RACISM REDUCTION IN SOUTH AFRICA: A FRAMEWORK FOR UNDERSTANDING AND DESIGNING AN INTERVENTION PROGRAM

MARC JOHANN ROGATSCHNIG

Assignment presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Masters of Arts (Clinical Psychology) at the University of Stellenbosch

Supervisor: Prof. L. Swartz

December 2003

STATEMENT

I, the undersigned, hereby declare that the work contained in this assignment is my own original work, and that I have not previously in its entirety or in part submitted it at any university for a degree.

ABSTRACT

This review explores the availability of programs aimed at reducing racism in South Africa. A summary of legislation and policy directives is included to provide clarity and inject impetus into the need for such programs. There were difficulties in receiving information and reviewing such programs and therefore a conceptualisation of racism is provided along with an examination of current manifestations thereof. To assist in the future design of racism reduction programs a detailed exposition of principles shown to be crucial to racism reduction is also provided.

OPSOMMING

Hierdie literatuur oorsig ondersoek die beskikbaarheid van programme wat daarop gemik is om rassisme in Suid-Afrika te verminder. 'n Opsomming van wetgewing en staatsbeleid word as verklaring en motivering vir die behoefte aan sodanige programme ingesluit. Aangesien daar sekere probleme ondervind is tydens die insameling van inligting, asook by die ontleding van sodanige programme, word daar gefokus op die konsep van rassisme, asook op die huidige voorkoms daarvan. In 'n poging om die ontwikkeling van toekomstige programme wat daarop gerig is om rassisme te verminder, te vergemaklik, word daar 'n gedetailleerde uiteensetting van sekere beginsels wat onteenseglik verwant is aan die vermindering van rassissme, ook weergegee.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

"More than a rejection of people's epidermic colour, racism is a denial of people's history and civilization; a rejection of its ethos, its total being. Diversity however, is the universal condition of human existence, and the richness of human experience derives largely from interaction, intercommunication, and interchange among specific cultures. The truly revolutionary goal is not to eradicate differences but to see that they are not made the cornerstones of oppression, inequality of opportunity or economic and social stratification." (Nascimento & Nascimento, 2000).

The South African national elections in 1994 heralded the end of a remarkable struggle by the people of South Africa to overthrow and dissolve the Apartheid state and to introduce a new, non-racial, non-sexist and democratic dispensation. From this new political landscape rose the 'rainbow nation' where Nelson Mandela, his hand of reconciliation outstretched, became the head of state. However with passing time, cracks began to show in this seemingly miraculous transition and in the ensuing years there have been much publicised, racially motivated clashes across the country, in schools and universities, on farms and in the cities. More recently the presence of an organised threat from right wing extremists reared its head and threatened to unsettle the state through acts of terrorism and sabotage. It should, however, have hardly been surprising that beneath the gloss of the New South Africa the inescapable reality of its racist past would eventually show. Since the 1650's the South African psyche has been moulded by a legacy of racism which eventually produced the Apartheid ideology. In the 1950's, the Apartheid government entrenched this predisposition by generating legislation based on the racist principles of separate development and intrinsic white superiority and dominance (Foster, 1991 quoted in Eyber, Dyer and Versfeld, 1997).

It is this history, riddled with the legacies of discrimination and oppression, which still profoundly informs the day to day order of South Africa's social functioning in search of a political

dispensation which addresses the evils of the past by integrating the cultures and peoples of South Africa through reconciliation and nation building. In this process, however, the history of oppression in South Africa cannot be ignored or denied and therefore it is necessary to do more than simply acknowledge the historical bias and consider it finished (Jones, 1997).

The impetus of political change encouraged rapid transformation within the legislature based primarily on section 9 of the Constitution which proclaimed 'formal equality', where everyone is equal before the law; and 'substantive equality' where acknowledgment is given that steps needed to be taken to counter the effects of past discrimination and authorise measures designed to promote the achievement of equality (Taylor, 2000). By 2000 most, if not all, of the apartheid laws were dispensed with or extensively altered, thus fulfilling the governments promises to make South Africa a country for all its citizens. The African National Congress government drafted and enacted a multitude of statutes promoting the ideals of equality, diversity and transformation, and publicly rejected all racist and segregationist principles. The blueprint for the structure and nature of South African society had thus been established. Of course embedding these principles into law made them enforceable, an objective which is important to remember when reviewing the laws that have been enacted and the purposes for which they were promulgated. It is also remarkable to note how broad the platform of transformation has been and to what extent the government has put in place official assistance to legally redress the inequalities of the past.

Legislative Reform

There has been a fundamental recast of legislation in current South Africa. On the one hand the view is that in order to reduce tensions there needs to be a move away from laws which focus primarily on racial characteristics (Ranuga, 2000; Sono, 1999). On the other hand transformation requires legislation focusing on racial issues, so that redress can be achieved (Ginwala, 2000). These views are supported by the idea that there can be little long lasting change unless it is accompanied by adjustments to the very deep seated, underlying structures of South African society

(Bradnum, Niewoudt, & Tredoux, 1993; Finchilescu & De La Ray, 1991; Foster & Finchilescu, 1986). To illustrate these points; a review of legislation passed between May 1994 and December 1998 reveals that close to a third of the four hundred and ninety two Acts passed, have in some way contributed to combating racism in South Africa (Taylor, 2000).

In fact fifty-eight of these Acts dealt with the repealing of the Homelands, while twenty four Acts ensured representivity on public boards and governing bodies. Another eighteen Acts initiated the creation of new institutions including The Office of the Public Protector, the South African Human Rights Commission, The Council of Traditional Leaders, The Volkstaat Council, The National Economic Development and Labour Council, the Pan South African Language Board, The Public Service Commission and The South African Qualifications Authority, all of which have in some way defined and identified racism as offensive and intolerable. Twenty Acts have dealt with racism in other ways by making professions more representative, and developing sport, art and culture in previously disadvantaged areas (Taylor, 2000). Thirty-nine Acts dealt with socio-economic rights which included the following important additions (Taylor, 2000):

ACT	AIM OF ACT
The Restitution of Land Rights Act (1994)	Addressed land claims.
The South African Citizenship Acts (1995)	Restored South African citizenship to all South Africans
The South African Schools Act (1996)	Created a unified, inclusive, national education system
The Labour Relations Act (1996)	Provided greater protection for the labour market.
The Telecommunications Act (1996)	Encouraged control of telecommunications services by previously disadvantaged people.
The Competition Act (1998)	Opened the economy to all South Africans.

The Employment Equity Act (1998)	Redressed the inequitable distribution of jobs and income.
The Promotion of Equality and Prevention of Unfair Discrimination Act (2000)	Enforced provisions to prevent and punish racist offences

These remarkable new laws followed the significant de-institutionalisation of the Apartheid laws in 1991 (James & Lever, 2000), when the Group Areas Act, Population Registration Act and Separate Amenities Act were dispensed with as a precursor to the multi-party negotiations that would ultimately force the capitulation of the Apartheid state. Although it may not seem obvious, each of these new Acts explicitly promote the participation and protection of all South African citizens, irrespective of their race, colour or creed, in all the sectors of society as equals before the law. Each of these Acts thus legally binds South Africans to uphold and respect the most important tenets and principles of non-racism and equality for all, as enshrined in the South African Constitution of 1996.

The Revisions of Policy towards Racism in South Africa

In essence then, the stage has been set for all South Africans to work together, unimpeded as equals, towards a free and democratic future. But laws alone have not been enough; in fact, more direct action and intervention may be required because it seems that very few proactive, racism reduction interventions have emanated from this legislation. Following the legal consolidation of post-1994 South Africa, the drafting of policy aimed at driving programs and initiatives that would promote and enliven these laws, grew. Policies adopted in the fight against Apartheid had to be reviewed and new guiding principles, borne of the legislative transformations and relevant to the new post-Apartheid reality, emerged. Of all the post-apartheid policy that was created, there was

one conference that had the most significant impact in charting the map of action that would guide the addressing of racism and prejudice in South Africa.

The National Conference on Racism in 2000 was convened by President Thabo Mbeki under the leadership of the South African Human Rights Commission and served as a precursor to the World Conference against Racism held in Durban, South Africa in 2001. At this gathering an inclusive, consultative, transparent and open process was initiated between government departments, civil society, faith communities, organised labour, business, and the youth to establish guidelines, principles and goals that were deemed vital in the pursuit of a non-racist society (National Action Plan & Strategy to Combat Racism, 2001). The Millennium Statement on Racism was then adopted. It stipulated the intentions of the nation in appraising and addressing the issues of racism in South Africa and declared the following (South African National Conference on Racism, 2000):

The conference should be outcomes-oriented in order to commit all South Africans to a common program of action to combat racism. (p. 1)

Racism is a major problem that prevents the full enjoyment of human rights…and constitutes a gross violation of human rights. (p. 3)

Some institutions of national life do not yet fully promote the development of effective non-racism and structural systems do not sufficiently reflect and honour the diversity of cultures, social systems, values and ways of life as recognised in the constitution. (p. 2)

Persistent forms of racial discrimination, particularly manifested in economic and social disparities created by colonialism and apartheid are perpetuated by negative aspects of globalisation and continue to undermine the realisation of a truly non-racial society. (p. 2)

National efforts at reconciliation, nation-building, social development and economic prosperity as embodied in the spirit of the African Renaissance will never succeed in an environment where racism thrives. (p. 2)

Racism manifests itself in complex ways, affecting the psychological, social and cultural spheres of life. (p. 3)

The task of eliminating racism is a national responsibility and the establishment of a society free of racism will contribute to the eradication of poverty and the promotion of sustainable human development. (p. 2)

There is a need for affirmative action and corrective measures to promote the achievement of substantive equality. (p. 3)

In an attempt to breathe life into this declaration, the South African parliament declared 2001-2010 as the Decade for National Mobilisation against Racism and the South African Non-Governmental Organisations Coalition (SANGOCO) and other agents of civil society were urged to establish and spearhead a national anti-racism forum which would develop into a movement against racism at all levels of society. This declaration was comprehensive and clear and yet the march to endorse all these principles and create proactive interventions has been slow if not non-existent at times. As this process has proved slow-moving, so the levels of discontent amongst the millions of

South Africans who were promised so much may rise to the point where it poses a threat to the country's stability and should therefore be a matter of national urgency.

THE CONTEXT OF DISCONTENT IN SOUTH AFRICA

Despite the legislative reform and policy review it would be unreasonable to assume that these, largely superficial legal amendments, would translate into an attitude change amongst the general population. In reality, South African society remains predominantly segregated and integration has been sporadic and at times traumatic too. It has been argued that South Africans persist in defining each other almost exclusively and obsessively along racial lines (Sono, 1999) and there should be no illusions that freedom and the dismantling of Apartheid has lead to a complete disappearance of racism (James & Lever, 2000). Yet the apparent unresponsiveness in addressing this problem suggests that there may be many who truly believe that South Africa has achieved a non-racist reality. However, it is still obvious that racism exerts destructive influences throughout South African society and numerous, racially motivated crimes and conflicts have been reported (Gerwel, 2000). There have been much publicised incidents of blatant racial prejudice in shocking attacks that have grossly violated human rights (Ranuga, 2000) and there is a simmering discontent with the slow pace of transformation. In so many respects it seems that little has changed in the New South Africa. The status quo of white power remains intact, and although the concept of equality has become a political reality, economic parity remains unaccomplished (Ranuga, 2000). Poverty is still intrinsically interlinked with race (Gerwel, 2000) where the rich are still primarily white and the poor primarily black. The reality of this state of affairs can not be ignored or neglected.

From within the enduring contradictions of post Apartheid South Africa, it is then not surprising that findings show that South Africans from diverse racial groups are wary of each other, and often regard the other as immoral, not trustworthy, prejudiced, unfriendly and cold (Solomons,

1996 quoted in Slabbert, 2000). Although this research is now relatively dated can it still be assumed that time alone will bring racial harmony to the South African population (Slabbert, 2000)? South Africans themselves may doubt whether transformation has been fully realised. In a survey of South African Universities, including historically white, black, coloured, Afrikaans and English universities there was a large majority of respondents who were 'in favour' of racial equality under the law (Ranuga, 2000). However the survey also showed that only 25% of respondents thought that black people were actually receiving equal treatment under the law (Ranuga, 2000). A substantial proportion of respondents (43%) believed realising racial equality was possible, 16% believed it could be realised, while a significant number (32%) were doubtful that racial equality could ever be realised (Ranuga, 2000). When asked to project how long it would take to achieve racial equality many respondents (38%) felt it would take 'many decades' (Ranuga, 2000). Despite some relatively positive opinions, it is still difficult to contest that race relations are more tense and strained (Sono, 1999).

In light of findings such as these, it may be realistic to discard any illusions that the attitudes of the Apartheid generations can be altered to become non-racist and non-prejudiced without sufficient time and effort. This may be an important concession but what is vitally important is that the youth are raised in a society that is aware and wary of its past, while at the same time embracing the collective and integrated future that has been embarked upon. Unfortunately the reality is not quite as hopeful. In a comprehensive analysis of school racism by the South African Human Rights Commission (SAHRC) in 1999 (Vally & Dalamba), it was glaringly shown that little progress had been made to ensure an end to racial discrimination and prejudice in schools. Efforts at racial integration had not achieved the desired results, in part because schools had no mechanisms to challenge and stimulate the unlearning of ingrained prejudices, as well as transform the minds of learners. Educators themselves tended to exhibit little or no commitment to constructing a learning environment free from discrimination and prejudice (Vally & Dalamba, 1999).

Although various policies have been unveiled and legislation enacted to hasten desegregation, the incidence of racial conflict in many school communities remains unchanged (Zafar, 1999 quoted in Vally & Dalamba, 1999). Schools are battling without direction and assistance from the authorities who have struggled to fill the policy vacuum in the areas of racial awareness and sensitivity (Vally & Dalamba, 1999). The curriculum has embraced a more divergent selection of knowledge systems, and recommendations have been made around the access to education in mother tongue languages, yet little has been done to develop direct interventions dealing with racism (Sekete, Shilubane & Moila, 2001).

Racial tension and conflict within South Africa has been commonplace (Vally & Dalamba, 1999) and this persistent reality should provide impetus towards acknowledging and addressing the problem. Some people may believe that only certain South Africans are racist, yet there are inherent dangers in discounting racism as a potential characteristic of all South Africans. Not acknowledging the evidence of racism in South Africa could serve to reverse much of the progress that has been made. Without a conscious effort to continually review and assess the current trends of thought and aspiration, South Africa has the potential of sliding back into the dichotomous context of Apartheid South Africa (Sono, 1999). To illustrate this, Sono (1999) in his address to President Thabo Mbeki, highlighted the fact that it seems many Africans want to give South Africa an African colour and consciousness, which could be construed as a rejection of the notion of non-racism characteristic of the post-1994 dispensation. Of course such racial consciousness can not always be viewed as racist, but if it fuels a social movement and becomes a philosophy then it may become a way of life and in time degenerate into naked racism (Sono, 1999). Black people and the expression of their 'black values' may thus be at the brink of adopting the attitudinal characteristics of racists themselves (Sono, 1999). In fact, black people are increasingly becoming satisfied to define themselves by the colour of their skins, just as whites were during the second half of the apartheid era (Sono, 1999). This illustration should not be viewed in isolation; the heritage of

racism may still be evident amongst all South Africans. This case serves only to highlight the pervasiveness and insidious qualities of racism if it is not monitored and managed amongst all the peoples of South Africa. One example of this focuses on the persistent racial thinking in South African politics where politicians do not understand that their competitors are merely rivals and not foes, let alone racial antagonists (Sono, 1999). Such a state of affairs has the potential of creating increased racial polarisation and it is therefore crucial that all South Africans acknowledge that racism is not specific to Whites, Blacks, Coloureds or Indians but a malady potentially shared by all. The message should be that anyone can be racist and that to address this problem it needs to be approached as holistically and comprehensively as possible.

In summary, laws have set the goals and the aims of the government but the reality of South Africa is still in the minds of its people who have inherited and continue to live out many virulent prejudices in their daily lives. In many cases the dreams of a non-racist society for all are far from realised and this dawning reality poses the danger of unsettling the precarious calm of this fledgling democracy.

IMPLEMENTATIONS OF RACISM REDUCTION INTERVENTIONS IN SOUTH AFRICA

In addition to analysing laws and policies that have helped shape the South African intentions to transform, it may be useful to investigate how these issues are being addressed at a more practical level. Ideally, all the sectors of South African society should, or could be, playing an important role in translating the policy and declarations of the national government into programs that are effective, theoretically sound and thoroughly evaluated. The reality of the situation seems ominous however and this current investigation has revealed a shortage of materials and programs that are available. The Millennium Statement on Racism in 2000 stated that measures would be adopted to restore and enhance the usage and recognition of diverse cultures, languages and religions. That research would be undertaken to find ways of effectively promoting and deepening

understanding of traditional lore and cultures of all South Africans with a view to ensuring respect for their identity, cultures and values. These initiatives would all be aimed at forging a sense of nationhood out of difference and diversity. Anti-racism training was to be made available to public service officials and other service providers, such as professionals, businesses, hospitality as well as leisure and entertainment industries, which interact with the public in the course of their duties. Transformation would be promoted in the administration of the justice system, representivity in the police, the prosecutorial service and the judiciary so as to better reflect the diversity of cultures and world-views represented in South African society (South African Millennium Statement on Racism, 2000).

Clearly, The Millennium Statement on Racism laid down numerous intentions and plans of action, yet whether any of these have been pursued has been difficult to verify. Initially academic literature was reviewed and it has been astonishing to discover that in general there have been very few published materials documenting initiatives undertaken to address racism in South Africa. Having identified important role players through this review of literature, telephonic and electronic contact was made with a selection of relevant organisations who in turn either arranged meetings, shared resources and literature or provided contact details for additional organisations and individuals who could assist in searching for information. Indeed many organisations both governmental and non-governmental have outlined strategies and motivations in support of racism reduction interventions, yet few proactive steps have been taken to enact the presented policy. This discovery is not surprising in light of the responses and impressions that were received from various NGO's (i.e. The Institute for Justice and Reconciliation, IDASA, Centre for Conflict Resolution, Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation, South African Institute for Race Relations, The Quaker Peace Centre, South African NGO Coalition); Universities (University of Cape Town, University of Stellenbosch, University of Durban-Westville, University of the Western Cape) and Education Policy Units (University of Durban-Westville, University of Natal and University of the

Witwatersrand); civil society (Home for All Campaign, United Against Racism) and numerous Government Departments and Commissions (including The South African Human Rights Commission).

In general the sentiment and input received from most of these interest groups and selected role players has been vague and apologetic. There was general excitement regarding the topic selected for this research but also resignation over the lack of projects and programs available for review. In some cases the reality of the situation was explained as a factor of timing and that many programs were still in their nascent stages. Others confirmed the lack of research and cited a selection of university courses that had been designed to cover the issues of racism at an under-graduate level. It also seems that much of the work that has been done is in the corporate arena, yet access to these programs has been difficult. Diversity training, as it is known, is apparently quite financially lucrative yet questions have been raised as to the evaluation measures and efficacy of such work. It also seems that many organisations have been waiting for leadership from government and that there is a preoccupation with the genesis and prevalence of racism amongst some academics yet still little focused attention on actual program design. The South African Human Rights Commission has played a pivotal role in advising government and analysing the current manifestations of racism, especially in education. The general impression is that very few organisations or individuals feel confident enough to claim that they have a program that truly reduces racism.

The scope and parameters of this review are limited yet the organisations and individuals that were contacted consistently gave the impression that although programs are available they are often theoretically not sound and in almost all cases not evaluated independently for their efficacy. Astonishingly there also seems to be limited collaboration between the various interest groups that are attempting to design such programs. In reality, it seems that there is a dearth of interventions

and that the gap between the policies and the wide-scale addressing of the issues of racism is far wider than previously imagined.

At a governmental level the motivation and policy is in place but delivery seems hampered. There is no central body that co-ordinates such programs or that drives a national initiative to address these issue, and no single interest group has been identified to oversee the implementation of such programs across broader society.

Psychological, academic literature in this field is also limited. It seems the history of psychology in South Africa has hampered and stunted the influence that it could have. Many South African psychologists have rejected accusations of racism during the Apartheid era by insisting their influence was even-handed and scientific (Murray, 2002). Yet this supposedly impartial approach failed to recognise and acknowledge the existence of apartheid as an influence on psychology and silenced the role that psychology played in supporting apartheid (Foster, Nicholas & Dawes, 1993; Nicholas, 1993; Nicholas & Cooper, 1990; Vogelman, 1987 quoted in Durrheim & Mokeki, 1997). By their relative inaction, South African psychologists actually unwittingly condoned the apartheid ideology (Cloete, Muller & Orkin, 1986 quoted in Durrheim & Mokeki, 1997) and for the most part failed to speak out against apartheid and the racist status quo (Durrheim & Mokeki, 1997). Beyond that, it was common knowledge that some South African psychologists actively supported apartheid in the manner in which they practised, formed professional organisations and trained psychologists in a segregated fashion (Foster, 1991; Nicholas & Cooper, 1990 quoted in Durrheim & Mokeki, 1997). There were, however, also South African psychologists who sought to bring human dignity, equality and justice to their profession and continue today to engage in, and with, the psychological issues and needs that face all South Africans (Murray, 2002). It is these individuals who are helping to guide South African psychology towards reinforcing its relevance by introducing a number of steps including, the development of large-scale social interventions, the recruitment of more

scholars and researchers, particularly blacks, into South African psychology and focusing more on an indigenous, African psychology and the unique needs of the total population (Murray, 2002).

Despite these advances there is still a shortage of definitive research conducted in South Africa on South African subjects regarding the analysis of racism and how to combat it. Therefore a practitioner who wishes to create a racism reduction intervention would be hard pressed to find a well-documented instrument that has been locally designed and evaluated. Thus it is of critical importance that practitioners are provided with some essential guidelines and translations of policy and theory that can assist in creating and implementing pragmatic and effective racism reduction interventions. The focus of the remainder of this review will thus be to (a) conceptualise and create an understanding of what racism is, and how it develops and manifests itself most commonly and to (b) provide a theoretical outline of the principles which should be understood, analysed and adopted when constructing an anti-racism or racism reduction program.

THE NATURE OF CONTEMPORARY RACISM

As has been outlined, there seems to be a lack of clear and constructive guidelines available that will assist in identifying racism, understanding its meaning and aetiology and then implementing effective techniques to combat it. This review aims to help provide basic guidelines in an attempt to assist further research and racism reduction program development. Thus, in line with the proposed rationale of this review, it is important to look at the very nature of racism; how it manifests itself and how it can be understood from a broad, theoretical perspective. Racism needs to be defined and its variety of expression mapped out, in order to clearly establish what the target of an intervention should be. Also important is learning to understand how human beings develop the social, psychological and cognitive justifications to act and think in a prejudicial or, more specifically, racist manner. Therefore understanding the genesis of prejudice is presumed essential in reversing or addressing racism and, armed with a more clear understanding of exactly how to

define it, it is hoped that the important factors that are needed to identify its presence, will be illustrated.

Defining Prejudice and Racism

Efforts at quantifying racism reveal the insidious quality of prejudice, which is at times blatantly obvious, and at others times quite elusive. Racism has the potential of affecting all members of society and could considerably impede integration and harmony among people of different races and cultures. Cycles of violence and unrest, subjugation and tyranny, alienation and marginalisation may feed off and fuel the destructive energies of prejudicial thought and behaviour. Yet, despite their pervasive presence, racism and prejudice have eluded clear definition. There is, for example, no single authoritative definition of prejudice other than that it is generally seen as an attitude which is expressed in the form of a belief, feeling, and behaviour and is loaded with a predominantly negative judgement towards members of an out group (Hightower, 1997; Klegg, 1993; Ponterrotto & Pedersen, 1993). Allport (1979 quoted in Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995) defined prejudice as 'an antipathy based upon faulty and inflexible generalisations that may be felt or expressed. It may be directed to a group or toward an individual who is a member of that group (p. 58)'. From a social psychological perspective prejudice has been defined as behaviour directed towards out-group members and based on a fixed over-generalisation or totally false belief (Klegg, 1993). In summary, prejudice can be understood as a negative attitude, judgement or behaviour based on beliefs held about a group and its individual member (Jones, 1997). Racism, on the other hand, is a form of prejudice where the basis for discrimination is a specific and biologically determined attribute or characteristic of a group or an individual from that group. To state it more generally, Skillings & Dobbins (1991 quoted in Hightower, 1997) defined racism as 'a belief that ones own cultural or racial heritage is innately superior to others (p. 369)'. Knowledge of how racism is defined is only the starting point of the greater process of identifying and exposing the

ways that it manifests. Merely knowing what racism is may not provide enough information as to how it can be identified and therefore it becomes important to understand the incidence of racism in daily life.

Contemporary Expressions of Racism

Attempting to conceptualise the nature of contemporary manifestations of racism is considered important, especially in light of the significant shifts in the expression of overt, explicit or blatant prejudice since the 1950's (Schuman, Steeh & Bob, 1985; Taylor, Sheatsley & Greele, 1978 quoted in Devine, Plant & Buswell, 2000). Fewer people are now presumed to hold strongly prejudiced beliefs and more have come to integrate, tolerate and endorse more positive stereotypes of ethnic out-groups. Overt, direct forms of prejudice have declined yet certain studies show that more subtle, unobtrusive and non-verbal responses continue to reveal widespread negative reactions to out group members (Crosby, Bromley & Saxe, 1980; Dovidio, Kawakami, Johnson, Johnson & Howard, 1997 quoted in Devine et al., 2000).

One way to understand this is that prejudice has not actually declined but merely changed its form (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986 quoted in Devine et al., 2000). Much of the past research on racism has focused on the blatant and intentional forms of racism whereas current studies recognise the presence of more subtle, unintentional and possibly unconscious forms of bias as increasingly relevant (Dovidio, 2000). Introducing the notion of subtle racism suggests that there are suspicions that consciously expressed attitudes do not necessarily capture the full extent of racism in modern society (Banaji & Greenwald, 1994; Dovidio et al., 1997 quoted in Oskamp, 2000). Essentially there are important differences between subtle and blatant racism that need to be revealed.

Blatant or Explicit Racism

Blatant racism is generally close and direct (Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995), and two components to blatant racism continually emerge. Firstly, blatant racists feel threatened by, and reject an out-group based on a belief in that group's inherent inferiority which implies that the sentiment that is felt towards that group is justified and therefore it cannot be construed as discriminatory. Secondly, there is an active opposition to intimate contact with an out-group (Allport, 1958 quoted in Hightower, 1997; Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995).

Subtle or Implicit Racism

Subtle racism is more covert and difficult both to identify and quantify but new research is providing more information about its defining features. What has consistently emerged is that subtle racism is a veiled means of expressing prejudice; it is more distant and indirect (Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995) and startlingly commonplace (Essed, 1984 quoted in Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995). Subtle racism appears to be characteristic of some individuals who possess strong egalitarian values and believe that they are non-prejudiced (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986; Kovel, 1970 quoted in Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995). It is thus viewed as an attempt to attribute out-group disadvantage to causes other than discrimination (Maconohay, 1983 quoted in Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995) or used as a defence against acknowledging innate prejudice (Kovel, 1970 quoted in Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995). Subtle racists tend to deny their prejudice but will demonstrate a lack of sympathy to the troubles of the out-group, and blame social inequities on traits of the out-group (Hightower, 1997; Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995). An example of this would be the sentiment held by some White South Africans that Black South Africans are poor because they are not innately hard working people. Through such manipulations, subtle racism is commonly expressed in ways that seem normative and acceptable. The following are commonly held justifications of behaviours that illustrate the nature of subtle racism:

Defence of Traditional Values

Subtle racists will express racism through the defence of their traditional values. They will judge out-group members as unable to succeed because they act in 'unacceptable' ways or threaten the integrity of the in-groups values. In this case, what is regarded as acceptable is assessed according to the values of the in-group and therefore the out-group is, in fact, blamed for its inequitable status within society. There is thus an implicit insistence that the out-group must conform or assimilate to the in-groups values or else remain marginalised and excluded from the mainstream of society. Obviously this stance disregards the quality of the out-group as worthy or acceptable which further perpetuates racist ideation towards that out-group (Allport, 1958 quoted in Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995). Another example of how subtle racists impose these beliefs and succeed in rejecting out groups is by, for example, rejecting forceful interventions aimed at improving intergroup relations because it requires that the in-group may need to alter its traditional beliefs to be more accommodating and inclusive (Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995).

Exaggeration of Cultural Differences

Belief dissimilarity (Rokeach, 1960 quoted in Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995) along with racial identity is considered an important predictor of racial prejudice (Smith, Williams & Willis, 1967; Stein, Hardyck & Smith, 1965; Triandis & Davis, 1965 quoted in Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995). Subtle racists tend to equate differences in race with belief dissimilarity. Thus exaggerated assumptions of group differences tend to enhance the assumptions of belief dissimilarity between members of the in-group and members of the out-group (Dienstbier, 1972; Moe, Nacoste & Insko, 1981 quoted in Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995). Instead of the genetic inferiority beliefs of blatant racists, subtle racists regard out-group disadvantages as a factor of belief dissimilarity and cultural differences. For example, it may be assumed by subtle racists that a member of the out-group has a different set of beliefs which can then be used by subtle racists to explain a perceived weakness in

his/her performance. These differences are in reality often genuine but clearly exaggerated and distorted into a false perception.

Denial of Positive Emotions

Although there is an insistence by subtle racists that no negative emotions are held against the out-group (Dovidio et al., 1989 quoted in Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995) it is considered equally significant that positive emotions towards the out-group are also absent. Thus there seems to be no overt expression of feelings towards an out-group, either negative or positive. These three strategies used by subtle racists manifest in ways that are seemingly non-racist by punishing failed assimilation into traditional values; using cultural differences as explanations for failures and inequities and offering no negative or positive feelings towards the out-group, yet the out-group is still marginalised and rejected (Pettigrew & Meertens, 1995). These strategies are often unconscious and attempts to steer away from more blatant forms of racial prejudice, yet at their very heart they are still discriminatory and almost exclusively based on racial differences. Thus it can still be defined as racism

While this may be how subtle racism manifests currently, a better understanding of how this form of racism develops is important when attempting to ascertain how to address and transform it. Subtle or implicit racism may be best understood against the backdrop of the great strides made socially, politically and morally in instilling norms of fairness and equality in Western Europe and America over the past few decades (Dovidio, Kawakami & Gaertner, 2000). Tolerant individuals internalise such norms while racists evidently ignore and reject them. Subtle racists partially comply with these norms and yet express their negative inter-group views in an outwardly non-racist manner that seems to slip in under the egalitarian norm but is still racist.

It seems therefore that there is a conflict between consciously endorsed and internalised egalitarian principles and unconscious negative feelings which create ambivalence within the subtle

racists (Dovidio et al., 2000). Thus when the appropriate response is clear in a certain context, the subtle racists will not discriminate, however because subtle racists do possess negative feelings these will eventually be expressed in indirect ways when the appropriate response is not clear. In some instances the appropriate response is ambiguous and racist attitudes can be veiled as something else which serves to insulate subtle racists from having to acknowledge their bigotry (Dovidio et al., 2000). Of course, this also makes it difficult for the victims of such racism to prove or confidently challenge what they are experiencing.

Learning to identify the indicators or quality of racism is important. Subtle forms of prejudice tend to elude detection, yet the consequences for those that are being surreptitiously discriminated against can be harmful. Understanding how we as humans have transformed the nature of racial prejudice is a pivotal component of addressing the subjective expression of such beliefs, be it consciously or subconsciously. In this section there has been an attempt to define racism and to describe the forms in which it is expressed in modern society. It is clear that the knowledge of subtle racism is important yet it does not automatically translate into a clear procedure of helping subtle racists to acknowledge the extent of their racism. There are however various theories which attempt to explain the genesis of racism and which may shed some light on the more fundamental processes that operate in both subtle and blatant racists. It is hoped that reviews of thought processing, categorisation and Social Identity theory will reveal a better understanding of racism.

CONCEPTUALISING RACISM & PREJUDICE

Thought Processing & Categorisation

In conceptualising prejudice it is important to take a closer look at the fundamentals of human thought processing, to in other words, review how it is that human beings deal with all the information that they receive and retrieve from the environment. A fundamental means of

processing such information is by categorising sensory stimuli into smaller and more manageable components. This is an important cognitive process that assists in organising the overload of information that is presented to all people (Billig, 1985). In essence, categorisation is an attempt at giving structure and coherence to the large amount of input presented by the environment.

An important component of categorisation is the matching of information to fit a category or schema. Schemas are the cognitive categories according to which the information overload is simplified, interpreted and sorted. Thus large amounts of information are matched to a category and placed within a cognitive structure that makes it easier to understand. The consequence, however, is that the infinite differences between stimuli are minimised to behaviourally and cognitively usable proportions (Billig, 1985) which can result in two or more distinguishable objects being treated equivalently, so that the non-equivalent becomes equivalent (i.e. a circle and a square both become commonly identified as shapes yet in comparison to each other they are distinct and mutually exclusive). This represents a potential distortion, in addition to a simplification, of all perceived sensory information (Billig, 1985). This is noteworthy in light of the fact that category constructions often serve to organise and legitimate particular kinds of inter-group behaviours (Dixon & Reicher, 1997) which may thus be based on false assumptions about what has been perceived. It is not difficult to see that although categorisation is important and functional, its influence on interpersonal relating can cause problems. Tajfel (1969 quoted in Billig, 1985) termed this process of interpersonal/inter-group categorisation as Social Categorisation, whereby people are categorised into an in-group/out-group dimension and then assume characteristics about each other that impact their behaviour in the following ways (Brewer, 2000):

- **Inter-group accentuation:**

Differences between and similarities within groups are accentuated.

- **In-group favouritism:**

Positive affect is reserved for in-group members only.

• **Social competition:**

There is perceived competition between the in-group and out-group.

Once these distinctions have been made then the evaluations of the out-group in comparison to the in-group follow. Many of these evaluations are informed by popularly assumed stereotypes which are used to denigrate the out-group or glorify the in-group (Wetherell, 1996). Stereotyping is thus regarded as an automatic consequence of categorisation (Wetherell, 1996) and becomes activated upon perception of the category, which subsequently influences judgements and behaviours. Negative group stereotypes can be thought of as the cognitive component of prejudice (Lepore & Brown, 1997) and thus, a wellspring for prejudiced attitudes (Klegg, 1993).

Stereotyping

The development and adoption of stereotypes is an intrinsic component of understanding categorisation and racism. Lippmann (1922 quoted in Klegg, 1993) defined stereotypes in relation to how people perceive and interpret reality. Due to the complexity of stimuli in the environment, people receive pieces of information regarding an object, place or event and their imagination fills in the gaps to create categories. The filling in of information in these gaps could lead to distorted stereotypes (Klegg, 1993; Wetherell, 1996). In other words, people imagine most things before they experience them and those preconceptions govern the process of perception (Kelly, 1955 quoted in Levy, 1999; Lippmann, 1922 quoted in Klegg, 1993). Stereotypes therefore seem to impress themselves on reality and transform reality to fit the stereotype (Klegg, 1993; Wetherell, 1996). They are the perceived reality of an individual and therefore, to change behaviour, it is essential to deal with the perceptions of reality and not reality itself.

Stereotypes are also loaded with moral judgements (Lippmann, 1922 quoted in Klegg, 1993; Wetherell, 1996) and may therefore be inherent within an individual's impression of reality and

their place within that reality. Stereotypes are also decidedly resistant to change, either because they assist individuals to make sense of the world or because they serve a social role and contain useful information about the nature of inter-group relations (Johnstone & Macrae, 1994 quoted in Hill & Augoustinos, 2001). The content of these stereotypes is then both descriptive and explanatory and hence functional and difficult to change (Jost & Banaji, 1994 quoted in Hill & Augoustinos, 2001). So how can stereotypes then be managed and controlled? It has been mentioned that blatant racists express unedited racist beliefs whereas subtle racists tend to censor and edit their expressions of prejudice and in that way exert control over that process. Thus eliminating racist tendencies altogether may not be the only means of reducing prejudice but there may be ways of gaining control over what has previously been assumed to be an automatic processing of thoughts. This alternative view now needs some attention.

Automatic versus Controlled Thought Processing

Racism can be conceptualised as a cognitive model (Dovidio, Kawakami, Johnson & Howard, 1997 quoted in Dovidio et al., 2000) in which dual attitudes, explicit and conscious on one hand and implicit and unconscious on the other, do not necessarily coincide (Dovidio, Kawakami & Beach, 1999; Greenwald and Banaji, 1995 quoted in Dovidio et al., 2000). Devine (1989 quoted in Dovidio et al., 2000) proposes that both high and low prejudiced individuals are equally knowledgeable about cultural stereotypes and that they similarly activate these stereotypes. However, lower prejudiced people endorse egalitarian values and are thus more motivated to suppress and counteract their initial, automatic reactions (Dovidio et al., 2000). In order to understand how it is that low prejudiced individuals are able to suppress such automatic, prejudiced reactions, it is important to understand the processes that occur within the individual under such circumstances.

It is believed that automatic processes are those that occur without any awareness, they occur unintentionally and spontaneously. Both low and high prejudiced people are vulnerable to an automatic activation of stereotypic thinking (Devine, 1989; Dovidio et al., 1997; Fazio, Jackson, Dunton & Williams, 1995; Greenwald, McGhee & Schwartz, 1998 quoted in Devine et al., 2000) yet the more highly prejudiced the individual, the more readily stereotypes will be endorsed (Devine, 1989; Devine & Elliot, 1995; Lepore & Brown, 1997 quoted in Devine et al., 2000). However it has also been shown that renouncing prejudice and developing non-prejudiced beliefs doesn't necessarily eliminate stereotypes from the mind.

Controlled processes, on the other hand, are intentional and deliberate. These processes, should they be adopted, take time and cognitive capacity to overcome the automatic stereotypes and replace them with non-prejudiced personal beliefs. Without sufficient time the responses may well continue to be racist. These important distinctions between controlled and automatic responses may shed some light on how to reverse the process of automatic stereotyping, yet at the same time it illustrates how racism is almost inevitable in many ways. After all, thinking involves distortion and simplification, which implies that a prejudiced person, thinking in terms of stereotypes which distort and simplify, is employing normal categorisation processes (Billig, 1985 quoted in Lepore & Brown, 1997). Stereotyping and prejudice can thus in many ways be seen as normal (Billig, 1985; Lepore & Brown, 1997).

SOCIAL IDENTITY THEORY

Social Identity Theory provides an alternative understanding of racism removed from cognitive processes. It proposes that when an individual's social identity is prominent in a particular situation then they will respond with respect to that aspect of their social identity, rather than their personal identity (Doise, 1978; Doise & Sinclair, 1973; Tajfel, 1969; Wilder, 1978 quoted in Brewer & Miller, 1984; Louw-Potgieter, Kamfer & Boy, 1991). The ways in which people

behave and the dimensions along which they differentiate themselves are thus dictated by the meanings associated with their relevant social categories i.e. race, gender, age etc. (Miles, 1989 quoted in Dixon & Reicher, 1997). In other words it is the individual's personal understanding of the social environment within which they exist that dictates their behaviour and strategies of group differentiation. The expectation would be that such categorisation would depersonalise the out-group members and serve only to enhance group distinctiveness and thus legitimate in-group behaviours as those that enhance favourable and positive in-group status. Ultimately that would be the dominant feature of their thought processing, and it is an aspect of inter-group contact intrinsic to each individual. Turner (1982 quoted in Louw-Potgieter et al., 1991) argued that the sum total of our in-groups will form our social identity, which in turn constitutes a sub-part of the self–image. Personal identity, the other sub-part of our self-image, is formed by individual attributes. Important however with respect to inter-group contact is that members of the in-group are made to feel secure in their own social identity and hopefully see no need to engage in defensive strategies to enhance the positive belongingness of their own in-group (Louw-Potgieter et al., 1991). An insecure social identity, where the individual feels that there is some measure of threat to their group status, is not conducive to social learning and personal change.

Once a better understanding of racism has been achieved, the process of addressing it can begin. Much research has been conducted to seek the most effective methods of addressing racism. With a fuller understanding of racism and its contemporary manifestations it has become important to adopt well studied principles of prejudice reduction in order to avoid the unintentional, negative side-effects that may arise from programs without sound theoretical backing. This area of enquiry has continued since the 1950's and there have been some significant findings in the past 10 years to add substance to the efficacy of such programs. Interventions that have been successfully implemented abroad will be used as a basis for the following principles and guidelines. Having reviewed the various conceptualisations of prejudice and how thought processing, categorisation,

stereotyping and the social identity theory have contributed to this debate, it is now important to look at ways in which the genesis and perpetuation of racism can be addressed and diminished.

REDUCING RACISM

It is evident from the preceding sections that there is a large amount of information to be considered when constructing an anti-racism intervention. Research findings, psychological theories and the current context all need to be integrated to maximise the potential success of such a program. The goals of teaching about prejudice and rejecting racism should include (1) teaching concepts and facts regarding racism and its effects, and (2) reducing prejudiced attitudes and changing behaviours in a positive direction (Oskamp, 2000).

Just how this is accomplished is the focus of this section. It has already been mentioned that programs that encourage tolerance and acceptance have not gained significant momentum in South Africa, and people are not experiencing equal opportunity and social justice (Oskamp, 2000). It is essential that well researched conceptualizations of prejudice and racism are offered as a basis upon which such racism reduction programs can be designed and implemented. Thorough studies have been conducted in the field of prejudice and racism reduction and there are certain fundamental elements that need to be included in such programs.

It has already been noted that the causes of racial prejudice are multiple and elaborately intertwined. Consequently, prejudice reduction programs need to consider and combat the multiple causes of racial prejudice (Oskamp, 2000). Due to the limited parameters of this review, it has been decided that only interventions aimed at inter-group and interpersonal interactions (Oskamp, 2000) will be considered. The following guidelines are not mutually exclusive and it is important to note that a combination of the behavioural, cognitive and motivational approaches that will now be presented may be most effective.

BEHAVIOURAL APPROACHES TO REDUCING RACISM

By means of behavioural techniques, racial prejudice is addressed through inter-group contact under specific conditions, cooperative learning techniques and structured experiences (Oskamp, 2000).

Contact Hypothesis

The Contact Hypothesis evolved due to an emerging commitment to political democracy in the social sciences (Dixon & Reicher, 1997) and is still considered to be one of the most effective and important contributors to the body of knowledge in this area. It attempts to delineate parameters within which there would be optimum potential for success in resolving inter-group prejudice. The primary objective is thus to facilitate contact between diverse individuals and to specify conditions which promote successful, long lasting interactions and relationships as a direct result thereof (Dixon & Reicher, 1997).

The Contact Hypothesis claims that the facilitation of regular inter-group contact between members of different ethnic or racial groups promotes inter-group harmony. Contact purportedly increases knowledge of the out-group; reduces anxiety levels in the company of out-group members and diminishes perceptions of out-group dissimilarity and negative stereotypes (Dixon & Reicher, 1997). These results therefore directly address some of the cardinal characteristics of racial prejudice.

To facilitate these aims it is important that contact occurs under certain conditions. Structural inequalities between groups, real conflicts of interest and social identity dynamics (Brown, 1995; Hewstone & Brown, 1986; Sheriff, 1966) have a significant effect on the relationships between groups. It has been shown that what critically shapes how a person perceives, interprets, evaluates and responds to situations and others, depends on whether personal or collective identity is more salient (Kawakami & Dion, 1993 quoted in Dovidio et al., 2000). Thus

the context of inter-group contact mediates the nature and outcome of contact (Dixon & Reicher, 1997). The following conditions are thought to be critical in ensuring successful inter-group contact:

Social and Institutional Support.

Allport (1954 quoted in Amir, 1969; 1954 quoted in Brown, 1995) claims that institutional and social support promotes amicable contact between groups. The significance and impact of this support lies in the power of a higher authority to either reward or sanction the actions of groups or individuals through legislation. The effect of an enforced, authoritative set of guidelines may lead to an internalisation of those prescribed beliefs (Festinger, 1957 quoted in Brown, 1995) and modifications in behaviours based on social or institutional dictates (Deutsch & Collins, 1951 quoted in Amir, 1969).

Equal Status Contact

Perceived Equal Status in the contact context is essential. Although difficult to establish, the importance of this condition can be illustrated in a context where one group is unable to complete or take part in a joint, inter-group task; consequently the perceived group disparity and inferiority will be re-enforced (Allport, 1954 quoted in Brown, 1995). The importance of equivalent performance competencies is thus also evident (Amir, 1969), however discrepancies do exist between the experimental and the real-world levels of status equality. It is questionable as to whether artificial equality is predictive of meaningful psychological equality (Brewer & Miller, 1984) however, contact between members of the majority and high status members of the minority have shown noticeable reductions in prejudice (Amir, 1969). To address this potential shortfall it may be beneficial to assess the perspectives of each group in fashioning the optimal, structured contact situation (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2000).

Common Goal Orientation versus Competition

Equal status and Institutional support are irrelevant should there be a competitive relationship between the groups. Merely reducing a competitive dynamic is insufficient to reduce prejudice but what has proved effective is participation in co-operative, joint ventures that deliver mutual benefits. Sheriff (1966, quoted in Amir, 1969; Brewer & Miller, 1984) claims that super-ordinate group goals create an opportunity for reducing the prominence of category membership and foster mutual dependence between the groups to successfully complete the tasks (Brown, 1995). There is a reasonable chance that positive attitude changes will occur should the group co-operation lead to a successful outcome (Allport, quoted 1954 in Brown, 1995; Dovidio et al., 2000). Obviously competition, which maintains in-group identity and re-enforces inter-group boundaries, must be avoided at all costs (Amir, 1969 quoted in Dixon & Reicher, 1997).

Intimate Contact versus Casual Contact

The success of contact can be measured by the extent that participants forge and maintain meaningful relationships. Contact needs to be frequent, intimate, enduring and possess substantial acquaintance potential (Jahoda & West, 1953 quoted in Amir, 1969; Deutsch & Collins, 1951 quoted in Amir, 1969). Allport (1954 quoted in Amir, 1969) perceives the development of an intimate relationship as rewarding to the participants. The pleasure derived from a reward suggests an inherent positive out-group view and thus a high probability of rejecting negative, out-group stereotyping. Contact in a work or organisational setting has more success than contact in a setting typical of travel and tourism. This probably reflects differences in the length and the intensity of the contact (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2001)

Personality Factors

The decisive mediating factor in all displays of behaviour and expressions of belief is an individual's personality. The intention of contact should include a desire to stimulate mutual respect and tolerance between segregated groups. Thus, the purpose of integration needs to be validated by an accepting personality. Amir (1969) identifies characteristic traits of non-receptive personalities as individuals who possess little inner security and display their personal disorder within their judgement. Their prejudice is thus perpetuated due to an important self-preserving function.

Evaluating the efficacy of the Contact Hypothesis

It is generally believed that achieving the above criteria will maximise the effective resolution of racially prejudicial relationships. Yet it may be difficult to achieve this in all cases. Much ingenuity and creativity will be needed to attain some of these goals and all potential program designers need to make sure that at the very least they do not create hindrances to these aspirations. To create an environment that is in opposition to any of these conditions would be counter-productive and it is important to at all times monitor the subtle balance between these conditions as the program progresses.

It is important to remember that in many contexts prejudice is functional and serves the interest of the perpetrators. Duckitt (1992) supports this view and adds that inter-group contact must be characterised by hopes for gain and not fears of loss. It has been encouraging to find that the Contact Hypothesis has withstood much criticism and rigorous evaluation to emerge as one of the most influential features of a racism reduction program. Pettigrew & Tropp (2000) completed a meta-analysis on a wide selection of research that focused on factors that facilitated a successful contact context. The following theoretical and empirical findings emerged:

Face-to-face contact between group members leads to significant reductions in levels of prejudice: Of 203 studies, 93% found inverse relationship between contact and prejudice.

Contact has lead to significant generalisations: Most of the research has demonstrated generalisations of effects from immediate participants to the general out-group.

The size of the contact-prejudice effects was mediated by whether the participants were from a majority or minority group: In-group participants reveal much greater effects than out-groups. This may illustrate that both groups may perceive the optimal conditions for contact differently. What is regarded as equal status by the in-group may not be seen as such by the out-group.

The more rigorous the study, the larger the positive outcome: Research that included control groups with no out-group contact, experimental designs and more reliable measures of both dependent and independent variables all yielded larger mean effects.

Inter-group contact relates to a wide range of prejudice measures: Contact leads to more learning about the out-group, altered beliefs and stereotypes, and changes in the affective indicators.

These findings indicate that inter-group contact should form an integral part of any prejudice reduction program. Approaches will also be presented that can be used as adjuncts and additions to the Contact intervention. The following approaches can form an integrated part of a greater program and serve to help fulfil and improve on the stipulated contact conditions. As has been mentioned many other approaches and techniques can be used in conjunction with the stipulations of the Contact Hypothesis and some can even help to better accomplish certain dynamics. The reduction of competition between groups is viewed as critical to the success of the contact context and the Realistic Conflict Theory addresses this issue directly.

THE REALISTIC CONFLICT THEORY

The Realistic Conflict Theory focuses primarily on the factors which perpetuate current levels of prejudice (Duckitt, 1992). Inter-group Competition is assumed to perpetuate itself due to the misinterpretation of intentions by both sides where competitive participants view each other's actions as intentionally antagonistic and not as functionally motivated according to their own interests and goals (Duckitt, 1992). Perceived intentions of the out-group are then viewed as a direct manifestation of an out-group disposition which is in turn generally judged to be negative and inferior (Cooper & Fazio, 1979 quoted in Duckitt, 1992). Such an assessment of the out-group's personality constitution seems to legitimise, in the minds of the in-group, forms of Domination and Exploitation over the out-group (Duckitt, 1992). These actions are then overt expressions of group distinctiveness that lead to scape goating and the attribution of the in-group's misfortunes to the behaviours of out-group members (Duckitt, 1992). This cycle perpetuates itself and therefore the emphasis here is on reducing the bases of realistic conflict by sharing power with the out-group, yielding out-group specific areas of responsibility/authority and increasing resources available to contending groups. This approach is difficult to implement because it is in conflict with the dominant group's usually strong motivation to maintain power over subordinate groups (Sidanius & Veniegas, 2000 quoted in Oskamp, 2000) but it is an essential step that needs to be accomplished to ensure greater efficacy in racism reduction. Apart from these more behaviourally oriented approaches there are other means by which racism can be targeted and some of them rely on the more cognitive elements of racism to be modified.

COGNITIVE APPROACHES TO REDUCING RACISM

Essentially there are many aspects to cognitive approaches that help reduce racism that are inherent and functionally compatible within a contact context. In fact, a combination of research on Contact Hypothesis, social categorisation and Social Identity Theory has provided a theoretical

framework to understand the cognitive mechanisms by which co-operative contact is presumed to work (Brewer & Miller, 1984; Hewstone, 1996; Hewstone & Brown, 1986; Wilder, 1986 quoted in Brewer, 2000). This knowledge has lead to a greater understanding of the efficacy and endorsement of certain cognitive approaches. Decategorisation and recategorisation both offer explanations of some of the cognitive processes that need to be accomplished within a contact situation.

Decategorisation and Recategorisation

Decategorisation occurs when both groups that are interacting focus on more individualised characteristics of each other (Brewer & Miller, 1984 quoted in Dovidio et al., 2000). Recategorisation, on the other hand, is where the boundaries are maintained but often redefined into new group memberships that cut across the in-group and out-group (Urban & Miller, 1998 quoted in Dovidio et al., 2000). For example, if university students are the participants, then no matter whether they are members of the in-group or the out-group the salience of their identity as students is emphasised. The Common In-group Identity Model promotes the idea of recategorisation and facilitates a change in group membership to include a group identity that is more inclusive (Gaertner, Dovidio, Anastasio, Bachman & Rust, 1993 in quoted in Dovidio et al., 2000). The Common In-group Identity Model is rooted in the social categorisation perspective of inter-group behaviour (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) where each member of a group is redefined so that they are members of a super ordinate group. To redefine members as part of an in-group rather than an out-group has significant positive changes in evaluations of these people and may lead to a decrease in prejudice (Dovidio et al., 2000). It has also been shown that upon mere categorisation people value in-group members more than out-group members (Tajfel, Billig, Bundy & Flament, 1971 quoted in Dovidio et al., 2000) because it is believed to facilitate greater empathy in response to others needs (Pillivan, Dovidio, Gaertner & Clark, 1981 quoted in Dovidio et al., 2000). In addition, people tend to have better memory for similarities with the in-group and differences with the out-group (Wilder,

1981 quoted in Dovidio et al., 2000) and have shown to be more forgiving and generous in their explanations of the behaviours of in-group members (Hewstone, 1990 quoted in Dovidio et al., 2000). For all the mentioned reasons it may be important to redefine people on an alternative dimension to race (Dovidio et al., 2000). In a sense then, the processes that accompany the conditions of the contact hypothesis have been shown to have quantifiable cognitive components that may be crucial to take into account when attempting to construct a racism reduction program. Creating cognitive changes in the ways that group members perceive one another can be very fruitful yet there also needs to be the motivation to attend to the process of adopting such news ways of categorisation.

MOTIVATIONAL APPROACHES TO REDUCING RACISM

Both the behavioural and cognitive approaches have focused on the provision of external procedures and processes to assist in racism reduction but what is pivotal to that transformation is a willingness or motivation, either intrinsic or extrinsic, to change prejudicial thoughts and behaviours. Levels of motivation may be difficult to establish but it seems obvious that changing the beliefs of individuals may be in vain if there is strong opposition to the core values of egalitarianism. It may thus be important to establish and measure a baseline of the extent of belief in egalitarianism and equality before an intervention is instituted. In this way a better match may be established between the levels of racism expressed, the underlying belief systems, and the ultimate goals of a racism reduction program.

The relevance of this lies in the research which shows that people can learn to regulate their responses so as to avoid responding in a racist manner (Devine & Monteith, 1993; Monteith, 1993; Monteith, Ashburn-Nardo, Voils & Kephart, 1999 quoted in Devine et al., 2000). Findings also suggest that failure to live up to internalised personal standards, along with the accompanying guilt, encourages people to learn to live up to their expectations more effectively (Monteith, 1993 quoted

in Devine et al., 2000). Therefore it could be supposed that such reactions to failure may press people to inhibit their automatically activated, yet personally unacceptable responses and to replace them with responses that are based on their non-prejudiced beliefs (Devine et al., 2000). This personal contradiction between beliefs and actions may lead to an increased motivation to change and thus give impetus to a process that hopes to achieve a non-racist disposition.

In effect this approach can be successful if it is possible to arouse cognitive dissonance by making people aware of inconsistencies about their self-images, values and behaviours (Leippe & Eisenstadt, 1994 quoted in Dovidio et al., 2000). As was discussed earlier, many racist attitudes and prejudices are unconscious and automatic, yet that does not mean they are necessarily irreversible and inevitable (Dovidio et al., 2000). The method of reforming such attitudes then focuses on highlighting inconsistencies in thoughts and actions.

Value Self-Confrontation

To reiterate, people who consciously endorse non-prejudiced attitudes but whose behaviours reflect racial prejudice commonly experience feelings of guilt and regret when they become aware of discrepancies between their potential behaviour towards minorities (what they would do) and their personal standards (what they should do). These emotional reactions, it is thought, can enforce a change in attitudes and subsequent behaviour (Devine & Monteith, 1993 quoted in Dovidio et al., 2000). Rokeach's Value Self Confrontation procedures (Rokeach, 1973 quoted in Dovidio et al., 2000; Devine et al., 2000) force people to recognise these very contradictions between their core values and their thoughts and actions. It is theorised that revealing such contradictions may then motivate individuals to increase the importance of equality as a core value and then to behave in ways that are more consistent with that non-prejudiced self-concept (Grube, Mayton & Ball-Rokeach, 1994 quoted in Dovidio et al., 2000). In fact, these effects have been shown to be enduring and it is thus significant to know that people can avoid the influence of stereotypes in their

conscious evaluations of others when they are sufficiently motivated to do so (Bargh, 1999; Devine, 1989; Fiske, 1989 quoted in Dovidio et al., 2000).

As has been shown, it is important to understand whether individuals are motivated to respond without prejudice (Plant & Devine, 1998 quoted in Devine et al., 2000) and why they are motivated to respond without prejudice. Low prejudiced people report high levels of internal motivation to respond without prejudice, whereas high prejudiced people respond with relatively low levels of internal motivation (Devine et al., 2000). This is significant in that this process of self-regulation may produce changes, with time and effort, but has mainly been effective in groups of low prejudiced people (Dovidio et al., 2000). It seems that more highly prejudiced individuals do not respond that favourably to the value self confrontation technique and that low prejudiced people have learned to control their automatic activation of stereotypes because they are motivated to avoid doing so (Kawakami, Dion & Dovidio, 1998 quoted in Devine et al., 2000). Yet modifying prejudiced beliefs is still notoriously difficult (Monteith, Zuwerink & Devine, 1994 quoted in Devine et al., 2000) and it has been difficult to ascertain why and for whom the strategies have been effective or ineffective. The challenge, especially for high prejudiced individuals, may be to focus on individual differences as the source of motivation to respond without prejudice. Although it may be possible to create changed standards through norms and social influence, a more productive approach may be to couple the positive effects of norms with other efforts explicitly designed to encourage internal change.

Thought suppression techniques are one possible solution and involve extensively retraining individuals through practice to inhibit their automatically activated prejudiced thoughts and to replace them with more acceptable and egalitarian beliefs. This replacement process may then become formalised and automatic and relies on the motivation of the individual to adopt such strategies (Sherman & Devine, 1998 quoted in Dovidio et al., 2000). The applicability of this approach is time consuming and laborious and requires further research to assess its efficacy

(Dovidio et al., 2000). Current research does however show that training in negating stereotypes was able to reduce automatic stereotype activation which further strengthens the view that if implicit attitudes and stereotypes can be learned then they can surely be unlearned or inhibited by equally well learned counteractive influences through extensive retraining.

Breaking the Prejudice Habit and Creating Internal Motivation

For low prejudiced people the challenge is to learn skills necessary to respond consistently with their non-prejudiced beliefs. Thus far the most effective method of gaining these skills is frequent practice and exposure to out groups (Monteith, Sherman & Devine, 1998 quoted in Devine et al., 2000). The aim is to activate core beliefs of non-prejudice, rather than stereotypes, to serve as the basis for responding to others. Combating prejudice is thus about identifying the cues that signalled previous failures (Monteith, 1993; Monteith, Ashburn-Nardo, Voils & Kephart, 1999 quoted in Devine et al., 2000) and avoiding these contraventions of personal standards (Devine et al., 2000).

In many ways the reduction of prejudice through this approach can be seen as 'breaking a habit' (Devine & Monteith, 1993 quoted in Dovidio et al. 2000). The process begins with the rejection of prejudice and stereotype–based responses which then need to be internalised in order to motivate continued efforts to change. Finally people must learn to inhibit automatic, prejudiced responses and replace them with non-prejudiced, controlled responses (Devine et al., 2000). It may be possible to avoid using stereotypes when people are motivated to be non-prejudiced (Devine, Monteith, Zuwerink & Elliot, 1991; Montieth, 1993; 1996; Monteith, Devine & Zuwerink, 1993; Monteith, Sherman & Devine, 1998 quoted in Kawakami et al, 2000), experience heightened awareness of egalitarian norms and standards (Macrae, Bodenhausen & Milne, 1997 quoted in Kawakami et al, 2000), or have goals that require the gaining of unique information about an out-

group member (Erber & Fiske, 1984; Fiske & Nueberg, 1990; Neuberg & Fiske, 1987 quoted in Kawakami et al, 2000).

REDUCING PREJUDICE IN THE CONTEMPORARY SOCIAL CLIMATE

Although in the past, prejudice was sanctioned as a norm in South Africa, that is no longer the case, and the standards and laws rejecting racism are clear. The hope has been that imposing normative standards against discrimination, would curtail overt expressions of racism and that over time there would be attitudinal change. In some cases this may have occurred but there also seems to be a group of individuals who not only have maintained their negative racial attitudes but also seem to resent the pressure to curtail their prejudices (Devine et al., 2000). Therefore some detrimental consequences have arisen when prejudiced individuals conceal their racism due to normative pressures from society. Normative pressure would be successful if it established and enforced non-prejudiced norms in the individual, yet this doesn't always seem to be the case. Plant and Devine (1999 quoted in Devine et al., 2000) examined affective, behavioural and attitudinal consequences of being exposed to normatively imposed pressure to respond without prejudice. The evidence shows that compliance with non-prejudiced norms imposed on one by another can lead, in some cases, to a backlash and in fact fuel prejudice. Plant and Devine (1999 quoted in Devine et al., 2000) also showed that when there was a direct attempt to enforce norm compliance, those with a low internal motivation to comply reacted with anger, less favourable attitudes to the policy and a behavioural backlash. Overall their reactions suggested resistance to blatant efforts to change their attitudes (Devine, 1989; Katz & Hass, 1988; Plant & Devine, 1998 quoted in Devine et al., 2000). It seems that in this case the persuasive communication served as an attack and the effects of the communication were counter-intentional (Devine et al., 2000). This information supports the notion that many factors including the readiness of an individual to accept change, need to be assessed before utilising a racism reduction program. More effort may be required to diminish the levels of

threat and fear that groups may feel when they are exposed to racism reduction interventions. Room for misperception is large and the aims of the program need to be openly presented. Also, it will be important to note that not all people will be receptive to such programs and that in some cases it may be better to back off than push the point.

Essentially the approaches that have been presented all contain vital elements to be considered when constructing a racism reduction program. The Contact Hypothesis provides clear parameters whereby the context can be contained and managed. Then there are varying interventions aimed at consolidating or modifying the beliefs of the individual to fall in line with the universally sanctioned ideals of egalitarianism. Numerous methods can be used to break down barriers between groups and to provide recategorised identities that are shared amongst the diverse participants. In many cases there is little motivation to adopt new beliefs, yet it should also be said that there are many occasions where there is internal conflict between the ideals and the behaviours of an individual which seem contradictory. Such conflict can be addressed and diminished to provide cues and guidelines that will assist individuals in controlling more automatic and racist expressions. There can be many ways in which all these approaches are included in a program or workshop aimed at reducing racism but it may be useful to provide a short summary of a program that was introduced in 1991 as a foundation from which to discuss some of the more practical implications of the theory that has been reviewed.

AN EXAMPLE OF A STEREOTYPE REDUCTION WORKSHOP

The primary aim of this workshop, developed by Louw-Potgieter, Kamfer and Boy in 1991, was to establish norms regarding acceptable and non-acceptable inter-group behaviour and attitudes; while the secondary aim was to learn to understand, recognise and intervene effectively in stereotyping. Also important was an examination of personal identity, the effects of group belongingness and fostering unity across group boundaries. These aims are common to many

racism reduction programs but generally there are variations in their content and structure. The presentation of this particular workshop serves merely to help illustrate some of the ways in which the theory presented in this review can be translated into a practical intervention. The workshop consisted of the following components:

Learning what stereotyping/racism is.

This educational element is very important and is coupled with the process of assisting individuals to become aware of their own prejudices and the manner in which they present these. Illustrating the differences between subtle and blatant forms of racism will help participants to better understand the varieties of ways in which racism can be expressed and understood and may help to create better awareness of the ways in which racism and stereotyping develop.

Discovering common multi-group memberships and blurring boundaries.

These processes of recategorisation and decategorisation (Brewer & Miller, 1984; Giles & Johnson, 1981; Sherif & Sherif, 1969; Turner, 1981; Worchel, 1979, 1986 quoted in Louw-Potgieter et al., 1991) serve to eliminate the salience of the inter-group divisions and provide a greater sense of group cohesion that makes establishing cooperative relationships, equal status and intimate contact between the groups more achievable. This aspect of the workshop can be vital in creating a contact context that is most likely to facilitate effective racism reduction based on the principles of the Contact Hypothesis.

Expressing the content of out-group stereotypes and exploring the reactions of relevant out-group members to such stereotyping.

The important contact criteria mentioned earlier provide the space for the expression of commonly held stereotypes within a generally non-confrontational environment. The analysis of these stereotypes can serve to bolster the opportunities to define, express and reinforce egalitarian

and non-stereotypic norms and beliefs. The reiteration of the favoured norms should be consistent and constant throughout the workshop.

Sharing instances of hurtful discrimination, building unity with out-group members and valuing intra- and inter-group diversity.

An emotional component is added to this program which assists in the process of continually reinforcing egalitarian norms and providing motivation to attempt responding in ways that are less stereotypic and racist. If participants can begin to empathise with the feelings of the victims of prejudice then it is hoped they will adopt a greater awareness of the role that they can play and how they as individuals could censor the racist expression of themselves or others.

Discovering the complexity of social identity by exploring the negative aspects of identity which keep individuals apart from their own people.

This element of the workshop focuses on processes more specific to the self and personal insights. Participants have an opportunity to reflect on the ways in which their social identity impacts upon their personal identity and vice versa. Again an opportunity is provided to highlight possible contradictions between the behaviours and actions of participants and the internalised values and ideals that they possess. Any discrepancies are hoped to provide cognitive dissonance and thus motivate a change in behaviour.

Empowering individuals to intervene effectively in stereotypical actions.

At this point there is an examination of the extent of automaticity of the beliefs that are expressed. Continued elucidation of the processes of categorisation and stereotyping helps to inform participants of the distortions inherent in these forms of thinking and is hoped to create dissonance that will in turn spawn internal motivation to change.

Thoughts about re-entry and strategies for dealing with the difficult inter-group situations back in the workplace.

Essentially this final component allows for individuals to speculate where and under what conditions they may find themselves predisposed to act or think prejudicially. They are then challenged to think about how they could apply what they have learnt and what may inhibit them to change their pattern of prejudicially motivated actions and behaviours.

Most of this workshop is based on experiential learning and exercises aimed at personal insight. Importantly it combines rational and emotional components and focus remains on the self, own experiences and self-criticism.

CONCLUSION

In a country scarred by the detrimental effects of racism and historically mobilised to depose a racist government, it seems ironic that there is such an apparent scarcity of well-conceived and effective racism reduction programs. It appears South Africans have thus far not arrived at a common understanding and appreciation of the pervasiveness of racism in South Africa (Ginwala, 2000). Much evidence points to the ever-present scourge of racism and there is little doubt that unless it is effectively tackled, the aspirations, values and vision of the new South Africa will become a matter of history rather than its dominant features. The much-acclaimed miracle of transformation may prove to have been nothing but a fleeting illusion (Ginwala, 2000).

In this review I have attempted to outline the significant reforms that have occurred in the South African political arena. It has been shown how legislative reforms have assisted in guiding revisions of policy by government and civil society. A review of current interventions and programs available in South Africa revealed a profound difficulty in locating such programs and a general scarcity of relevant information. Due to the apparent lack of accessible material that could be used to design a racism reduction program, it was felt that providing such information in a review article may provide interested parties with a starting point from which to launch their

initiatives and ultimately design a program that is relevant to their specific contexts. Thus the theoretical information provided focused on distinguishing the ways in which racism can be identified and expressed in either blatant or subtle forms. This distinction highlighted the fact that although it may seem that racism has declined it may in fact have more accurately, changed its form. These manifestations of racism need to be understood. A conceptualisation of how racism and prejudice develops was presented focusing on the aetiology of racism as a function of cognitive processes and the salience of social identity development. Having outlined the context of racial prejudice and its pervasive influence on society, a summary of approaches that are complementary to each other in the overall design of a racism reduction program were presented. In general it was shown that motivational approaches serve to predispose and align individuals and groups towards endorsing attempts to minimise and eliminate racist or prejudicial thinking. This is assumed to be possible by highlighting inconsistencies between internalised, egalitarian values and racist actions and behaviours. The Contact Hypothesis provides criteria which are best suited to facilitate contact between groups. It also activates individuals in line with principles of learning and thought processing that have been identified as important to the Cognitive approaches. The importance of providing guidelines for the design of a theoretically sound program lies in the potential dangers inherent in programs that are not evaluated to assess the true effects of the intervention.

South Africa has an opportunity to develop and become world leaders in the field of racism and prejudice reduction. The surprising lack of information in this field raises many questions. There is not enough scope to address them in this review, but some of them may be considered for further research, for example:

1. What are the perceptions and opinions of the prevalence and aetiology of racism in South Africa?

2. Is there a belief that the racism is specific to certain population groups?

3. Whose responsibility is it to address racism?

4. Is there a belief that racism is reversible or manageable?

5. What is the extent of the political will to reduce racism?

6. To what extent does research inform currently presented racism reduction programs?

7. Should interventions be punitive or preventative?

In addition, programs need to establish baseline measures of racism before they are presented, in order to more accurately assess the success of the objectives. Of course there are difficulties inherent in evaluating such programs which rest on the very nature of the change (i.e. having a delayed and latent effect, being inconspicuous, cognitive process resulting in private conversion and insight). There are a myriad of manifestations of racism, either blatant or subtle, commission or omission of acts and linguistically or non-verbally, all of which makes it quite difficult to provide a single, operational definition of a dependent variable (Louw-Potgieter et al., 1991). It may also be useful to carry out an audit of an institution/organisation/group to identify the core issues which may be salient and thus interfere with the attainment of the program's objectives. Such issues could revolve around problems associated with status, gender and rivalries for leadership, promotion etc.

This review is not a comprehensive portrayal of the current context within which South Africans live, rather it is an attempt to set a baseline of information that, it is hoped, will provide interested parties with the confidence to pursue a course of action that will introduce more prominent and successful programs and workshops to address the problem of racism.

REFERENCES

Aboud, F. E., & Levy, S. R. (2000). Interventions to reduce prejudice and discrimination in children and adolescents. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination* (pp. 269 - 293). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Alexander, N. (2000). In their own voices: Lessons. In Bell, P. D., Brasiliero, A. M., Huntley, L., James, W., Johnson, S., Pinheiro, P. S., Roland, E., Shubane, K., Singh, R., Steinem, G., Thomas, F. A., Uhlman, T. (Eds.), *Beyond racism: Embracing an interdependent future. Brazil, South Africa, the United States: In their own voices* (p. 63). Atlanta: Southern Education Foundation.

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

Billig, M. (1985). Prejudice, categorisation and particularisation: from a perceptual to a rhetorical approach. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 15*, 79-103.

Bradnum, M., Niewoudt, J., & Tredoux, C. (1993). Contact and the alteration of racial attitudes in South Africa. *South African Journal of Psychology, 23*, 204-211.

Brewer, M. B., & Miller, N. (1984). Beyond the contact hypothesis: Theoretical perspectives on desegregation. In N. Miller & M. B. Brewer (Eds.), *Groups in contact* (pp. 281-302). New York: Academic Press.

Brewer, M. B. (2000). Reducing prejudice through cross-categorisation: Effects of multiple social identities. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination* (pp. 319 - 334). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Byrnes, D. A., & Kiger, G. (1990). The effect of a prejudice – reduction simulation on attitude change. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 20,* 341 – 356.

Devine, P. G., Plant, E. A., & Buswell, B. N. (2000). Breaking the prejudice habit: progress and obstacles. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination* (pp. 81-98). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

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

Dovidio, J. F., Kawakami, K., & Gaertner, L. S. (2000). In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination* (pp. 137 - 163). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Duckitt, J. (1991). Prejudice and racism. In D. Foster & J. Louw-Potgieter (Eds.), *Social psychology in South Africa* (pp. 171-207). Johannesburg: Lexicon Publishers.

Duckitt, J. (1992). Patterns of prejudice: Group interests and intergroup attitudes. *South African Journal of Psychology, 22,* 147-156.

Duckitt, J. (1993). Conformity to social pressure and racial prejudice among white South Africans. *Genetic, Social and General Psychology Monographs, 120,* 123-143.

Durrheim, K., & Mokeki, S. (1997). Race and relevance: a content analysis of the South African Journal of Psychology. *South African Journal of Psychology, 27*, 206 – 213.

Eyber, C., Dyer, D., & Versfeld, R. (1997). *Resisting racism: A teacher's guide to equality in education.* Cape Town: TLRC/IDASA.

Fiske, S. T. (2000). Interdependence and the reduction of prejudice. In S. Oskamp (Ed.) *Reducing prejudice and discrimination* (pp. 115 - 135). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Foster, D., & Finchilescu, G. (1986). Contact and conflict in a "non-contact" society: The case of South Africa. In M. Hewstone & R. Brown (Eds.), *Contact and conflict in intergroup encounters* (pp. 52-71). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Gerwel, J. (2000). A Nation in Dialogue. In P. Jordan (Eds.), *Non-racialism in action: Acknowledging the past, changing the present, building the future* (pp. 27-31). South Africa: ANC.

Ginwala, F. (2000). In their own voices: Lessons. In Bell, P. D., Brasiliero, A. M., Huntley, L., James, W., Johnson, S., Pinheiro, P. S., Roland, E., Shubane, K., Singh, R., Steinem, G., Thomas, F. A., Uhlman, T. (Eds.), *Beyond racism: Embracing an interdependent future. Brazil, South Africa, the United States: In their own voices* (pp. 68 - 73). Atlanta: Southern Education Foundation.

Hewstone, M., & Brown, R. (1986). Contact is not enough: An intergroup perspective on the contact hypothesis. In M. Hewstone & R. Brown (Eds.), *Contact and conflict in intergroup encounters* (pp. 86-101). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Hightower, E. (1997). Psychosocial characteristics of subtle and blatant racists as compared to tolerant individuals. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 53*, 369-374.

Hill, M. E., & Augoustinos, M. (2001). Stereotype change and prejudice reduction: short-and long-term evaluation of a cross-cultural awareness program. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 11*, 243-262.

James, W., & Lever, J. (2000). The second republic: race, inequality and democracy in South Africa. In Bell, P. D., Brasiliero, A. M., Huntley, L., James, W., Johnson, S., Pinheiro, P. S., Roland, E., Shubane, K., Singh, R., Steinem, G., Thomas, F. A., Uhlman, T. (Eds.), *Beyond racism: Embracing an interdependent future. Brazil, South Africa, the United States: three nations at the crossroads* (pp.43-59). Atlanta: Southern Education Foundation.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2000). The three c's of reducing prejudice and discrimination. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination* (pp. 239 - 268). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Jones, J. M. (1997). *Prejudice and racism* (2nd ed.). Washington: McGraw-Hill.

Kawakami, K., Dovidio, J.F., Moll, J., Hermsen, S., & Russin, A. (2000). Just say no (to stereotyping): Effects of training in the negation of stereotypic associations on stereotype activation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78*, 871 -888.

Klegg, M. (1993). *Hate prejudice and racism*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Lea, S. J. (1996). That ism on the end that makes it nasty: Talking about race with young white South Africans. *South African Journal of Psychology, 26*, 183-190.

Lee, Y.T. (1996). Difference, not prejudice, engenders intergroup tension. *American Psychologist, 51*, 267-268.

Lepore, L., & Brown, R. (1997). Category and stereotype activation: is prejudice inevitable? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*, 275-287.

Levy, S. R. (1999). Reducing prejudice: Lessons from social-cognitive factors underlying perceiver differences in prejudice. *Journal of Social Issues, 55*, 745-765.

Louw-Potgieter, J., Kamfer, L., & Boy, R. G. (1991). Stereotype reduction workshop. *South African Journal of Psychology, 21*, 219-214.

Murray, B. (2002). Psychology tackles apartheid's aftermath. Retrieved February 15, 2003 from the World Wide Web: http://www.apa.org

Nascimento, A. D., & Nascimento, E. L. (2000). In Bell, P. D., Brasiliero, A. M., Huntley, L., James, W., Johnson, S., Pinheiro, P. S., Roland, E., Shubane, K., Singh, R., Steinem, G., Thomas, F. A., Uhlman, T. (Eds.), *Beyond racism: Embracing an interdependent future. Brazil, South Africa, the United States*: Overview Report (p.16). Atlanta: Southern Education Foundation.

Non-racialism in action: Acknowledging the past, changing the present, building the future. (2000). South Africa: African National Congress.

Oskamp, S. (2000). Multiple paths to reducing prejudice and discrimination. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination* (pp. 1 - 19). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Pettigrew, T. F., & Meertens, R.W. (1995). Subtle and blatant prejudice in Western Europe. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 25*, 57-75.

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2000). Does intergroup contact reduce prejudice? Recent meta-analytic findings. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination* (pp.93 - 114). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ponterrotto, J. G., & Pedersen, P. B. (1993). *Preventing prejudice: A guide for counselors and educators*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications

Ranuga, T. K. (2000). *South Africa under majority rule: A study in power sharing, racial equality and democracy*. United Kingdom: The Edwin Mellen Press.

Sekete, P., Shilubane, M., & Moila, B. (2001). *Deracialisation and migration of learners in South African schools: Challenges and implications.* South Africa: South African Human Rights Commission.

Slabbert, A. (2001). Cross cultural racism in South Africa - dead or alive? *Social Behaviour and Personality, 29*, 125-132.

Sono, T. (1999). *Race relations in post – apartheid South Africa.* Johannesburg: South African Institute of Race Relations.

South African Human Rights Commission. (2001). *National action plan and strategy to combat racism: South African decade for the mobilisation against racism (2001-2010).* Sandton: South African Human Rights Commission.

South African National Conference on Racism. (2000). South *African millennium statement on racism.* Sandton: South African National Conference on Racism.

Taylor, M. (2000). Public sector interventions in combating racism in South Africa. In Bell, P. D., Brasiliero, A. M., Huntley, L., James, W., Johnson, S., Pinheiro, P. S., Roland, E., Shubane, K., Singh, R., Steinem, G., Thomas, F. A., Uhlman, T. (Eds.), *Beyond racism: Embracing an interdependent future. Brazil, South Africa, the United States*: Color Collage (pp.82-95). Atlanta: Southern Education Foundation.

Vally, S., & Dalamba, Y. (1999). *Racism, 'racial integration' and desegregation in South African public secondary schools.* Randburg: South African Human Rights Commission.

Wetherell, M. (1996). Group conflict and the social psychology of racism. In M. Wetherell (Ed*.),Identities, groups and social issues* (pp. 175-238). Milton Keynes: Open University.