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Abstract

Issues of group identity and prejudice have played a large role in the history of South Africa. This study examined differences among Xhosa-speaking Black, so-called Coloured, English-speaking White, and Afrikaans-speaking White adolescents within a context of social change. Data was collected from 818 high school students using a questionnaire that assessed aspects of these groups' perceptions of themselves (their identities), attitudes toward other racial groups (their prejudices), and beliefs about changes in the socio-political environment. Several statistically significant differences between the groups were found. Comparative analyses on identity and attitude variables performed with 263 White American adolescents were also statistically significant for all groups.
Identities and Racial Attitudes of South African and American Adolescents: 

A Cross-Cultural Examination

Social, racial, and economic equality comprise three of the most pervasive and problematic issues worldwide. These thorny topics are particularly relevant in contemporary South African society, where transformations in these areas have been occurring over the past decade. Changes in the country's macro-level political and social structures undoubtedly have been associated with changes in the more micro-level structures comprising the psychology of its citizens. That is, the "new" South Africa is both political and psychological (Adam, 1995).

A clear finding of past psychological research is the strong effect that the Apartheid system had on group identities (e.g., Bloom, 1994; Dawes & Finchilescu, 1996; Heaven, Le Roux, Stones & Simbayi, 1998; Heaven, Stones, Nel, Huysamen & Louw, 1994). It fostered and enforced the perception that South Africans are mainly, or exclusively White, Black, so-called "Coloured", Indian, etc. With the political changes of the past decade, however, group identities may also be changing, with race and ethnicity potentially losing their importance of the Apartheid past (Adam, 1995) or potentially increasing in salience (Sennett & Foster, 1996). One recent study (Braungart & Braungart, 1995) found that both Black and White university students equally rejected Apartheid, held optimistic attitudes toward the future, and shared deep emotional commitments toward the country. An amalgamation of a new national identity may be forming.

Social change since 1994 provides a unique set of circumstances to assess post-Apartheid aspects of group identity. Social identity theory (i.e., Tajfel & Turner,
Cross-cultural data suggests that as group identity changes so do attitudes about other groups (prejudices, stereotypes, etc.). In addition, this theory emphasizes that social change will have an impact on the process of identity formation (de la Rey, 1991). From this perspective, investigation of social identities in the new South Africa would offer unique insight into one aspect of inter-group relations in the country and into the resistance to, or acceptance of, the rapidly changing social environment.

Also of interest are cross-cultural data as to how the country’s several racial/cultural groups perceive themselves, each other, their rapidly changing social environment, and the need for retribution for the wrongs of the past (e.g., Apelgren & Bornman, 1996; Duckitt & Mphuthing, 1998; Heaven, Stones & Bester, 1997; Heaven et al., 1994; Mboya, 1994; Stones, Heaven & Bester, 1993). Comparisons of the several South African groups on these variables with a foreign group would also provide valuable cross-cultural data that could further shed light on the South African context.

Furthermore, because identity formation has theoretically and empirically been associated with adolescence (e.g., Erikson, 1968), investigation of the identity attitudes of this age group within the context of the new South Africa would appear to be particularly warranted (Stones, 1992). No studies were located in the literature that have addressed these several issues within the context of social change. The present research was therefore designed to bridge that gap.

Specifically, the present study assessed aspects of adolescents’ personal and cultural identity, racial attitudes, and attitudes toward the changes that have occurred in South Africa. For comparison purposes, data on many of these variables were also collected from American high school students.
Method

Sample

A total of 818 adolescent South Africans attending high school in the Eastern Cape Province participated in the present study. Of these, 180 were Black (78% Xhosa), 117 were Afrikaans-speaking Whites, 89 were Afrikaans-speaking individuals of mixed racial decent (so-called Coloured), and 432 were English-speaking Whites. Thirty-three percent of these participants were raised predominantly outside of the Eastern Cape. In addition, 263 White Americans from two eastern and three mid-western states participated. For the total sample, ages ranged from 13 to 19, with the average being 15.6 for the entire sample ($SD = 1.6$). No age differences existed among the several groups. Students were nearly evenly distributed ($p = .63$) across standard levels 6 to 10 (USA grades 8 to 12). The majority of subjects (51%) reported coming from middle-class homes, but statistically significant differences were found between groups ($F = 7.8; p < .001$). Post hoc tests revealed that White English-speaking South Africans reported higher socio-economic levels than all other groups, and both Afrikaans-speaking Whites and White Americans reported higher socio-economic levels than Black South Africans.

Design and Instrumentation

This study employed a cross-sectional design in which analyses of the data were made both within and across the five groups of participants. South Africans completed a questionnaire (with English and Afrikaans cross-translations) assessing aspects of their personal identity, cultural identity, racial membership identification, quality of racial attitudes, subtle racist sentiment, anti-White sentiment (including the need for Whites to
make retribution for the wrongs of the past), and attitudes toward social/political change in South Africa. Americans completed a questionnaire containing all but the last three measures, since their item content was not appropriate for the American context. The specific measures used are described below.

The Anti-White Scale (AWS; Duckitt & Farre, 1994) evaluates attitudes toward White participation in the social, economic, and political contexts of South Africa. For Whites, the AWS assesses a willingness to relinquish power and make retribution for the wrongs of the past, whereas for other groups, it assesses retribution issues and resentment/forgiveness of Whites. The Subtle Racism Scale (SRS; Duckitt, 1991; 1993) assesses acceptance of inter-racial contact and the aspiration for equal status among all races. Both the SRS and the AWS were developed in South Africa specifically for use with South African populations. These scales have demonstrated acceptable reliability coefficients (ranging from .91 to .76) in previously published studies, and they have been evaluated as having sufficiently acceptable content and construct validity (Duckitt, 1991; 1993; Duckitt & Farre, 1994).

To measure quality of racial attitudes, three subscales from the Oklahoma Racial Attitude Scale (ORAS; Choney & Behrens, in press) which focused on aspects of avoidance, dependence, and stability of racial attitudes were used. The ORAS has also demonstrated acceptable reliability (with alpha coefficients ranging from .85 to .77) and validity in previous investigations (Choney & Behrens, in press).

Attitudes toward one's own personal identity (PI), one's own cultural identity (CI), one's perceptions of social/political change in South Africa (ACSA), and one's level of racial membership identification (RMI) were assessed by sets of questions specifically
designed for this purpose by the author. Standard questionnaire development procedures were followed (Nachmias & Nachmias, 1987), and the developed questions were subjected to factor analysis as a verification of their construct validity. All four scales demonstrated acceptable factor structures, with all items having loadings above .35 and 19 of 24 items loading above .50. The reliability coefficients (Chronbach’s alpha) computed for these scales were at .81 for the ACSA, .76 for the CI, and .70 for both the PI and RMI.

**Results**

**South African Group Differences on Racism and Attitudes Toward Social Change**

To examine differences on the three measures pertinent to the South African context (AWS, SRS, ACSA), a MANOVA with the four South African groups was conducted. The analysis was statistically significant at the \( p < .00001 \) level. Post hoc univariate analyses were also statistically significant for each dependent variable (\( p < .001 \)). Mean response scores ranked by group for each variable are reported in Table 1.

---

**Insert Table 1 about here**

To interpret the results of the post hoc ANOVAs, effect sizes were calculated as an estimate of the magnitude of group differences (Glass & Hopkins, 1984). Often more useful than traditional inferential hypothesis testing methods (such as ANOVAs), the
effect size is a descriptive (not inferential) statistic used to assess the practical significance of group differences (Borg & Gall, 1989; Shaver, 1993). The effect size statistics (ES) reported below were computed by dividing the difference between two groups’ mean scores by their pooled standard deviation. Practical significance can be evaluated using Cohen's (1988) standards for effect sizes, in which absolute values around or below .20 are considered small, those around .50 are considered moderate, and those around or above .80 are considered large.

Group differences of moderate to very large magnitude were found on the measure of attitudes toward change in South Africa (ACSA). Of the four groups, Black subjects were the most positive about the changes ($p < .02$; $ES$s ranged from .44 to 1.22). So-called Coloured and White English-speaking subjects did not significantly differ in their predominantly neutral evaluations of the changes ($p = .45$; $ES = .19$), but these two groups were more positive in their attitudes than were White Afrikaans-speakers ($p < .001$; $ES$s were .57 for White English-speaking respondents and .81 for so-called Coloured respondents).

On the measure of interracial tolerance (SRS), Black subjects were the most tolerant of all groups, although they did not differ significantly from the so-called Coloured subjects ($p = .10$; $ES = .35$). All other group comparisons were significant ($p < .01$), with White Afrikaans-speakers being less tolerant than all other groups ($ES$s were .32 compared with White English-speakers, 1.07 compared with so-called Coloured respondents, 1.35 compared with Black respondents).

On the measure of anti-White sentiment (AWS), Black and so-called Coloured
subjects expressed similar and predominantly neutral attitudes that were significantly less positive than White English and Afrikaans speakers ($p < .001$; $ESs$ ranged from .72 for White Afrikaans speakers compared to so-called Coloured subjects to 1.50 for Black subjects compared to White English-speaking subjects). Surprisingly, White English speakers scored significantly ($p < .001$; $ES = .66$) less anti-White (more pro-White) on the AWS than the White Afrikaans speakers. Item analyses indicated that English speakers consistently (9 of the 10 items) disagreed more strongly ($p < .01$) with AWS items such as “After what they have done to other groups, whites should have to make some kind of repayment”, whereas Afrikaans speakers were more likely to disagree with items such as “Whites can and should play an important role in the new South Africa”.

**Cross-Cultural Differences in Identity**

The three measures of aspects of identity (PI, CI, and RMI) were entered into a second MANOVA with the addition of the American subjects. The analysis was statistically significant at the $p < .0001$ level. Post hoc univariate analyses were also statistically significant for each dependent variable ($p < .01$). Mean response scores ranked by group for each variable are reported in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White English</td>
<td>White Afrikaans</td>
<td>Coloured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMI</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the measure of cultural identity (CI), White English speakers scored lower than the other South African groups ($p < .001$; $ESs$ ranged from .38 to .71), who did not differ from one another on this measure. White Americans scored lowest of all on
cultural identity ($p < .01$; ESs ranged from .27 compared to White English speakers to 1.04 compared to White Afrikaans speakers).

Scores on the measure of personal identity (PI) were similarly neutral for all South African groups. However, White American subjects held slightly stronger personal identities than all South African groups ($p < .05$; ESs ranged from .27 to .45), except for White Afrikaans speakers ($p = .51$).

Finally, scores on the measure of racial membership identification (RMI) revealed that White English-speaking subjects perceive themselves as being more similar to members of their race, when compared to the perceptions of the other South African groups in this study ($p < .01$; ESs ranged from .40 to .48). No other group differences were found on this variable.

**Cross-Cultural Differences in Quality of Racial Attitudes**

The three remaining dependent variables examined in this study (ORAS Avoidance, ORAS Dependence, ORAS Instability) that assessed qualities of racial attitudes were entered into a third MANOVA, which was also statistically significant ($p < .001$). Post hoc univariate analyses were also all statistically significant ($p < .01$). Mean response scores ranked by group for each variable are reported in Table 3.

__________________________________________

Insert Table 3 about here

__________________________________________

South African subjects did not significantly differ among themselves on the measure of avoidance of racial issues (ORAS Avoidance). However, White Americans were significantly less avoidant of racial issues than were White Afrikaans-speaking
subjects and so-called Coloured subjects \((p < .05; \text{ESs} = .40 \text{ and } .38, \text{respectively})\).

On the ORAS Dependence, White English-speaking South African respondents and White American respondents held similar predominantly independent racial attitudes that were significantly more independent than the other three groups \((p < .05; \text{ESs} \text{ ranged from } .54 \text{ to } .81)\). Black subjects were also significantly more independent in their attitudes than so-called Coloured subjects \((p < .001; \text{ES} = .53)\).

Scores on the ORAS Instability revealed that so-called Coloured subjects were the least stable in their racial attitudes of all groups \((p < .01; \text{ESs} \text{ ranged from } .44 \text{ to } 1.00)\). White Americans scored as having the most stable racial attitudes of all groups \((p < .001; \text{ESs} \text{ ranged from } .49 \text{ to } 1.00)\). No significant differences on this scale were found between White English-speaking, Black, and White Afrikaans-speaking subjects.

**Relationships Between Variables**

So that the relationships between the several dependent measures could be examined, bivariate Pearson product moment correlations were computed for the total sample and for each group separately. For ease of interpretation, only statistically significant \((p < .001)\) correlations are reported here.

The only variables that were consistently related to one another across all groups were the three subscales of the ORAS. For the total sample, ORAS Avoidance was significantly related to both ORAS Dependence \((r = .33)\) and ORAS Instability \((r = .28)\), which were also significantly related to one another \((r = .40)\). This finding indicates that racial attitude avoidance, dependence, and instability are positively interrelated; and it also provides evidence for the convergent validity of the ORAS subscales.
For the analyses conducted with each group considered separately and in pairs, the highest correlation ($r = .48$) occurred between the SRS and the ACSA among South African Whites (both English- and Afrikaans-speaking), signifying that subtle racism attitudes among these groups are strongly related to negative attitudes toward change in South Africa (and vice versa). The same association was of much lesser magnitude ($r = .28$) for Black and so-called Coloured subjects.

The latter two groups had a unique pattern of correlations different from the White subjects. Three correlations that were statistically significant for these two groups were: ACSA and ORAS Avoidance ($r = -.32$), RMI and CI ($r = .26$), and PI and ORAS Instability ($r = -.25$). Thus, for Black and so-called Coloured participants only, greater acceptance of social change in South Africa was associated with less avoidance of racial issues, greater identification with one’s race was associated with stronger cultural identity, and greater personal identity was associated with more stable racial attitudes.

For so-called Coloured respondents only, significant relationships were also found between the PI and ACSA ($r = .30$), ORAS Dependence and ACSA ($r = -.31$), and ORAS Instability and CI ($r = .30$). Therefore, for these subjects, stronger personal identities were related to more acceptance of social change, greater dependence on others for racial attitudes was related to less acceptance of social change, and greater cultural identity was related to greater racial attitude instability.

**Discussion**

**Cross-Cultural Differences**

Overall, the subjects in this study demonstrated generally positive attitudes...
toward aspects of their own culture and slightly favorable attitudes toward interracial
tolerance. They also demonstrated a moderate to positive sense of similarity to other
members of their own race. However, important group differences were noted on all of
the variables assessed in this study.

As a group, Black participants tended to endorse statements reflective of racial
tolerance, this finding concurring with past research (e.g., Durrheim & Foster, 1997).
They were neutral in their anti-White sentiment, but they were notably supportive of the
changes that have occurred in the country thus far. Their racial attitudes were mixed
with regard to their avoidance, stability, and dependence. Rankings of the data for
each variable assessed in this study indicated that the Black participants: 1) were the
highest scorers on the measures pertinent to South Africa (SRS, AWS, and ACSA),
with so-called Coloured participants scoring most similarly to them on all of these
measures; 2) scored similarly to so-called Coloured and White Afrikaans-speaking
subjects on the measures of identity (PI, CI, and RMI); and 3) scored similarly to the
White English and White Afrikaans speakers on the three ORAS subscales.

The results of this study with so-called Coloured respondents are also similar to
past findings (e.g., Kinloch, 1985). Compared to the other groups, they were average in
their cultural identity and low in personal identity and racial membership identification.
They were most likely to depend on others for their racial opinions, which were the most
unstable (changing?, tentative?) of any group. Interestingly, the more they identified
with their culture, the less stable were their racial attitudes. Oppositely, the stronger
their personal identity, the more stable were their racial attitudes. Thus, cultural versus
personal identity appeared to play an interesting mediating role among these subjects.
Not surprisingly, so-called Coloured participants were not as satisfied with the changes in the country as were the Black subjects, but interestingly, the more they relied on others for their racial attitudes and the less they valued their personal identity, the less they were satisfied with the country’s changes.

Patterns of scores across all measures indicated that the White American subjects were by far most similar to the White English-speaking South Africans. The differences between them were that the Americans tended to have greater stability in their racial attitudes, a less developed sense of cultural identity, and stronger personal identities. The first difference speaks to the social context of relatively rapid social change in South Africa compared to America. The second and third differences may be due to the ethnic heterogeneity of many White Americans, whose ancestors immigrated from all parts of Europe and subsequently intermarried. Thus, cultural/ethnic identity has been diluted whereas individual identity has been made more salient. In any event, these findings confirm prior conclusions that Americans tend to be high in individualism and low on collectivism (e.g., Triandis, 1988).

Prior research which has shown differences between Afrikaans- and English-speaking White South Africans was strongly supported by the present data. Of the nine variables assessed, the only two on which group differences did not reach a statistically significant level were the stability of racial attitudes (ORAS Instability subscale) and the strength of personal identity (PI scale). As predicted by social identity theory, the group with the higher degree of ethnocentrism (the Afrikaans-speakers) demonstrated more negative attitudes toward social change in South Africa, more positive attitudes toward aspects of in-group culture, and more negative attitudes toward non-White out-groups.
However, on two aspects of the data, the group differences achieved in the sample were opposite those expected. These findings were quite notable, in that Afrikaans-speakers reported having fewer negative attitudes toward political reconciliation and anti-White beliefs (AWS scale) and a less positive sense of similarity with other Whites (RMI scale).

The first contradictory result may be explained by the possible effects of the historical legacy of Apartheid. The items on the AWS primarily assessed a willingness to forgo White power exclusivity and to make retribution for the wrongs of the past. Thus, it might be that because Afrikaners have been more often associated (explicitly and implicitly) with the political policies of Apartheid, they might now have more to gain by distancing themselves from it than the English-speaking subjects, who might feel less guilty or responsible for Apartheid. This finding might also be explained by the postulate of social identity theory that perceptions of group illegitimacy will lead to changes in social identity (de la Rey, 1991). A similar possibility may be that the stronger cultural identity of Afrikaans speakers is associated with a greater sense of social (rather than individualistic) responsibility. However, because issues of group legitimacy, guilt, and responsibility were not assessed, these interpretations remain speculative. In any case, this finding on the AWS should be considered together with the other results and the nature of the sample. That is, although adolescent White Afrikaans speakers demonstrated more willingness than their White English-speaking peers to make amends for the wrongs of the past (primarily on a political/economic level; AWS), they were more insistent that separateness between races continue (on a social level; SRS). Because adolescents do not yet have influence over
political/economic issues, attitudes toward social interaction may be the more relevant variable for this population. Nevertheless, the apparent contradiction of seemingly acknowledging the justice of majority rule while remaining separate and somewhat resentful (ACSA) should be explored in greater detail in future studies.

The second contradictory result of this study was that groups that scored high on cultural identity (CI) scored lower on racial membership identification (RMI). This finding might be explained if subjects had interpreted the questions as referring to the world population (i.e., Black peoples from all tribes/nations), rather than to the local racial context. Alternatively, the finding may be explained if individuals were reluctant to identify with other group members if their group is not valued by society. Given the pattern of CI scores, a more likely possibility is that the groups who scored low on the RMI perceive themselves as being more diverse than groups lacking in cultural identity.

The moderately positive attitudes toward social change in South Africa (ACSA) among Black and so-called Coloured participants may well have been predicted. Notably, Whites in this sample were less catastrophic in their attitudes than those reported in past studies (see Foster & Nel, 1991), but several limitations with this interpretation need to be mentioned: The present sample consisted of adolescents, not adults; past studies were conducted many years ago in a different socio-historical context; and, notably, previous studies assessed attitudes toward an unknown future, while this study assessed attitudes toward the changes that have taken place already. In any event, the optimism characteristic of the White university student sample of Braungart and Braungart (1995) was not present in the results of this study.

A finding that was more congruent with those of Braungart and Braungart (1995)
was that subtle racism attitudes were less prevalent than were somewhat accepting racial attitudes among all groups. This finding may indicate that prejudice and racism are decreasing in the new social/political context of the country. The fact that the majority of subjects fell in the undecided/neutral range, however, still seems to indicate that much has yet to be done to increase positive/accepting attitudes necessary for a nation seeking successful cultural assimilation or multiculturalism (Moghaddam & Solliday, 1991).

Limitations of the Present Research

It should be noted that the principal weakness of the study involved the design itself. Cross-sectional survey research cannot address issues of longitudinal change and the related issues of causality. Thus, this paper did not deal with the essential question of how attitudes or identities have changed from before to after the official political transition of 1994; it provided more of a "snapshot" assessment of the topic after the elections had occurred.

Another issue concerns the generalizability of the results. Given the fact that only high school students were recruited for this study, the results may not generalize to those of different ages or with different educational experiences. Moreover, because the South African sample was obtained from a single region of the country, it is possible that distinct patterns in attitudes and identity may be noted in other areas. Given the geographical diversity of American sample, this is less of an issue, although regional differences (i.e., Southern states) may well limit the external validity of the results presented here. An unfortunate additional limitation of the American sample was its lack of racial diversity. Data from African-Americans would no doubt substantially add
to the comparisons made in this study.

Finally, it should be noted that triangulation and replication are central to issues of validity. This study could have strengthened its conclusions if additional techniques (such as qualitative interviews) had been employed in addition to the administration of the survey. In listing these limitations, it is hoped that future studies could improve upon these issues and at the same serve to verify or refine the results that have been presented here.

Future research would do well to attempt replication of these findings. Issues of particular focus might include the finding of higher racism/cultural identity and anti-White sentiment among White Afrikaans speakers. Patterns of cultural/personal identity and racial attitude dependence/avoidance should be further examined among so-called Coloured samples. Implications of the finding that the White English-speaking sample scored more similarly to Americans than to their fellow South Africans on most measures should be followed through (i.e., they may be less likely to develop a truly representative national identity than other groups, making them most likely to emigrate or remain aloof from national development initiatives). For all groups, longitudinal stability of identity and racial attitudes clearly warrant ongoing investigation, with the current data available for comparison with future samples.

Summary

As stated in the introduction, issues related to group identity, including attitudes toward in-groups and out-groups, continue to play a major role in the transformation of South African society. The present results, although limited in their generalizability, serve to contribute some unique information on this important topic.
First, it was shown that most subjects felt uncertain about the social and political changes that have occurred in South Africa. Black subjects were the most accepting of social change and the most tolerant of interracial equality, while White Afrikaans speakers were the least accepting and tolerant.

Second, White English speakers were generally excessively pro-White, while White Afrikaans speakers were more willing to relinquish political power and make amends for the wrongs of the past. Black and so-called Coloured participants were more neutral in their attitudes toward White's socio-political power, indicating that for this sample of high school students, tolerance holds impatience in check.

Third, South African groups tended to identify with other members of their own racial group and to believe that their culture is important to them, but they did not seem to have a well-defined sense of their personal identity.

Fourth, this study indicated that the subjects’ racial attitudes were largely based on their own experiences, but no particular tendency for the subjects to either avoid or seek out racial issues was apparent. Of all groups, so-called Coloured subjects were the most likely to depend on others and feel uncertain about their racial opinions. Cultural identity among so-called Coloured subjects was negatively related to stable racial attitudes, whereas personal identity was positively related with their attitude stability. Thus, personal versus cultural identity appear to be salient mediators for that population.

Fifth, it was shown that, to a large extent, differences noted in past research between the various South African groups still contribute toward relatively large differences in group identity patterns. While a collective South African identity may be
forming slowly, differences on related variables far outweigh similarities.

In conclusion, it may be said that the adolescent subjects in this sample were generally in a state of transition. They were neither stable nor unstable in their opinions, which were neither the depreciatory attitudes of previous generations nor the accepting attitudes characteristic of more integrated multicultural societies. Some were frightened or confused by the changes which have taken place in the country, while others embraced them with excitement; most, however, were either uncertain or hesitant to commit their opinion one way or another. As one legacy of Apartheid, group identification continues to be important to many, but some are more willing than others to alter forms of power and social dominance, thereby changing the dynamics which have been such a part of South African identity in the past. Hence, the adolescents in this study appear to be a reflection of their larger society. As they struggle in the process of their development between identity formation and role confusion (Erikson, 1963), so too does their adolescent nation, a State in transition.
Cross-cultural data
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Endnotes

1 The authors do not advocate compartmentalizing people on ethnic lines. However, Apartheid constructed a social reality that continues to play itself out in contemporary South Africa. The use of racial/ethnic categories in this paper reflects the ongoing significance of people’s historical experience.

2 The constructs that were meant to be assessed were first operationally defined. Second, the author generated a list of approximately sixty statements that reflected the content of those constructs. Third, this list, together with the operational definitions, was presented to a team of four psychologists, each of whom was familiar with the questionnaire development literature. These four judges independently, then in discussion with one another, evaluated the content validity and the clarity of the statements presented to them. Questions which were not deemed to reflect accurately the constructs they were designed to assess were discarded, and those statements which were rated as too complex or unclear were re-worded to the satisfaction of all judges concerned. Fourth, a draft of the questionnaire was pilot tested on a small sample of adolescents. Questions rated unclear were subsequently re-worded, and minor changes in the appearance of the questionnaire were made for the sake of clarity.
Table 1.

Ranked Group Differences on Measures of Racism and Social Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Change Attitudes (ACSA)</td>
<td>Black subjects</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>So-called Coloured subjects</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White English-speaking subjects</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White Afrikaans-speaking subjects</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtle Racism (SRS)</td>
<td>White Afrikaans-speaking subjects</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White English-speaking subjects</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>So-called Coloured subjects</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black subjects</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-White Sentiment (AWS)</td>
<td>Black subjects</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>So-called Coloured subjects</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White Afrikaans-speaking subjects</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White English-speaking subjects</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Response means were derived by dividing mean scores by the number of items on the scale. Items were rated on a 1 to 7 scale, with 1 being “strongly agree” and 7 being “strongly disagree”. Therefore, low scores on the ACSA indicate greater comfort with and support for social change; low scores on the SRS indicate greater interracial tolerance; and low scores on the AWS indicate greater anti-White sentiment.
Table 2.

Ranked Group Differences on Measures of Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Identity (CI)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Afrikaans-speaking subjects</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black subjects</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So-called Coloured subjects</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White English-speaking subjects</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White American subjects</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Identity (PI)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White American subjects</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Afrikaans-speaking subjects</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White English-speaking subjects</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black subjects</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So-called Coloured subjects</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Racial Membership Identification (RMI)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White English-speaking subjects</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White American subjects</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black subjects</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Afrikaans-speaking subjects</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So-called Coloured subjects</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Response means were derived by dividing mean scores by the number of items on the scale. Items were rated on a 1 to 7 scale, with 1 being “strongly agree” and 7 being “strongly disagree”. Therefore, low scores on the CI indicate stronger cultural identity; low scores on the PI indicate stronger personal identity; and low scores on the RMI indicate stronger racial membership identification.
Table 3.

 Ranked Group Differences on Measures of Racial Attitude Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORAS Avoidance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Afrikaans-speaking subjects</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So-called Coloured subjects</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black subjects</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White English-speaking subjects</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White American subjects</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORAS Dependence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So-called Coloured subjects</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Afrikaans-speaking subjects</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black subjects</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White English-speaking subjects</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White American subjects</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORAS Instability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So-called Coloured subjects</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black subjects</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Afrikaans-speaking subjects</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White English-speaking subjects</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White American subjects</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Response means were derived by dividing mean scores by the number of items on the scale. Items were rated on a 1 to 7 scale, with 1 being “strongly agree” and 7 being “strongly disagree”.