow-through responses and Agreement responses and decreases in Disagreement responses was produced by both Programmes A and B

(r) Interracial integration was found to be largely a function of Programme A.

It is evident from these findings that all four research hypotheses were confirmed. In addition, racial differences in outcome were revealed. Further, information on the most discriminating dimensions of the composite dependent variables was elicited.

2. CONCLUSIONS

The most significant conclusion is that Group Programmes make a difference to students in terms of interracial perceptions, racial discomfort and interracial behaviour. This change potential is most marked for Programme A with its confrontational approach. Benefits from the Group Programmes were greatest for the White Subgroups.

Group Programmes can be successful in producing change in both race relations and social functioning. These benefits were true for the White Subgroup participating in Programme B with its non-confrontational approach and emphasis on personal growth. Personal growth groups do not necessarily lead to positive growth experience
for Blacks. The nature of growth groups that successfully produce change in Blacks needs to be explored in further research efforts.

The fact that the Black Subgroups benefitted less than the White Subgroups in both the interracial and personal growth programmes warrants serious attention. Consideration should be given to research efforts that examine concepts such as the Anglo-Saxon psychological-mindedness of Black first-year university students and their specific needs with regard to interracial work. Every caution needs to be exerted by helping professionals to avoid an ethnocentric practice. Intervention models tailored to meet multiracial needs may have to be designed. Reports of initiatives in this direction in the field of group psychotherapy have been produced by Brayboy (1971) and Boyd-Franklin (1987).

In a non-contact society, the potential to develop deeply ingrained racial prejudices and ethnocentric attitudes and behaviour is great. When racial groups meet at common educational or work venues they interact with little awareness and insight into their peculiar racial patterns of interacting. Little or sporadic feedback is unlikely to make a noteworthy impact on these groups. When one considers the fact that prejudices and racism find expression in language, literature, media, standard "average man" practices and perceptions, policies and laws, the depth and extent to which racial prejudice and racism has permeated White society, is apparent (van Dijk, 1987). Group Programme A represents one significant effort directed at eliminating individual racism and racial prejudice among university students. The Programme afforded participants the all important opportunity of becoming acutely aware of each other as individuals and gave them permission to share perceptions of each other. In view of the time constraints of the Programme and the fact that the sample used was a student sample, it should be recognised that the perceptions shared were only a
limited representation of the general perceptions Blacks and Whites have of each other. Nonetheless, the shared perceptions that did occur in the Programme initiated significant interracial change. It follows that the potential for interracial change in longer programmes of a more indepth nature, in settings such as work, the social and wider community is immense.

It has been previously mentioned that scientific interest in intergroup relations in South Africa has been recorded since 1930. However, 60 years later, limited documented scientific evidence exists in the field of intergroup relations improvement strategies. The present research is historic in that it is the first controlled, experimental evaluative research study of intergroup relations programmes in South Africa. In addition to the proven pragmatic potential of Group Programme A, the stringent rigour of this study in terms of its design, highly defined intervention strategies and sophisticated measures of effect, provides for easy replication and logical variation of dependent and independent variables in further research endeavours.

There is agreement that randomised experimental designs are ideally the most appropriate and reliable way of evaluating programmes, since they provide the best means of controlling for a variety of potential biases (Cook and Campbell, 1976). The present research adopted this highly sophisticated design in spite of the hazards implicit in randomised experimental designs (Rossi, Freeman and Wright, 1979):

(a) Attrition effects ie. drop-out of participants due to variables such as lack of motivation, dissatisfaction with programme and external pressures.

(b) High costs such as in providing financial incentives for participants.

(c) The risk of external variables interfering with the project viz. student boycotts.
It was the researcher's opinion that such rigour was essential especially in the evaluation of intergroup relations programmes. The review of literature had revealed that there was a dearth of literature on evaluative studies of confrontational programmes and that there was limited scientific evidence to guide practitioners in the management of interracial disharmony locally and abroad. Existing studies were found to be inadequate in terms of samples used and comprehensiveness of evaluation instruments. This research owes its success to:

(a) The maintainence of a level of meaningful confrontation between participants that fostered change as opposed to withdrawal and defensiveness.

(b) The meticulous presentation of the research programmes in a manner that sustained the interest of participants over a six-week period.

(c) The extensive publicising of the research programmes.

(d) The fact that the programmes received maximum institutional support in that the Vice-Principal of the University of Natal, the relevant Deans of Faculties, department Heads, Lecturers and the staff of the Student Counselling Centre were seen to be intimately associated with the programmes.

(e) The care taken to canvass the opinions of Black and White student representative bodies as to the relevance of the programmes to student needs.

(f) The timing of the research when a sense of interracial optimism was prevalent in the country as a whole.

As an evaluation study, the present research may be classified as developmental research. Thomas (1987) defined developmental research as "inquiry directed toward the analysis, design, development, and evaluation of human service innovations" (p. 382). Although this concept was evolved for social work technology, it may be generalised to technological innovations in any human service endeavour. According to Thomas (1987) efforts should be made to conduct developmental practice, which is
service having developmental objectives in which selected methods of developmental research are used. Further, a call is made for research projects and dissertations to be directed towards developing new models of interventions and human service. The present research adequately meets this call.

Theory-building and information-gathering were not the primary goals of the research. However, interracial Programme A demonstrated the potential to elicit information about the communication barriers in Black-White relations. This change programme could be used as a research tool, specifically, to explore Black-White interactions and the nature of the barriers that do exist. Further, the relevance of the Contact Hypothesis was highlighted. It is evident that the conditions of contact prescribed by this hypothesis are crucial to the success of intergroup relations programmes. Three active processes were identified in the most successful programme ie. Programme A:

(a) The development of insight into barriers in interracial communication.
(b) Active facilitation of awareness of racial stereotypes and the countering of such stereotypes with new information.
(c) Deliberate consideration of strategies to facilitate interracial mixing and awareness.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

Several urgent recommendations emerged from this study. These are:

(a) Programme A should be used on a regular basis by helping professionals to improve intergroup relations on university campuses. The programme could be ideally offered by a sub-department of the Student Counselling Centres of universities. It is the prime responsibility of Counselling Centres to proactively and curatively respond to the social, psychological, educational
and career needs of students. Further, these units are staffed by trained psychologists. Hence, it is within the functions and resources of Counselling Centres to conduct and co-ordinate interracial programmes. In view of the importance of institutional support for these programmes, it is recommended that Programme A be offered to all students as a "Human Relations" course with a one-semester course credit. Depending on the student enrolment, the course could be offered initially by a sub-department comprising one Counsellor, an assistant and a secretary. With sufficient publicity and demand, an independent "Centre for Social Change" could be established. The function of such a centre would be to develop and conduct a variety of initiatives to eradicate racism at individual, institutional and cultural levels within the university environment and in the wider community.

(b) In conducting group interventions, heed should be taken of the group structural modifications suggested in the practical implications section viz. a maximum group size of 20 and a session length of not less than two hours.

(c) Every opportunity to evaluate intergroup programmes needs to be utilised. It is only through regular and thorough evaluation that practitioners can have access to educated guidance on useful techniques, dynamic processes and difficulties in their work. At the very least, the RDQ should be used on its own as an evaluation instrument in view of its sensitivity to Change. Behavioural interaction assessments should be used whenever feasible because of their propensity to highlight changing group dynamics.

(d) The importance of recognising the role of perceptions of cultural interaction styles in creating interracial barriers was highlighted by this study. The relevance of this issue needs to be fostered by ongoing interracial programmes in all institutional contact situations. This would include schools, hospitals, police stations and religious institutions as well as the commercial and industrial sectors. In addition this issue needs to be
publicised in written material, audiovisual material and creative theatrical production.

(e) The negative role of White ethnocentricism in Black-White relations was observed in this study. Awareness of this phenomenon should be fostered by group programmes and awareness strategies in a wide variety of venues as suggested in (d).

(f) In keeping with the conception of the university as a significant initiator of change (Meerkotter, 1987), every attempt must be made to promote harmonious interracial relations at all levels of contact in the university community by recognising the relevant communication barriers and creatively fostering change.

(g) In view of its success in the student population, Group Programme A should be offered to the public as an extra-mural university course by trained professionals.

(h) The previous recommendations were largely directed at personal interracial change which was the focus of the present research. However, it has been emphasised that racism is a three-tiered phenomenon existing at individual, institutional and cultural levels. Hence, whenever it is feasible, it is recommended that institutional policies based on White experience, values and orientations should be carefully scrutinised for multiracial relevance.

3.1 Further Research Possibilities

Further research possibilities relate to the various limitations of the present study and to specific questions generated by the study. The following are examples of such possibilities:
(a) Samples could be varied by drawing them from:

(i) Other Faculties in the University
(ii) Later years of study
(iii) Older age groups
(iv) Non-university settings such as schools and the general community

(b) Programmes could be varied by:

(i) Increasing the number of sessions
(ii) Varying specific inputs and exercises
(iii) Varying the race of the leader
(iv) Using two leaders of different races
(v) Varying the length of sessions
(vi) Varying the number of participants.

(c) Projects could be designed to answer questions such as:

(i) What is the effect of involving only African or only Indian students as Black participants and only English or Afrikaans-speaking students as White participants?
(ii) Is it feasible to involve conservative White groups in confrontational programmes like Programme A?
(iii) How durable are the benefits of intergroup programmes?
(iv) What is the effect of using anti-racism awareness training for Whites only as opposed to interracial programmes?
(v) What kinds of personal development programmes would be most effective for Blacks?

This is not an exhaustive list of further research possibilities. However, the ideas suggested provide educated guidance for much needed and highly relevant strategies to be used by practitioners in the field of intergroup relations. The ultimate aim would be to eradicate racism and racial prejudice.
The desegregated university society is a microcosm of the racially divided South African society. Strategies, scientifically developed to facilitate harmonious intergroup relations at individual, institutional and cultural levels in this microcosm, could form the blueprint for change in the macro-society. The successful use of Programme A in this research project provides:

(a) A vital tool to facilitate change at a macro-social level
(b) A useful method for helping professionals to identify negative interracial interactional processes that operate at individual, institutional and cultural levels
(c) Impetus for researchers to conduct further evaluative research to give urgently needed educated guidance on change strategies, consolidation of change and resistance to change.

As indicated by Welch (1988), it is recognised that the establishment of harmonious intergroup relations is a continuous cumulative process. Hence, no single programme can be expected to eradicate intergroup tensions completely. Instead, due recognition is given to Welch's hypothesis that the experiences provided by a variety of programmes begin the process of extinction of racially negative attitudes.

The South African situation provides exceptional opportunities for socially relevant activities by both behavioural and social scientists. Urgent moral and academic necessities demand the serious attention of these scientists. We live in the midst of a population that, on a daily basis, contends with emotionally-scarring traumas such as violence, deprivation, terrorism, racism and racial prejudice. Reports of these traumas are in themselves sufficient to traumatising people of a free and affluent
society. The following international perception of South Africa is cause for serious reflection by helping professionals in this country:

When South Africa is mentioned in other countries the name conjures up negative images of prejudice, racial tension, hostility, injustices, suppression, subversive activities, revolutionary attempts, and the like. (Strümpfer, 1981, p. 18)

Two searching questions are raised:

(a) To what extent have helping professionals accommodated the gross realities that surround them?

(b) How, ethically, can helping professionals remain content with their highly limited research into socially relevant issues?

The present research is a pioneering effort in the field of intergroup relations in South Africa. It focussed on an issue that has been taboo in social and academic spheres viz. racism. Racism elimination strategies are needed more now in South Africa than ever before. The need to abandon racist beliefs is urgent. Without scientific and insightful social planning, social desegregation, which is imminent in South African society, may result in chronic social friction. The psychological and social trauma of apartheid could well be compounded to a point where the present violent polarisation of South African society will continue and intensify. It behoves all social scientists to take cognisance of this greater impending tragedy, and to direct their resources and energies actively towards contributing to insightful social planning. It is the hope of the researcher that the present study will serve as a catalyst for further socially relevant research.
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APPENDIX A

BIOGRAPHICAL INVENTORY (BI)
CONFIDENTIAL

BIOGRAPHICAL INVENTORY

DATA NUMBER: STUDENT NO:
NAME: TEL. NO:
ADDRESS:

PLACE A CROSS (X) ON THE APPROPRIATE ANSWER TO THE ITEMS BELOW:

1. SEX: Male (1) Female (2)
2. RACE: African (1) White (2) Indian (3)

Coloured (4)
3. MARITAL STATUS: Single (1) Married (2) Other (3)

4. RELIGION: Christian (1) Zion (2) Hindu (3)

Moslem (4) Atheist (5) Other (6)

5. AGE: 18-25 yrs (1) 26-35 yrs (2) 35 yrs + (3)

6. MAIN BREADWINNER: Father (1) Mother (2)

Both Parents(3) Other (4)

7. FATHER'S / MALE OTHER'S OCCUPATION:

Professional eg. Doctor, Lawyer, Accountant (1)

Own Business eg. Factory Owner, Farmer (2)

Manager (3)

Artisan eg. Bricklayer, Electrician, Plumber (4)

Clerk (5)

Labourer/Domestic (6)

Unemployed (7)

Disabled (8)
8. **MOTHER'S / FEMALE OTHER'S OCCUPATION:**
- Professional (1)
- Own Business (2)
- Manager (3)
- Artisan (4)
- Clerk/Secretary/Receptionist (5)
- Labourer/Domestic (6)
- Unemployed (7)
- Disabled (8)
- Housewife (9)

9. **Are you a Boarder?**
- Yes (1)
- No (2)

10. **If "Yes" to 9, then are you boarding because your home is far away?**
- Yes (1)
- No (2)

11. **Is this your first year of University study?**
- Yes (1)
- No (2)

12. **Have you been to a multiracial institution before?**
- Yes (1)
- No (2)

13. **What degree are you registered for?**
- BSoSc (1)
- BSoSc (Nursing) (2)
- BSoSc (Social Work) (3)
- Other (4) Specify .......... 

14. **What career do you propose to follow?**
- Nursing (1)
- Psychology (2)
- Social Work (3)
- Public Relations (4)
- Other (5) Specify .......... 

15. **Do you feel sociopolitical change is necessary in our country, so that all avenues of life are free of racial restrictions?**
(Mark your answer on the scale below):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not necessary</td>
<td>slightly necessary</td>
<td>necessary</td>
<td>very necessary</td>
<td>urgently necessary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. **In what languages are you very fluent?** (You may cross (x) one or more languages below:
- English (1)
- Afrikaans (2)
- Zulu (3)
- Xhosa (4)
- Sothu (5)
- Tamil (6)
- Hindi (7)
- Other (8)

17. **Have you lived or worked a lot with other race groups?**
- Yes (1)
- No (2)
18. If "Yes" to 17, specify which groups. Cross (x) one or more of the following: Africans (1) Whites (2) Indians (3) Coloureds (4)

19. How useful do you think it is for students of various race groups on campus to participate in supervised group work to improve race relations among students? (Mark your answer on the scale below):


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not useful</td>
<td>slightly useful</td>
<td>useful</td>
<td>very useful</td>
<td>extremely useful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Have you ever received any psychological or psychiatric treatment?
   Yes (1) No (2)

21. What courses are you registered for?

1. ........................................
2. ........................................
3. ........................................
4. ........................................
5. ........................................

22. Do you have a part-time job? If so, state times, days and if during vacations

........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................
APPENDIX B
HEIMLER SCALE OF SOCIAL FUNCTIONING (HSSF)*

* In the HSSF, the Work, Finance, Family and Personal areas consist of more than one set of questions. For the purposes of this study, only those sets of questions appropriate to the research sample (student, never-married population) were selected for use. This was done to ease administration.
This questionnaire is a short list of questions which provide information that assists in self-understanding. Open and honest answers are essential for a valid assessment. Please answer each of the questions with either YES, NO or PERHAPS. The last answer i.e. PERHAPS indicates that you are not sure how you feel or if you feel that "sometimes" will apply.

Please answer the questions as you feel today and try to make immediate responses. Whatever you understand by the question is what you should answer.
I  WORK

a)  Do you like University?
    Yes / Perhaps / No
b)  Do you feel accepted by your fellow students?
    Perhaps / Yes / No
c)  Do you feel your are in the right setting?
    No / Perhaps / Yes
d)  Have you any really satisfying hobbies or interests?
    Yes / No / Perhaps
e)  When your studies are completed, do you regard going out to work as an attractive prospect?
    Perhaps / Yes / No

II  FINANCIAL

a)  Is your pocket money or allowance enough?
    No / Yes / Perhaps
b)  Do you earn any extra?
    Yes / Perhaps / No
c)  Do you feel at ease when you spend money?
    No / Yes / Perhaps
d)  Do you feel happy about your family's finances?
    Yes / Perhaps / No
e)  Do you feel that your future prospects are reasonably good?
    Perhaps / Yes / No

III  FRIENDSHIP

a)  Have you a close friend in whom you can confide?
    No / Yes / Perhaps
b)  Outside your family, do you feel there are people who care about you?
    Perhaps / No / Yes
c)  Do you enjoy making acquaintances?
    Perhaps / Yes / No
d)  Would you want your friends to turn to you with their problems?
    No / Yes / Perhaps
e)  Do you enjoy entertaining or meeting people?
    No / Perhaps / Yes
IV  FAMILY

a) When you look back do you feel happy about your childhood?  No / Yes / Perhaps
b) Did you have a secure childhood?  Yes / No / Perhaps
c) Did you feel that there were people in your childhood who really cared?  Yes / Perhaps / No
d) On the whole, do you think your childhood was a good preparation for adult life?  No / Yes / Perhaps
e) Would you want your family to turn to you with their problems?  Yes / Perhaps / No

V  PERSONAL

a) Do you like being single?  No / Yes / Perhaps
b) Do you like the company of the opposite sex?  Perhaps / No / Yes
c) Do you like children?  Yes / Perhaps / No
d) Does sex bring you much enjoyment?  Perhaps / Yes / No
e) Can you relax?  Yes / Perhaps / No

VI  ENERGY

a) Do you feel overworked?  No / Yes / Perhaps
b) Do you feel too tired to work?  Yes / No / Perhaps
c) Do you find that your mind is under-active?  Perhaps / Yes / No
d) Do you feel too tired to enjoy life?  Perhaps / Yes / No
e) Do you feel frustrated because you are prevented from doing things properly?  Perhaps / Yes / No
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VII HEALTH</th>
<th>Ring your answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Do you have frequent headaches?</td>
<td>Yes / No / Perhaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Do you suffer from aches and pains?</td>
<td>No / Perhaps / Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Is sex an unwelcome activity in your life?</td>
<td>Yes / No / Perhaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Are you concerned about your health?</td>
<td>No / Perhaps / Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Is your imagination painful to you?</td>
<td>Perhaps / Yes / No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VIII PERSONAL INFLUENCE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Do you often feel disappointed by people you trust?</td>
<td>Yes / No / Perhaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Do you often find that people like being hurtful to you?</td>
<td>No / Yes / Perhaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Do you feel that circumstances are often against you?</td>
<td>Yes / Perhaps / No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Do you find that people are often against you?</td>
<td>Perhaps / No / yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Would you like to have more power and influence?</td>
<td>Yes / Perhaps / No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IX MOODS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Are you at times very depressed?</td>
<td>Perhaps / Yes / No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Do you often feel vaguely insecure?</td>
<td>No / Yes / Perhaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Do you feel unduly guilty at times?</td>
<td>No / Yes / Perhaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Do you ever wish you were dead?</td>
<td>Perhaps / Yes / No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Do you find that people are often unappreciative of your efforts?</td>
<td>Yes / Perhaps / No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
X   HABITS

a) Are you inclined to drink too much? Perhaps / Yes / No
b) Do you take drugs or medicines to help you to relax? Yes / Perhaps / No
c) Do you tend to get over-active or over-excited? No / Yes / Perhaps
d) Do you tend to eat too much or too little? Yes / Perhaps / No
e) Are you driven to do things which cause trouble to yourself or others? Perhaps / No / Yes

OVERALL VIEW OF LIFE

SYNTHESIS

Score each question out of 20 points

Points

1. How far do you feel that you have achieved your ambition in life? ...........
2. How far do you feel hopeful for your future? ...........
3. How far do you feel your life has meaning? ...........
4. How far has life given you enough scope for self-expression? ...........
5. When you look back how far do you feel that life was worth the struggle? ...........

Ring your Answer
APPENDIX C

PHILOSOPHY OF HUMAN NATURE SCALE (PHNS-W)
ANSWER SHEET

Use this Answer Sheet to record your attitudes according to the instructions on the Questionnaire itself.

NAME: __________________________________________

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24

25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36

37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48

49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60

61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72

73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84
PHNS-W ATTITUDE SCALE

This questionnaire is a series of attitudes statements. Each represents a commonly held opinion and there are no right or wrong answers. You will probably disagree with some items and agree with others. We are interested in the extent to which you agree or disagree with matters of opinion.

The questions are about your attitudes to people. As there are so many different cultural groups in South Africa, we have found it best to study attitudes towards one group at a time. For this reason this set of questions is only about your attitudes towards Black people. To remind you of this, each question includes a phrase like "among Black people". This does not mean that your attitudes towards other groups is not also important or interesting. It is just that, for the purposes of this questionnaire, only your attitudes towards Black people are being asked about.

Read each statement carefully, and then express the extent to which you agree or disagree with it by choosing one of the numbers below:

+3 I agree strongly
+2 I agree somewhat
+1 I agree slightly
-1 I disagree slightly
-2 I disagree somewhat
-3 I disagree strongly

Then record the number you have chosen on the answer sheet by writing it in the appropriate box.

Example: 10. Among the Blacks, most people tend to keep very much to themselves these days.

Suppose that you disagree strongly with this statement. You would then select the value -3 and write it in the answer box numbered 10 thus:

10
-3

First impressions are usually best in such matters. Read each statement, decide if you agree or disagree and determine the strength of your opinion. Then write the appropriate number on the answer sheet in the correct answer box. Be sure to answer every statement.

If you find that the numbers to be used in answering do not adequately indicate your opinion, use the one that is closest to the way you feel. If there is anything you do not understand about answering this questionnaire, please speak to the researcher in charge.
NB. Black = African, Coloured and Indian

1. Among Black people, great successes in life such as great artists or leaders are usually motivated by forces of which they are unaware.

2. Most Black students would tell an instructor when he has made a mistake in adding up their scores, even if he had given them more points than they deserved.

3. Most Black people will change the opinion they express as a result of an onslaught of criticism even though they really don’t change the way they feel.

4. Even in today’s complex society, most Black people treat others as they would like to be treated themselves.

5. A Black person’s reaction to things differs from one situation to another.

6. I find that my first view of a Black person is usually correct.

7. Success in life for Black people is pretty much determined by forces outside their own control.

8. If you give an average Black person a job to do and leave him to do it, he will finish it successfully.

9. Among Black people nowadays, many people won’t make a decision until they find out what other people think.

10. Most Black people do not hesitate to go out of their way to help someone in trouble.

11. Among Blacks different people react to the same situation in different ways.

12. Black people can be described accurately by one term, such as “introverted”, or "moral" or "sociable".

13. Attempts to understand Black people are usually futile.

14. Black people usually tell the truth even though they know they would be better off lying.

15. Among Blacks the important thing in being successful nowadays is not how hard they work, but how well they fit into the crowd.

16. Most Black people will help others in trouble if given the opportunity.

17. Each Black person’s personality is different from the personality of every other Black person.

18. It is not hard to understand what is really important to a Black person.

19. There’s little a Black person can do to alter his/her fate in life.

20. Most Black students do not cheat when taking an exam.

21. The typical Black student will cheat in a test when everybody else does even though he has a set of ethical standards.
22. "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you" is a motto that most Black people follow.

23. Black people differ among themselves in their basic interests.

24. I think I would get a good idea of a Black person's nature after a brief conversation with him.

25. Most Black people have little influence over the things that happen to them.

26. Most Black people are basically honest.

27. Among Blacks it's a rare person who will go against the crowd.

28. The typical Black person is sincerely concerned about the problems of others.

29. Among Black people, individuals are pretty different from one another in "what makes them tick".

30. If I could ask a Black person three questions about himself/herself (assuming he/she would answer them honestly) I would know a great deal about him/her.

31. Most Black people have an over favourable view of their own capabilities.

32. If you act in good faith with Black people, almost all of them will reciprocate with fairness towards you.

33. Most Black people have to rely on someone else to make their important decisions for them.

34. Most Black people would offer accommodation to a neighbour whose house had been badly flooded.

35. Often, among Blacks, a person's basic personality is altered by such things as a religious conversion.

36. When I meet a Black person, I look for one basic characteristic through which I try to understand him/her.

37. Most Blacks vote for a political candidate on the basis of unimportant characteristics such as appearance or name, rather than on the basis of his/her stand on the issues.

38. Most Black people live clean, decent lives.

39. Typically, among Blacks, people will rarely express their opinion in a group when they see that the others disagree with them.

40. Most Black people would stop and help a person whose car was disabled.

41. Black people are unpredictable in how they'll act from one situation to another.

42. Give me a few facts about a Black person, and I'll have a good idea whether I'll like him/her or not.
43. If Black people try hard enough they will usually reach their goals in life.

44. Among Blacks, people claim that they have ethical standards regarding honesty and decency, but few people stick to them when the chips are down.

45. Most black people have the courage of their convictions.

46. The average Black person is a "show-off".

47. Among Blacks, people are pretty much alike in their basic interests.

48. I find that my first impressions of Black people are frequently wrong.

49. The average Black person has an accurate understanding of the reasons for his/her behaviour.

50. Among Black people if you want to do a job right, you should explain things to them in great detail and supervise them closely.

51. Most Black people can make their own decisions, uninfluenced by public opinion.

52. Among Blacks it's only a rare person who would risk his own life and limb to help someone else.

53. Among Blacks, people are basically similar to each other in their personalities.

54. Some Black people are too complicated for me to figure out.

55. In the Black community, if people try hard enough lawlessness and violence can be prevented in the future.

56. Among Blacks, if most people could get into a movie without paying and be sure they would not be seen, they would do it.

57. Among Black people it is achievement rather than popularity with others that gets you ahead nowadays.

58. It is pitiful to see an unselfish person among Blacks today, because so many other Blacks make use of him/her for their own purposes.

59. If you have a good idea how several Black people would react to a certain situation, you can expect most Blacks to react the same way.

60. I think you can never really understand the feelings of Black people.

61. The average Black person is largely the master of his/her own fate.

62. Most Black people are not really honest for a desirable reason; they're afraid of getting caught.

63. Among Blacks, on average, people will stick to their opinion if they think they're right, even if others disagree.

64. Among Blacks, people pretend to care more about one another than they really do.
Among Blacks, most people are consistent from situation to situation in the way they react to things.

You can't accurately describe a Black person in just a few words.

In a local or national election most Blacks select a candidate rationally and logically.

Most Black people would tell a lie if they could gain by it.

If a Black student does not believe in cheating, he/she will avoid it even if he/she sees many others doing it.

Among Blacks, most people inwardly dislike putting themselves out to help other people.

Among Blacks, a child who is popular will be popular as an adult too.

You can't classify every Black person as good or bad.

Most Black people have a lot of control over what happens to them in life.

Among Blacks, most people would cheat on their income tax or other forms of official dues if they had a chance.

In the Black community the person with novel ideas is respected.

Among Blacks most people exaggerate their troubles in order to get sympathy.

If I see how a Black person reacts to one situation, I have a good idea how he/she will react in other situations.

Black people are too complex to ever be understood fully.

Among Blacks most people have a good idea of what their strengths and weaknesses are.

Among Blacks nowadays, people commit a lot of crimes and sins that no one else ever hears about.

Among Blacks most people will speak out for what they believe in.

Black people are usually out for their own good.

When you get right down to it, Black people are quite similar to each other in their emotional make up.

Black people are so complex that it is hard to know what "makes them tick".
APPENDIX D

PHILOSOPHY OF HUMAN NATURE SCALE (PHNS-B)
PHNS-B ATTITUDE SCALE

This questionnaire is a series of attitudes statements. Each represents a commonly held opinion and there are no right or wrong answers. You will probably disagree with some items and agree with others. We are interested in the extent to which you agree or disagree with matters of opinion.

The questions are about your attitudes to people. As there are so many different cultural groups in South Africa, we have found it best to study attitudes towards one group at a time. For this reason this set of questions is only about your attitudes towards White people. To remind you of this, each question includes a phrase like "among White people". This does not mean that your attitudes towards other groups is not also important or interesting. It is just that, for the purposes of this questionnaire, only your attitudes towards White people are being asked about.

Read each statement carefully, and then express the extent to which to which you agree or disagree with it by choosing one of the numbers below:

+3 I agree strongly
+2 I agree somewhat
+1 I agree slightly
-1 I disagree slightly
-2 I disagree somewhat
-3 I disagree strongly

Then record the number you have chosen on the answer sheet by writing it in the appropriate box.

Example: 10. Among the Whites, most people tend to keep very much to themselves these days.

Suppose that you disagree strongly with this statement. You would then select the value -3 and write it in the answer box numbered 10 thus:

10 - 3

First impressions are usually best in such matters. Read each statement, decide if you agree or disagree and determine the strength of your opinion. Then write the appropriate number on the answer sheet in the correct answer box. Be sure to answer every statement.

If you find that the numbers to be used in answering do not adequately indicate your opinion, use the one that is closest to the way you feel.

If there is anything you do not understand about answering this questionnaire, please speak to the researcher in charge.
1. Among White people, great successes in life such as great artists or leaders are usually motivated by forces of which they are unaware.

2. Most White students would tell an instructor when he has made a mistake in adding up their scores, even if he had given them more points than they deserved.

3. Most White people will change the opinion they express as a result of an onslaught of criticism even though they really don't change the way they feel.

4. Even in today's complex society, most White people treat others as they would like to be treated themselves.

5. A White person's reaction to things differs from one situation to another.

6. I find that my first view of a White person is usually correct.

7. Success in life for White people is pretty much determined by forces outside their own control.

8. If you give an average White person a job to do and leave him to do it, he will finish it successfully.

9. Among White people nowadays, many people won't make a decision until they find out what other people think.

10. Most White people do not hesitate to go out of their way to help someone in trouble.

11. Among Whites different people react to the same situation in different ways.

12. White people can be described accurately by one term, such as "introverted", or "moral" or "sociable".

13. Attempts to understand White people are usually futile.

14. White people usually tell the truth even though they know they would be better off lying.

15. Among Whites the important thing in being successful nowadays is not how hard they work, but how well they fit into the crowd.

16. Most White people will help others in trouble if given the opportunity.

17. Each White person's personality is different from the personality of every other White person.

18. It is not hard to understand what is really important to a White person.

19. There's little a White person can do to alter his/her fate in life.

20. Most White students do not cheat when taking an exam.

21. The typical White student will cheat in a test when everybody else does even though he has a set of ethical standards.
22. "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you" is a motto that most White people follow.
23. White people differ among themselves in their basic interests.
24. I think I would get a good idea of a White person's nature after a brief conversation with him.
25. Most White people have little influence over the things that happen to them.
26. Most White people are basically honest.
27. Among Whites it's a rare person who will go against the crowd.
28. The typical White person is sincerely concerned about the problems of others.
29. Among White people, individuals are pretty different from one another in "what makes them tick".
30. If I could ask a White person three questions about himself/herself (assuming he/she would answer them honestly) I would know a great deal about him/her.
31. Most White people have an over favourable view of their own capabilities.
32. If you act in good faith with White people, almost all of them will reciprocate with fairness towards you.
33. Most White people have to rely on someone else to make their important decisions for them.
34. Most White people would offer accommodation to a neighbour whose house had been badly flooded.
35. Often, among Whites, a person's basic personality is altered by such things as a religious conversion.
36. When I meet a White person, I look for one basic characteristic through which I try to understand him/her.
37. Most Whites vote for a political candidate on the basis of unimportant characteristics such as appearance or name, rather than on the basis of his/her stand on the issues.
38. Most White people live clean, decent lives.
39. Typically, among Whites, people will rarely express their opinion in a group when they see that the others disagree with them.
40. Most White people would stop and help a person whose car was disabled.
41. White people are unpredictable in how they'll act from one situation to another.
42. Give me a few facts about a White person, and I'll have a good idea whether I'll like him/her or not.
43. If White people try hard enough they will usually reach their goals in life.

44. Among Whites, people claim that they have ethical standards regarding honesty and decency, but few people stick to them when the chips are down.

45. Most White people have the courage of their convictions.

46. The average White person is a "show-off".

47. Among Whites, people are pretty much alike in their basic interests.

48. I find that my first impressions of White people are frequently wrong.

49. The average White person has an accurate understanding of the reasons for his/her behaviour.

50. Among White people if you want to do a job right, you should explain things to them in great detail and supervise them closely.

51. Most White people can make their own decisions, uninfluenced by public opinion.

52. Among Whites it's only a rare person who would risk his own life and limb to help someone else.

53. Among Whites, people are basically similar to each other in their personalities.

54. Some White people are too complicated for me to figure out.

55. In the White community, if people try hard enough lawlessness and violence can be prevented in the future.

56. Among Whites, if most people could get into a movie without paying and be sure they would not be seen, they would do it.

57. Among White people it is achievement rather than popularity with others that gets you ahead nowadays.

58. It is pitiful to see an unselfish person among Whites today, because so many other Whites make use of him/her for their own purposes.

59. If you have a good idea how several White people would react to a certain situation, you can expect most Whites to react the same way.

60. I think you can never really understand the feelings of White people.

61. The average White person is largely the master of his/her own fate.

62. Most White people are not really honest for a desirable reason; they're afraid of getting caught.

63. Among Whites, on average, people will stick to their opinion if they think they're right, even if others disagree.

64. Among Whites, people pretend to care more about one another than they really do.
65. Among Whites, most people are consistent from situation to situation in the way they react to things.

66. You can't accurately describe a White person in just a few words.

67. In a local or national election most Whites select a candidate rationally and logically.

68. Most White people would tell a lie if they could gain by it.

69. If a White student does not believe in cheating, he/she will avoid it even if he/she sees many others doing it.

70. Among Whites, most people inwardly dislike putting themselves out to help other people.

71. Among Whites, a child who is popular will be popular as an adult too.

72. You can't classify every White person as good or bad.

73. Most White people have a lot of control over what happens to them in life.

74. Among Whites, most people would cheat on their income tax or other forms of official dues if they had a chance.

75. In the White community the person with novel ideas is respected.

76. Among Whites most people exaggerate their troubles in order to get sympathy.

77. If I see how a White person reacts to one situation, I have a good idea how he/she will react in other situations.

78. White people are too complex to ever be understood fully.

79. Among Whites most people have a good idea of what their strengths and weaknesses are.

80. Among Whites nowadays, people commit a lot of crimes and sins that no one else ever hears about.

81. Among Whites most people will speak out for what they believe in.

82. White people are usually out for their own good.

83. When you get right down to it, White people are quite similar to each other in their emotional make up.

84. White people are so complex that it is hard to know what "makes them tick".
APPENDIX E

RACIAL DISCOMFORT QUESTIONNAIRE (RDQ-W)
In many instances students on this campus have come from social backgrounds where due to political and other factors there was no or minimal mixing with other race groups on an equal basis i.e. schooling, worshipping, or playing together. Hence for many of you this may be the first time you are sitting together as social equals, although not political equals. The University is aware that this situation has been causing uneasiness amongst students. The following questions have been designed to estimate the degree of racial tension that you experience.

Please be as honest and open as you can in answering this questionnaire. Your responses will be treated with the utmost confidentiality. Only the researcher will have access to the information provided.
Read the following questions carefully and circle the number which corresponds to your answer. Please be as honest and open as you can.

NB. Black = African, Coloured and Indian

1. Do you feel awkward about studying with Black students?
   - 1. not awkward
   - 2. slightly awkward
   - 3. awkward
   - 4. fairly awkward
   - 5. very awkward

2. Do you feel awkward to sit next to Black students in class?
   - 1. not awkward
   - 2. slightly awkward
   - 3. awkward
   - 4. fairly awkward
   - 5. very awkward

3. Do you have concerns about the cleanliness of Black students?
   - 1. no concern
   - 2. little concern
   - 3. some concern
   - 4. fair concern
   - 5. great concern

4. Do you feel awkward to sit next to Black students in the library?
   - 1. not awkward
   - 2. slightly awkward
   - 3. awkward
   - 4. fairly awkward
   - 5. very awkward

5. Do you feel uncomfortable to ask Black students for help in the library, classroom or practicals?
   - 1 = not uncomfortable
   - 2 = slightly uncomfortable
   - 3 = uncomfortable
   - 4 = fairly uncomfortable
   - 5 = very uncomfortable

6. Do you feel reluctant to ask Black students to join you for a drink/meal at the cafeteria or residence dining hall?
   - 1 = not reluctant
   - 2 = slightly reluctant
   - 3 = reluctant
   - 4 = fairly reluctant
   - 5 = very reluctant

7. To what extent are you concerned that close Black-White association on the campus will negatively influence your life outside the campus?
   - 1 = no concern
   - 2 = little concern
   - 3 = concerned
   - 4 = fair concern
   - 5 = great concern
8. Do you feel uncomfortable to talk to a fellow Black student about personal and confidential matters?

1 = not uncomfortable  2 = slightly uncomfortable
3 = uncomfortable     4 = fairly uncomfortable
5 = very uncomfortable

9. Are you concerned that your family and friends will object to your associating closely with Black students?

1 = not concerned  2 = slightly concerned
3 = concerned     4 = fairly concerned
5 = very concerned

10. Does the possibility of rejection by your fellow students concern you if you associate closely with Black students?

1 = not at all  2 = a little
3 = some        4 = a fair deal
5 = a great deal

11. Does the possibility of offending a political group concern you if you associate closely with Black students?

1 = not at all  2 = a little
3 = some        4 = a fair deal
5 = a great deal

12. Do you become upset when a group of Black students talk and laugh loudly in the cafeteria, residence and other places on campus?

1 = not at all  2 = a little
3 = some        4 = a fair deal
5 = a great deal

13. Do you become upset when a group of Black students become involved in a heated political discussion?

1 = not at all  2 = a little
3 = some        4 = a fair deal
5 = a great deal

14. Do you feel uncomfortable to freely air your political views in the presence of Black students?

1 = not uncomfortable  2 = slightly uncomfortable
3 = uncomfortable     4 = fairly uncomfortable
5 = very uncomfortable

15. Do you object to the kind of questions a Black student asks in class?

1 = not at all  2 = a little
3 = some        4 = a fair deal
5 = a great deal
16. Does the accent of Black students make you feel awkward in discussions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>a little</td>
<td>some</td>
<td>a fair</td>
<td>a great</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Do you feel uncomfortable to invite Black students to your place of residence?

| 1 = not uncomfortable | 2 = slightly uncomfortable | 3 = uncomfortable | 4 = fairly uncomfortable | 5 = very uncomfortable |

18. Do you feel uncomfortable to visit Black students in their places of residence?

| 1 = not uncomfortable | 2 = slightly uncomfortable | 3 = fairly uncomfortable | 5 = very uncomfortable |

19. Do you have a desire for greater Black-White participation in various activities on campus (sports, societies, house-committees)?

| 1 = no desire | 2 = little desire | 3 = some desire | 4 = fair desire | 5 = great desire |

20. Do you have confidence in the possibility that Black and White students can relate to each other on a close friendly basis?

| 1 = no confidence | 2 = little confidence | 3 = some confidence | 4 = fair confidence | 5 = great confidence |

21. Do you like to join Black students in activities outside the campus (picnics, parties, etc.)?

| 1 = not at all | 2 = a little | 3 = some | 4 = a fair deal | 5 = a great deal |

22. Would you object to a Black male being friendly with a Black female?

| 1 = not at all | 2 = a little | 3 = some | 4 = a fair deal | 5 = a great deal |

23. Would you object to a Black female being friendly with Black male?

| 1 = not at all | 2 = a little | 3 = some | 4 = a fair deal | 5 = a great deal |
24. **Would you feel uncomfortable to be friendly with a Black student of the opposite sex?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>...</th>
<th>not uncomfortable</th>
<th>slightly uncomfortable</th>
<th>uncomfortable</th>
<th>fairly uncomfortable</th>
<th>very uncomfortable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. **Would you object to a Black male student going steady with a Black female student?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>...</th>
<th>not at all</th>
<th>little</th>
<th>some</th>
<th>a fair deal</th>
<th>a great deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. **Would you object to a Black female student going steady with a Black male student?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>...</th>
<th>not at all</th>
<th>a little</th>
<th>some</th>
<th>a fair deal</th>
<th>a great deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. **Would you feel uncomfortable to go steady with a Black student?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>...</th>
<th>not uncomfortable</th>
<th>slightly uncomfortable</th>
<th>uncomfortable</th>
<th>fairly uncomfortable</th>
<th>very uncomfortable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. **Do you freely air your political views in the presence of Black students?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>...</th>
<th>never</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>often</th>
<th>fairly often</th>
<th>very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. **Do you avoid sitting next to Black students in class?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>...</th>
<th>never</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>often</th>
<th>fairly often</th>
<th>very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. **Do you sit next to a Black student in class?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>...</th>
<th>never</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>often</th>
<th>fairly often</th>
<th>very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. **Do you make a special effort to sit next a Black student in class?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>...</th>
<th>never</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>often</th>
<th>fairly often</th>
<th>very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
32. Do you avoid sitting next to a Black student in the library?
   1 never  2 sometimes  3 often  4 fairly often  5 very often

33. Do you sit next to a Black student in the library?
   1 never  2 sometimes  3 often  4 fairly often  5 very often

34. Do you make a special effort to sit next to a Black student in the library?
   1 never  2 sometimes  3 often  4 fairly often  5 very often

35. Do you ask a Black student for help in the library?
   1 never  2 sometimes  3 often  4 fairly often  5 very often

36. Do you ask a Black student to join you for a drink/meal at the cafeteria or residence dining hall?
   1 never  2 sometimes  3 often  4 fairly often  5 very often

37. Do you talk to fellow Black students about personal and confidential matters?
   1 never  2 sometimes  3 often  4 fairly often  5 very often

38. Do you join Black students in activities outside the campus (going to the cinema, a disco or the beach)?
   1 never  2 sometimes  3 often  4 fairly often  5 very often

39. Do you invite Black students to your place of residence?
   1 never  2 sometimes  3 often  4 fairly often  5 very often
40. Do you visit Black students in their place of residence?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>never</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>often</td>
<td>fairly often</td>
<td>very often</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41. Do you have an interest in Black political issues?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>a little</td>
<td>some</td>
<td>a fair deal</td>
<td>a great deal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42. Do you try to befriend Black students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>never</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>often</td>
<td>fairly often</td>
<td>very often</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43. Do you have Black student friends of the opposite sex?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
<td>a few</td>
<td>some</td>
<td>a fair number</td>
<td>many</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44. How many Black student friends do you have?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
<td>a few</td>
<td>some</td>
<td>a fair number</td>
<td>many</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

RACIAL DISCOMFORT QUESTIONNAIRE (RDQ-B)
In many instances students on this campus have come from social backgrounds where due to political and other factors there was no or minimal mixing with other race groups on an equal basis i.e. schooling, worshipping, or playing together. Hence for many of you this may be the first time you are sitting together as social equals, although not political equals. The University is aware that this situation has been causing uneasiness amongst students. The following questions have been designed to estimate the degree of racial tension that you experience.

Please be as honest and open as you can in answering this questionnaire. Your responses will be treated with the utmost confidentiality. Only the researcher will have access to the information provided.
Read the following questions carefully and circle the number which corresponds to your answer. Please be as honest and open as you can.

1. Do you feel awkward about studying with White students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not awkward</td>
<td>slightly awkward</td>
<td>awkward</td>
<td>fairly awkward</td>
<td>very awkward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Do you feel awkward to sit next to White students in class?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not awkward</td>
<td>slightly awkward</td>
<td>awkward</td>
<td>fairly awkward</td>
<td>very awkward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Do you have concerns about the cleanliness of White students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no concern</td>
<td>little concern</td>
<td>some concern</td>
<td>fair concern</td>
<td>great concern</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Do you feel awkward to sit next to White students in the library?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not awkward</td>
<td>slightly awkward</td>
<td>awkward</td>
<td>fairly awkward</td>
<td>very awkward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Do you feel uncomfortable to ask White students for help in the library, classroom or practicals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not uncomfortable</td>
<td>slightly uncomfortable</td>
<td>uncomfortable</td>
<td>fairly uncomfortable</td>
<td>very uncomfortable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Do you feel reluctant to ask White students to join you for a drink/meal at the cafeteria or residence dining hall?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not reluctant</td>
<td>slightly reluctant</td>
<td>reluctant</td>
<td>fairly reluctant</td>
<td>very reluctant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. To what extent are you concerned that close Black-White association on the campus will negatively influence your life outside the campus?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no concern</td>
<td>little concern</td>
<td>concerned</td>
<td>fair concern</td>
<td>great concern</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Do you feel uncomfortable to talk to a fellow White student about personal and confidential matters?

1 = not uncomfortable          2 = slightly uncomfortable
3 = uncomfortable             4 = fairly uncomfortable
5 = very uncomfortable

9. Are you concerned that your family and friends will object to your associating closely with White students?

1 = not concerned          2 = slightly concerned
3 = concerned              4 = fairly concerned
5 = very concerned

10. Does the possibility of rejection by your fellow students concern you if you associate closely with White students?

1 = not at all           2 = a little
3 = some                4 = a fair deal
5 = a great deal

11. Does the possibility of offending a political group concern you if you associate closely with White students?

1 = not at all           2 = a little
3 = some                4 = a fair deal
5 = a great deal

12. Do you become upset when a group of White students talk and laugh loudly in the cafeteria, residence and other places on campus?

1 = not at all           2 = a little
3 = some                4 = a fair deal
5 = a great deal

13. Do you become upset when a group of White students become involved in a heated political discussion?

1 = not at all           2 = a little
3 = some                4 = a fair deal
5 = a great deal

14. Do you feel uncomfortable to freely air your political views in the presence of White students?

1 = not uncomfortable          2 = slightly uncomfortable
3 = uncomfortable             4 = fairly uncomfortable
5 = very uncomfortable

15. Do you object to the kind of questions a White student asks in class?

1 = not at all           2 = a little
3 = some                4 = a fair deal
5 = a great deal
16. Does the accent of White students make you feel awkward in discussions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>a little</td>
<td>some</td>
<td>a fair</td>
<td>a great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deal</td>
<td>deal</td>
<td>deal</td>
<td>deal</td>
<td>deal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Do you feel uncomfortable to invite White students to your place of residence?

| 1  = not uncomfortable | 2  = slightly uncomfortable | 3  = uncomfortable | 4  = fairly uncomfortable | 5  = very uncomfortable |

18. Do you feel uncomfortable to visit White students in their places of residence?

| 1  = not uncomfortable | 2  = slightly uncomfortable | 3  = fairly uncomfortable | 4  = very uncomfortable |

19. Do you have a desire for greater Black-White participation in various activities on campus (sports, societies, house-committees)?

| 1  = no desire | 2  = little desire | 3  = some desire | 4  = fair desire | 5  = great desire |

20. Do you have confidence in the possibility that Black and White students can relate to each other on a close friendly basis?

| 1  = no confidence | 2  = little confidence | 3  = some confidence | 4  = fair confidence | 5  = great confidence |

21. Do you like to join White students in activities outside the campus (picnics, parties, etc.)?

| 1  = not at all | 2  = a little | 3  = some | 4  = a fair | 5  = a great |
| deal | deal | deal | deal | deal |

22. Would you object to a White male being friendly with a White female?

| 1  = not at all | 2  = a little | 3  = some | 4  = a fair | 5  = a great |
| deal | deal | deal | deal | deal |

23. Would you object to a White female being friendly with White male?

| 1  = not at all | 2  = a little | 3  = some | 4  = a fair | 5  = a great |
| deal | deal | deal | deal | deal |
24. Would you feel uncomfortable to be friendly with a White student of the opposite sex?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 = not uncomfortable</th>
<th>2 = slightly uncomfortable</th>
<th>3 = uncomfortable</th>
<th>4 = fairly uncomfortable</th>
<th>5 = very uncomfortable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

25. Would you object to a White male student going steady with a White female student?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 = not at all</th>
<th>2 = a little</th>
<th>3 = some</th>
<th>4 = a fair deal</th>
<th>5 = a great deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

26. Would you object to a White female student going steady with a White male student?

|   | 1 = not at all | 2 = a little | 3 = some | 4 = a fair deal | 5 = a great deal |

27. Would you feel uncomfortable to go steady with a White student?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 = not uncomfortable</th>
<th>2 = slightly uncomfortable</th>
<th>3 = uncomfortable</th>
<th>4 = fairly uncomfortable</th>
<th>5 = very uncomfortable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

28. Do you freely air your political views in the presence of White students?

|   | 1 = never | 2 = sometimes | 3 = often | 4 = fairly often | 5 = very often |

29. Do you avoid sitting next to White students in class?

|   | 1 = never | 2 = sometimes | 3 = often | 4 = fairly often | 5 = very often |

30. Do you sit next to a White student in class?

|   | 1 = never | 2 = sometimes | 3 = often | 4 = fairly often | 5 = very often |

31. Do you make a special effort to sit next a White student in class?

|   | 1 = never | 2 = sometimes | 3 = often | 4 = fairly often | 5 = very often |


32. Do you avoid sitting next to a White student in the library?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>often</th>
<th>fairly often</th>
<th>very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

33. Do you sit next to a White student in the library?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>often</th>
<th>fairly often</th>
<th>very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

34. Do you make a special effort to sit next to a White student in the library?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>often</th>
<th>fairly often</th>
<th>very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

35. Do you ask a White student for help in the library?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>often</th>
<th>fairly often</th>
<th>very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

36. Do you ask a White student to join you for a drink/meal at the cafeteria or residence dining hall?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>often</th>
<th>fairly often</th>
<th>very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

37. Do you talk to fellow White students about personal and confidential matters?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>often</th>
<th>fairly often</th>
<th>very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

38. Do you join White students in activities outside the campus (going to the cinema, a disco or the beach)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>often</th>
<th>fairly often</th>
<th>very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

39. Do you invite White students to your place of residence?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>often</th>
<th>fairly often</th>
<th>very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
40. Do you visit White students in their place of residence?

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>never</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>often</td>
<td>fairly often</td>
<td>very often</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41. Do you have an interest in White political issues?

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not at all</td>
<td>a little</td>
<td>some</td>
<td>a fair deal</td>
<td>a great deal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42. Do you try to befriend White students?

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>never</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>often</td>
<td>fairly often</td>
<td>very often</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43. Do you have White student friends of the opposite sex?

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>a few</td>
<td>some</td>
<td>a fair number</td>
<td>many</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44. How many White student friends do you have?

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>a few</td>
<td>some</td>
<td>a fair number</td>
<td>many</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G
VIDEO SCORING MANUAL
SCORING MANUAL CODE

VERBAL

S = seeks information, suggestions, opinions, advice, asks questions.

G = responses give information, views, suggestions, opinions, advice, answers, attitudes, clarification.

L = Lead(ership) statements: initiates, takes charge, directs flow of conversation or ideas, including statements about self-accomplishment, constructive confrontation. Introduction of a new idea.

F = Follow-through statements: responding to the other person's response in his content; reflecting the other person's message and perhaps clarifying. Integrative statements. (If a follow-through expresses agreement or disagreement, score the latter).

A = Agrees: expresses acceptance, affirmation, understanding or co-operation, open-mindedness.

D = Disagrees: expresses disagreement, lack of affirmation, dissent, competition, rigidity of own ideas.

PA = Positive emotional response: expressions of humour, levity, satisfaction, gratification, emotional affiliation and mutuality.

NA = Negative emotional response: expressions of anger, fear, resentment, lack of hope, antagonism, rejection, resistance, mistrust, self-serving or self-defensive; deflation of others; distancing confrontation, argumentive.

N.B. In an extended leadership speech score only the first response.
DIRECTION OF RESPONSE

Note the direction of response by placing the letters b, w, or g next to the response.

b = Black student  
w = White student  
g = group

PROCEDURE FOR SCORERS

1. View tape at least once to obtain overall sense of the discussion.

2. Identify a starting subject - give description in terms of race, position, colour of clothing, physical characteristics.

3. Score one subject at a time.

4. Using the same procedures both raters must rate subjects in the same order.

5. The second rater must be blind to which are the pre and post videotapes.

6. Use one scoring sheet per subject.
APPENDIX H

PHNS SCORING KEY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCALE</th>
<th>ITEM NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strength of Will</td>
<td>1, 7, 13, 19, 25, 31, 37, 43, 49, 55, 61, 67, 73, 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>2, 8, 14, 20, 26, 32, 38, 44, 50, 56, 62, 68, 74, 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>3, 9, 15, 21, 27, 33, 39, 45, 51, 57, 63, 69, 75, 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>4, 10, 16, 22, 28, 34, 40, 46, 52, 58, 64, 70, 76, 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variability</td>
<td>5, 11, 17, 23, 29, 35, 41, 47, 53, 59, 65, 71, 77, 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>6, 12, 18, 24, 30, 36, 42, 48, 54, 60, 66, 72, 78, 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynicism</td>
<td>68, 44, 56, 74, 58, 70, 21, 64, 46, 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in Conventional Goodness</td>
<td>16, 22, 10, 81, 28, 4, 45, 67, 14, 63, 57, 40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I

VIDEO SCORING SHEET
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>RD</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>RD</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>RD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>RD</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>RD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>RD</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>RD</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>RD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<tr>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
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</tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
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</tr>
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</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Subject:**

**Race:**

**Physical Features:**

**Clothing:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>CHART</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX J

COMMUNICATIONS WORKSHEET
1. The trouble with these people is they are not capable of being independent.
2. I am deeply disappointed that you have judged me without listening to my account.
3. There you go again - can't you ever get it right!
4. That was a great suggestion, now can we now have some serious suggestions.
5. Why can't Blacks be honest?
7. Who said Blacks are poor, even I don't dress as smartly as Paul.
8. You White people are sheltered, you just don't understand what is going on in the townships.
9. I feel for you Tandi. It must be terrifying for you to live under such conditions.
10. I am sorry, but I think you have given me the wrong change.
11. Forgive me if this is a silly request, but, could you please explain what you meant when you said.....
12. I don't believe this plan will work, and nobody is going to convince me otherwise.
13. No, you can't say that!
14. Sue, how do you feel about joining us today?
15. How do you think we can contribute to change on this campus?
To be handed out to the group:

**BIographies**

1. Born in 1871, at a mission station in Natal, he was the son of a pastor, and studied at a prep school in the USA. He became a teacher and then a minister and was involved in setting up a school in Natal modelled on the principles of self-help. He got involved in politics and journalism and became the editor of a Natal newspaper. He was part of a multi-racial deputation to England to lobby against the colour bar in the Act of Union in 1909. In 1936, for his contributions to African education, he was awarded an honorary doctorate by the university of South Africa.

2. He was born in Johannesburg in 1918 and was educated in England. He was anti-communist and edited a fortnightly newspaper which was anti-government but never banned. He was banned and moved away from a position of non-violence to join the Pan Africanist Congress for whom he published a newsheet while living in Algeria during the sixties.

3. He was born in 1928 in Cape Town where he attended the UCT Ballet School before going to train at the Sadlers Wells Ballet School. He danced for the Sadlers Wells Theatre Ballet and the Royal Ballet, working with people such as Dame Ninette de Valois, Sir Frederick Ashton, John Cranko and David Poole. He has danced before a number of royal families in roles such as Puck in a "Midsummer Night's Dream", Neopolitan in "Swan Lake" and Jasper in "Pineapple Poll". He also studied in the USA. He now runs his own ballet school in Cape Town.

4. He was born in Natal in 1945 and studied art privately. He has held one-man exhibitions in Johannesburg, Benoni, London and the USA, and some of his work is owned by people such as the former British Prime Minister, Sir Harold MacMillan.
5. He was born in Cape Town in 1933 and graduated from the University of Cape Town. He was active in organising for the Congress of the People in 1955, and later became important in Umkonto We Sizwe, the militant arm of the ANC. He was arrested in 1963, tried and convicted, and is now serving a sentence of life imprisonment.

6. She was born in 1874 in the Cape and received her elementary and secondary education in Uitenhage and Port Elizabeth before going on to get a bachelors degree at a university in the USA from which she graduated in 1905. She was a social worker and a teacher, and was outspoken on social issues, running an employment agency for African women.

7. He was born in 1879 in the Orange Free State and became a teacher. He was proficient in at least eight languages, including German, Dutch, English and a number of African languages. He served in the civil service during the Boer War, and later became a journalist and later spent several years in England, lecturing, working at London University, and writing three books. He travelled widely in Europe, Canada and the USA, before returning to South Africa where he continued to write and was a parliamentary correspondent during the sessions.

8. He was born in Ventersdorp in the Western Transvaal in 1903, the son of a railway worker. He trained as a teacher and taught in the Orange Free State for a time, before joining the Communist Party and studying for a time at the Lenin School in Moscow. He ran for parliament as a Communist candidate from Germiston. He was active in trying to organise African workers and was involved in the 1946 Mine-worker's Strike. He was banned in 1952, but took part in the Defiance Campaign. He left South Africa in 1963, and died in Moscow in 1972.

9. He was born in 1893 and trained as a teacher before going to the USA where he graduated, first with a bachelor degree and then as a medical doctor, after which he studied in Europe before returning to South Africa to establish a medical practice in Johannesburg. He married an American woman whom he met on a visit to the USA in 1937-8. He was politically moderate although he did get involved in anti-government activity during a period when this activity was dominated by intellectuals. He died in 1962.
10. He left school in Standard Six and came from a family so poor that he didn't have shoes or a blazer. In 1958 he was employed as a porter for "one shilling, seven pence and a farthing an hour", and did everything from cleaning windows to door-to-door selling, sometimes sleeping on park benches. He has since won awards for the outstanding young South African and the Marketing Award of the Year.

Source: Human Awareness Programme, 1983.
APPENDIX L

KEY TO WHO'S WHO
To be handed to the group:

KEY TO WHO'S WHO

NOTE: These notes are taken largely from a Who's Who of Black South Africans (cited by the Human Awareness Programme, 1983).

1. DUBE, JOHN LANGALIBELLELE.

Educator, journalist, church leader, author, and first president-general of the African National Congress. Dube has been described as South Africa's Booker T Washington, after the American Black leader whose cautious approach and emphasis on racial pride, education, and self-help were a continuous influence on Dube throughout his life. One of the most influential leaders of his day, Dube developed close ties with racially moderate and economically conservative Whites, although Whites in Natal had at first seen him as a radical. A Zulu patriot, he was also a leading figure within the African educated elite and an opponent of "narrow tribalism". His interests were more in education than in politics, however. By the late 1930's and early 1940's, he increasingly isolated himself from political currents elsewhere in the country, and the rising generation of militant African nationalists came to look upon him as a conservative and parochial figure.

Dube was born in 1871 at the Inanda mission station of the American Zulu mission in Natal, where his father was a pastor. After studying at Amamzimtoti Training Institute, which later became Adams College, Dube went to America in 1887 and attended a preparatory school at Oberlin College. He also travelled and gave talks on self-help for the Africans of South Africa. In 1892 he returned to South Africa and became a teacher for the American Board Mission at Amamzimtoti. Two years later he left to become superintendent of a Christian industrial school. In 1897 he returned to America again, this time to study theology at a seminary in Brooklyn. After three years study, he was ordained by the Congregational Church and returned to Natal, where he set about the establishment of Ohlange Institute, a school modelled on the principles of self-help and vocational education. Overcoming great obstacle, Dube succeeded in this effort formally opening the school in 1901. In 1900-1901 he helped found the Natal Native Congress, and in 1903 he launched Natal's
first African paper, the weekly *Ilanga lase Natal*, in English and Zulu. He helped convene the South African Native Convention in 1909 to oppose the colour bar in the Act of Union, and the same year he accompanied a multi-racial deputation to England to lobby against the act. Dube was unable to attend the conference in January 1912 when the South African Native National Congress (later renamed the African National Congress) was founded, but he was elected in absentia as the ANC's first president, because he was a figure neutral between rival Cape and Transvaal leaders.

In 1914 he led the ANC deputation to England to protest against the 1913 Land Act. Prior to the delegation’s departure, Dube expressed his readiness to compromise on land policy. "We make no protest against the principle of separation," he said in a petition to Prime Minister Botha, "so far as it can be fairly and practically carried out" (Volume 1, Document 25). He abandoned his apparent acceptance of segregation in his attempts at later legislation, but nevertheless, discord within the ANC over how to respond to government land policies and personal rivalry with Pixley Seme led in 1917 to Dube's resignation as president-general of the ANC.

Dube retained the Natal presidency, however, until ill health forced his resignation from that position in 1945. Heading an elite of professionals, church leaders, and enlightened chiefs committed to gradualist strategies of African advancement, Dube jealously guarded his position of eminence in Natal, resisting all challenges to his leadership from younger or more radical men. Two such challenges came in the 1920's, one from the Industrial and Commercial Workers' Union, led in Natal by A. W. G. Champion, and one from Dube's own vice-president in the Natal Congress, J. T. Gumede, who formed an independent Natal African Congress in 1926. Differences were deeply personal but also based on principles and methods. Dube refused to co-operate with the national congress under Gumede's presidency. Dube supported the conservative Seme, while Champion backed the radical Gumede. With Gumede's defeat, Dube became a member of Seme's executive but soon fell out with him once again. Seme's efforts (and those of Z. R. Mahabane after him) to heal the provincial split founded by the lifelong struggle between Dube and Champion. By the 1940's Dube had become too ill with diabetes to remain active, and in 1945 his designated successor Abner Mtimkulu, was defeated for Natal presidency in a conference manoeuvre by Champion whose takeover was readily recognised and welcomed by A. B. Xuma and the national ANC.
During the 1920's Dube attended the second pan-African conference in London and the international missionary conference in Le Zoute, Belgium. During his third fundraising tour to the United States in 1926-1927, he made a six-month tour of the country. In South Africa, he participated in the Union government's Native conferences and, with White liberals, in the Durban Joint Council. In 1935 he was elected to the executive committee of the All African Convention but aroused wide criticism from Africans when he chose to support the Hertzog Bills, on the grounds that they would lead to the enlargement of African reserve areas in Natal. In 1936, for his contributions to African education, he was the first South African awarded an honorary doctorate by the University of South Africa. In 1937 and again in 1942 he was elected to represent rural Natal on the Natives' Representative Council, but in 1945, with his health rapidly failing, he declined to run and his seat was won by Albert Lutuli. He died of a stroke in 1946. His writings include Isita Somuntu N~e (The Enemy of the African is Himself), Insila Ka Tshaka (Jepe the Bodyservant of King Tshaka, in English translation 1951), and uShembe (1936), a biography of the Zulu independent church leader.

2. DUNCAN, PATRICK

A controversial white champion of African rights, he played a conspicuous role in opposition politics for over a decade, attracting notice from the beginning of his political career because of his famous father, a former governor-general of South Africa. He was born in Johannesburg in 1918 and was educated in England, at Winchester and Oxford. He served in the British colonial service in Basutoland from 1941 to 1952, during which time he became fluent in Sesotho. In 1952 he resigned his post and lead the first batch of White resisters in the Defiance Campaign. Unable to join the ANC, in 1955 he joined the new Liberal Party, of which he later became a national organiser. Among Liberals he was known as an emotional anti-communist, and this inclination showed through strongly in Contact, the fortnightly paper that he edited and published in Cape Town in support of the Liberal Party. In 1960 Contact survived efforts by the government to suppress it, but in 1961 and 1962 Duncan was served with banning orders. He moved secretly to Basutoland in May 1962. In March 1963 he resigned from the Liberal Party on the grounds that he no longer accepted its
defence of non-violence. Shortly thereafter he was accepted as a member of the Pan Africanist Congress. After being declared a prohibited immigrant in Basutoland in June 1963, Duncan moved to Algeria where he published a PAC newsheet in French. He wrote articles for British and American periodicals and a book, *South Africa's Rule of Violence* (1964). He died in 1967.

3. MOSAVAL, JOHAAR


4. NKOSI, STANLEY

Artist, studied privately under Peter Haden in Johannesburg, 1967; held one-man exhibitions, the Hopman Gallery Jhb., Gallery 21, Downstairs Gallery Benoni; his most recent local one-man show was in the Schweikerdt Gallery Pretoria before
exhibiting in England; at his first international exhibition in London all his works 
were sold - one to the former British Prime Minister, Sir Harold MacMillan; Stanley 
Nkosi recently won first prize in Oklahoma, USA for the Wild Life of the World 
competition; held a one-man exhibition, Atlanta, Georgia, August 1978; has 
regularly participated in all seven East Rand exhibitions; b. 1945, Newcastle, Natal.

5. GOLDBERG, DENNIS

A white radical important in Umkonto We Sizwe. His parents were both members of 
the Communist Party in Cape Town where he was born in 1933. He was a 1955 
graduate of the University of Cape Town and a highly successful engineer. He 
reached prominence in the Cape Town Congress of Democrats and was active in 
organising for the Congress of the People in 1955. In the 1960 emergency, he was 
detained; then he was seized in the Rivonia raid in July 1963. The Rivonia Trial 
disclosed that he had been responsible for the manufacture of various devices used by 
Umkonto for sabotage. In investigating the possibilities of manufacturing armaments 
on a large scale, he had left a well-documented trail of his activity. In his personal 
manner, he displayed an irrepressible and voluble sense of humour. The only white 
person convicted in the Rivonia Trial, is now serving sentence of life imprisonment.

6. MAXEKE, CHARLOTTE MAKGOMO MANYE

A founder of the African National Congress Women's League, social worker, teacher, 
and leader in the African Methodist Episcopal Church, she was the first African 
woman from South Africa to earn a bachelor's degree. Born in 1874 near Fort 
Beaufort in the Cape, she received her elementary and secondary education in 
Uitenhage and Port Elizabeth. She toured England, Canada, and the United States 
to study at Wilberforce University in Ohio, where she graduated with a B. S. in 1905. 
At Wilberforce she met and married Rev. Marshall Maxeke, another South African, 
and on their return to South Africa they jointly founded Wilberforce Institute, later 
one of the leading Transvaal secondary schools for Africans. President of the ANC 
Women's League for many years, she was outspoken on social issues and was 
frequently called to give evidence before government commissions dealing with 
African affairs. In 1919 she lead demonstrations protesting proposals to extend
passes to women. In 1920 she lent her support to Clements Kadalie and Selby Msimang in their early efforts to launch a national trade union movement for Africans. She was also prominent in the Joint Council movement. She ran an employment agency for African women and was later a government appointed probation officer for African juvenile delinquents. She attended an AME conference in the United States in 1928 and remained active in church and women’s activities until her death in 1939.

7. PLAATJE, SOLOMON TSHEKISHO

Author, journalist, linguist, and political publicist, Plaatje was one of the most outstanding Africans associated with the African National Congress at the time of its founding. He was born in 1879 in the Boshof district of the Orange Free State. His parents were Christians who belonged to the Setswana-speaking Barolong tribe. About the time he was born, his parents moved to the Pniel mission station of the Lutheran Mission Society, near Barkly West, and it was there that Plaatje received his only formal education, a few years in the elementary grades. He remained in Pniel for several years as an assistant teacher, studying further with the aid of the missionaries. In 1894 he went to Kimberley, where he found work as a postman, continued his private studies and eventually distinguished himself on the civil service examinations. On the eve of the Boer War he was sent to Mafeking as an interpreter, and during the siege of Mafeking in 1899-1900 he acted as both court interpreter and clerk to the Mafeking administrator of Native affairs. He was proficient in at least eight languages, including German and Dutch as well as English and all the major African vernaculars.

Advancement in the civil service being closed to him, Plaatje turned to journalism at the end of the war, and, with financial backing from Silas Molema, chief of the Barolong, he established the first Setswana - English weekly Koranta ea Becoana (Newspaper of the Tswana) in 1901. This existed, under Plaatje’s editorship, for six or seven years, after which he moved from Mafeking to Kimberley. There he established a new paper, Tsala ea Becoana, later renamed Tsala ea Batho (The Friend of the People). While producing these papers, Plaatje also contributed many articles to other papers particularly to the Kimberley Diamond Fields Advertiser. When the South African Native National Congress (later called the African National
Congress) was formed in 1912, Plaatje was chosen its first secretary-general. An articulate opponent of tribalism, he exemplified the new spirit of national unity among African intellectuals. (At a time when the inter-tribal marriages were still uncommon, Plaatje had married a Fingo. His wife Elizabeth was a sister of H.I. Bud-Mbelle.)

The first major campaign of the SANNC was against the Land Act of 1913, a measure that drastically curtailed the right of Africans to own or occupy land throughout the Union. In 1914 Plaatje went to Britain as a member of the deputation charged with appealing to the British government against the Act. The mission proved futile, but Plaatje decided to stay behind after the rest of the deputation, and he remained in Britain until February 1917, when he returned to South Africa. During this time he lectured, worked as a language assistant at London University, and produced three books, including a detailed and moving appeal against Land Act, Native Life in South Africa, Before and Since the European War and the Boer Rebellion (1916). The other two works, Sechuana Proverbs, With Literal Translations and their English Equivalents and A Sechuana Reader, written with Daniel Jones of London University, also appeared in 1916.

He returned to London in May 1919, a few months after the SANNC deputation to Versailles had left South Africa. Late in 1919 he took part in a meeting with British Prime Minister Lloyd George. In December 1920 he went to Canada and the United States, where he travelled widely. Meeting with leaders of the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People, he arranged for an American edition of his book, Native Life, to appear.

At the end of 1923 he returned to South Africa. He continued to write, and when Parliament was in session he travelled to Cape Town to cover the sessions and to lobby for African interests as a representative of the ANC. Influenced by his experiences in the United States, he became involved in the Joint Council movement. He also joined the African People's Organisations of Abdul Abdurahman. He made a trip to the Congo to observe conditions there and was active in civic affairs in Kimberley. Although his relations with the ANC was sometimes uneasy, in December 1930 he accompanied an ANC deputation to the Native Affairs department to register African complaints against the pass laws. He died of pneumonia while on a trip to Johannesburg in 1932.
In addition to the works already mentioned, his writings include a novel, *Mhudi. An Epic of South African Native Life a Hundred Years Ago* (1930), *The Mote and the Beam: An Epic on Sex-Relationship 'Twixt White and Black in British South Africa* (1921), and translations of four Shakespeare plays into Setswana. In 1972 his Mafeking diary, discovered in 1969 and edited by John L Comaroff, was published under the title *The Boer War Diary of Sol T. Plaatje: An African at Mafeking*.

8. MARKS, JOHN B. "J.B."

Prominent for many years in the trade union movement, the African National Congress, and the Communist Party of South Africa. Marks was born in 1903 in Ventersdorp in the Western Transvaal, the son of a railway worker. Since his parentage was mixed, he could have lived as a Coloured but chose to identify himself as an African. He entered Kilnerton teacher training college in 1919 and graduated about two years later. He taught in Potchefstroom and Vredefort in the Orange Free State but was dismissed from Vredefort because of his political activities. In 1928 he joined the Communist Party and thereafter studied for a period at the Lenin School in Moscow, returning to become a full-time party and trade union organiser. In 1932 he ran for Parliament as a Communist candidate from Germiston in a stormy campaign aimed at demonstrating the injustice of the electoral system. In 1939 he was one of the organisers of the short-lived Non-European United Front. Marks also joined the African National Congress in the late 1920s, and in the late 1930s he played a leading role in reviving the ANC from its moribund state in the Transvaal. Active meanwhile in efforts to organise African workers, Marks was chairman of the Council of Non-European Trade Unions and was a prime mover in the establishment of the African Mineworkers' Union in 1941. As chairman of the union, he was the leading figure behind the impressive mine strike of 1946, during which more than 70000 men stopped work. Charged under the Riotous Assemblies Act, he stood trial with other leaders of the union and of the CPSA in a series of legal proceedings that dragged on for more than two years following the strike.

His prestige high in the wake of the strike, Marks was elected to the national executive committee of the ANC in 1946 (Government sources have mistakenly propagated the notion that he became secretary-general of the ANC in 1936).
Banning orders issued to Marks in 1952 prohibited him from political activity, but on the eve of the Defiance Campaign he defied these orders by addressing a public meeting, thus remaining true to his reputation as one of the boldest leaders of the African cause. Genial in manner, wise in his political judgements, and an effective leader both on the public platform and behind the scenes, Marks continued, despite bans, to be influential in the ANC throughout the 1950s. In 1963 he left South Africa and was thereafter based at the headquarters of the ANC in Tanzania. He also remained an important figure in CPSA both underground and abroad, and in 1969 he was elected chairman of the party in exile. He died in Moscow in 1972.

9. **XUMA, ALFRED BITINI**

Physician, president-general of the African National Congress from 1940 to 1949, and one of the pivotal figures in the history of African politics in South Africa. Born in 1893 in Manzana, near Engcobo in the Transkei, Xuma had a typical rural childhood, alternately tending his father's livestock and attending a mission primary school. His parents were Christian converts who had never attended school. His father had learned basic literacy from his older children, however, and was also a local Methodist lay preacher. In 1908, Xuma entered Clarkebury Institute and in 1911 qualified as a primary school teacher. His ambition was stirred when he heard of African graduates returning from Europe and America, and in August 1913, after working as a teacher for 18 months, he put his savings into a steamer ticket to America.

Xuma spent two years at Tuskegee, then in 1916 entered the College of Agriculture at the University of Minnesota, earning his way with jobs in coal yards, stables, hotels and trains. Among his friends was Roy Wilkins, who was to become a major black American civil rights leader. Graduating with a B.S. degree from Minnesota in 1920, he then studied at the Marquette University medical school in Milwaukee for two years, transferred to North Western University in 1923, and completed an M.D. degree in 1926, after a year's internship at the St. Louis City Hospital No 2, at that time a facility for blacks. He then spent a year in Europe, studying surgery and gynaecology in Hungary and sitting for qualifying exams in Scotland, so that his training would be recognised in South Africa. In late 1927 he returned home, and in 1928 he established his medical practice in Johannesburg.
Out of touch with South African life and a stranger to Johannesburg initially, Xuma resisted pressures that were immediately exerted upon him to throw his weight as a highly qualified professional behind a wide variety of social and political causes. In 1930 he was elected in absentia to the national executive committee of the ANC under Pixley Seme, but he declined to become involved. He joined the Johannesburg Joint Council and the Bantu Men's Social Centre, both points of contact with leading white liberals of the day, but he put most of his energy into building his medical practice.

By 1935, however, with passage of the Hertzog Bills to restrict the African franchise pending, Xuma was prepared to assume the leadership role in public affairs for which his obvious abilities and prominent social position qualified him. He joined Selope Thema and Z.R. Mahabane in organising the first meeting of the All African Convention and was elected vice-president of the AAC when D.D.T. Jabavu became president. In early 1936, when it seemed that Jabavu and others might express public support for the compromise of a separate African voters' role, Xuma was one of those in the AAC most firmly opposed to any acceptance of the government's proposals. Also opposed to the view that the Natives' Representative Council should be "given a try", Xuma declined ever to run for the NRC, though he later co-operated with NRC members who were also leaders in the ANC. In May 1937 he left for an extended holiday in the United States and a course at the London School of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene. During his visit to the USA he met and, subsequently married Madie Hall Xuma, a master's student at the Columbia University. When he returned in late 1938, the efforts of James Calata and others to revive the ANC had borne some fruit, but strong leadership was still lacking at the centre. When Congress elections came up in December 1940, Xuma stood against Mahabane and captured the presidency by a vote of 21 to 20. Having by this time decided that the ANC held more promise as a national organisation than the loose-knit AAC, Xuma turned all his attention to strengthening the ANC.

During Xuma's nine years as president of the ANC, the organisation underwent great changes and attracted a far wider following than it had previously enjoyed. Independent and often competing provincial factions were brought to heel, and
authority at the centre was strengthened, in part with the aid of a revised constitution. Many more educated, middle-class Africans - the "graduates" - were brought into the organisation, and the interests of younger militants was encouraged, leading to the formation of the ANC Youth League in 1944. The document Africans' Claims in South Africa was produced in 1943 as a statement of the ANC's goals, and the issue of race discrimination in South Africa was brought up at the United Nations for the first time when Xuma, with financial aid from the South African Indian Congress, travelled to New York during the General Assembly session of late 1946. Xuma's efforts to effect a merger between the ANC and the AAC came to naught in 1943, 1944, and again in 1948, but his open attitude toward alliance led to a co-operative effort with the Communist Party in an antipass campaign in 1944-1945 and to a pledge of co-operation on matters of mutual interests with the SAIC. This pledge, signed by Xuma, Yusuf Dadoo and G.M. Naicker in the "Doctors' Pact" of March 1947, was a first step towards the later full-scale alliance of the ANC and the SAIC in the Defiance Campaign of 1952. Under Xuma's leadership mass action did not become a priority in the ANC, for Xuma lacked a common touch and was not inclined by temperament to the technique of civil disobedience nor to the leading of protest demonstrations. Nevertheless, by recognising the advantages of mass membership and by taking steps to improve administration and finance in the ANC, he helped to lay the foundation for the much broader based congress movement of the 1950s.

The Nationalist Party victory of 1948 brought a new sense or urgency into African politics, and to many younger members of the ANC it seemed that Xuma's shortcomings as a leader had begun to outweigh his strengths. Organisation was more important to him than action, and the self-assurance that had helped him in the early 1940s to pool together all factions of the ANC under his own rather autocratic leadership appeared by 1949 to be an obstacle to innovations in the movement. In December 1949, therefore, the Youth League threw its support behind James Moroka and Xuma was defeated in his bid for a fourth term as ANC president. He won election to the national executive committee but within a few months found it impossible to work with the new ANC leadership and resigned his position. He thereafter played no active role in the ANC, apart from sending a controversial open letter to the 1955 annual conference of the ANC, accusing the leadership of merging
with other racial groups and turning against the "Nation-building Programme of the 1940s." Before the implementation of the government's Western Areas removal scheme of the mid-1950s, he was active in organising his fellow property owners in Sophiatown, Johannesburg, to defend their rights. Despite his moderation and political inactivity, the first indictment in the Treason Trial, in 1958, listed him as a co-conspirator. He was not, however, arrested or tried. He died in Johannesburg in 1962.

10. TONY FACTOR

He left school at 13 because he was dyslexic, three years older than his classmates, and "terribly complexed". He is now "one of the most dynamic marketing men in South Africa - and needless to say a millionaire". He owns large discount houses.

He has a black belt in karate, does showjumping and calls himself a "workaholic". (Sunday Times 7/9/80)