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ABSTRACT

Utilising the methodology of portraiture this study set out to explore interactions of diverse students in a South African university residence. The purpose of the study was to understand how students from different racial and ethnic backgrounds interpret their own experiences as they had to share their personal space with people who had previously been seen as the out-group. The study was qualitative in nature and used a case study research design. Data-gathering techniques included semistructured interviews, observations, field notes and researcher’s journal. Critical race theory and contact theory were the theoretical frameworks of this study. Data was analysed by means of content analysis. Findings of this study were fivefold: first, institutional practice plays an important role in facilitating contact between diverse students. Second, an environment that promotes social interaction is important in reducing stereotypes and prejudices. Third, continuous communication between diverse students minimised misunderstandings and promoted understanding and sympathy. Fourth, the participants did not attribute the challenges they experienced in their unit to racial or cultural differences. Fifth, participants did not segregate themselves exclusively from racial others. However, evidence reveals lack of interaction between some of the black female students.
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CHAPTER 1
ORIENTATION TO THE STUDY

“The questions underlying this interest derive from the ghosts of South Africa’s past and the dreams of its future. Does race continue to carry deep meaning? Have the meanings attached to the ethnic and racial labels of the “old” South Africa persisted?” (Bekker & Leildé, 2003:125)

1.1 Introduction
The purpose of this study is to explore how diverse students interact in a university residence. A number of studies based on student interactions were recently conducted at South African universities including the university residences (Alexander & Tredoux, 2010; Cross & Johnson, 2008; Finchilescu & Tredoux, 2010; Greyling, 2007; Jansen, 2009; Maylam, 2005; Moguerane, 2007; Perez & London, 2004; Pillay 2010; Southern, 2008). Most of these studies report deficiencies; hence, we have not seen a study reporting examples of sound practices where diverse students interact in desegregated South African university residences. Since the demise of apartheid South African university residences bring together students from cultural, racial and ethnical diverse backgrounds. Accordingly this study asks, how does a group of diverse students interact with one another?

This chapter provides the synopsis of the current study. I introduce the study by providing its background context. I proceed by giving an overview of the University of Pretoria which is followed by an introduction of the research site. Thereafter I highlight the problem statement, the purpose of the study, the research questions and the rationale for this study. In addition I provide a brief synopsis of the research strategy that I employed in this study. Along with the ethical considerations I draw attention to the limitation of the study and research assumptions. Furthermore I provide conceptualization of terms and conclude with an outline of the chapters in this dissertation.

1.2 Background context
It is almost nineteen years since South Africa secured the much awaited democracy. As apartheid was swept away people had different expectations of what democracy would bring. Some hoped for total elimination of discriminatory barriers, while others felt that their long established dominance was being threatened by those that were categorized as the oppressed. Many people expected Nelson Mandela to be bitter and punish those who had banished him into captivity, but he preached reconciliation and encouraged people to embrace diversity by working together to build a rainbow nation. However, the challenge is that some South
Africans are still trapped by the history of bitter conflicts and they fail to see the significance of the rainbow nation. It is important to acknowledge that South Africa is a multicultural country and its past did not allow the concept of multiculturalism to be celebrated, because of the apartheid laws that kept its people apart (Gumbo, 2001).

MacDonald (2006) attests that South Africa divided its people and they were indoctrinated into thinking that they were different in terms of race and ethnicity with their services offered in different institutions. The apartheid regime formalised segregation through legislations like the Prohibition of Mixed Marriage Act No. 55 of 1949, Group Areas Act No. 41 of 1950, which mandated residential segregation between races and among different ethnic groups within the black race group, the Reservation of Separate Amenities Act No. 49 of 1953, which separated public facilities including transport and services, the Immorality Act No. 21 of 1950 that was later amended in 1957, which forbid interracial sexual relationships (MacDonald, 2000). However it is important to clarify that some segregation laws came into effect before the Nationalist party ruled South Africa. These include the Natives Land Act No. 27 of 1913, which made it unlawful for blacks to buy land in white areas and the Natives (Urban areas) Act No. 21 of 1923, which deterred African urbanisation and mobility. These acts became the base for lack of residential integration making cities a completely white preserve (about.com.africanhistory, n.d.). The Natives (Urban areas) Act of 1923 was later retracted by the Abolition of Influx Control Act No. 68 of 1986 and this resulted in the eradication of pass laws which limited movements of black people into white areas.

The racial divide could also be seen in the segregated education systems including institutions of higher learning. According to Council for Higher Education [CHE] (2004) most government systems across the world regarded higher education to be exclusively reserved for the white community prior to World War 2. In accordance with this, South Africa under the colonial rule did not initially offer education to black Africans (CHE, 2004). The first institution of higher education in South was established in 1829 and it was named the South African College (SACS). This institution was created as an English medium college (Du Plessis, 2006). In 1918 SACS was given university status and became the University of Cape Town (UCT). University of Cape Town started to enrol a handful of black students in the 1920s (University of Cape Town, 2011). Even though lecture rooms were desegregated black students had to seek accommodation elsewhere and were not allowed to take part in social activities on the campus. The second institution to be established was Stellenbosch Gymnasium which started in 1865. In 1887 it changed its name to Victoria College and it is
indicated that it was initiated by an elite Afrikaans-speaking group (CHE, 2004). Victoria College was given university status in 1918 and became Stellenbosch University (SUN). The degrees offered at both the South African College and Victoria College were awarded by a non-teaching University of the Cape of Good Hope which was founded in 1873 (Welch, Yang, Rui & Wolhuter, 2004).

Another institution was established as a theological school in 1869 in Potchefstroom. In 1921 this school was integrated with the University of South Africa (UNISA). After that the theological school gained independence in 1951 and became Potchefstroom University for Christian Higher Education. In 2004 Potchefstroom University was merged with the University of Bophuthatswana and became the North-west University (NWU).

In 1896 the South African School of Mines was established in Johannesburg and was renamed the Transvaal University College in 1906 (TUC). The Pretoria branch of TUC was established in 1908. Apparently in 1910 the two branches of TUC separated and the Johannesburg branch was changed to South African School of Mines and Technology (University of Witwatersrand, 2011) which became the University of Witwatersrand in 1922. The Pretoria branch of TUC became the University of Pretoria in 1930 (University of Witwatersrand, 2011).

In 1904 another institution called Grey College was established and it underwent several name changes and became the University of the Orange Free State in 1950 (University of the Free State, 2011). Presently the University of the Orange Free State is known as the University of the Free State (UFS).

Rhodes College was established in 1904 and was part of the colleges sitting for exams controlled by the University of the Cape of the Good Hope but later became a constituent of the University of South Africa. Rhodes College became an autonomous university in 1951.

The Natal University College was founded in 1910 and 1949 became the University of Natal. In 2004 the University of Natal was merged with the University of Durban-Westville which was established in the 1960s as the University College for Indians to establish the University of KwaZulu-Natal (University of Kwazulu-Natal, 2011).

An alternative institution called the South African Native College was established under UNISA in 1916 to serve the black Africans. It was later integrated with Rhodes University
and renamed the University College of Fort Hare. In 1960 the Nationalist government detached the University College of Fort Hare from Rhodes University and placed it under the Ministry of Bantu Education to serve the Xhosa-speaking Africans only (Morrow & Gxabalashe, 2000). The University College of Fort Hare became an autonomous university in 1970 and became known as the University of Fort Hare. All the universities mentioned above were developed before the Nationalist party ruled South Africa and all of them apart from Fort Hare served the white settler community according to their cultural and linguistic needs (Mabokela, 2001).

When the Nationalist party came to power in 1948 it introduced formal segregation between races and within racial groups. In the context of higher education the Extension of University Education Act No. 45 of 1959 informed the restructuring of historically white universities along the cultural and linguistic duality, while historically black universities were divided along ethnic lines and in terms of urban and rural areas (Mabokela, 2000; Mabokela & King, 2001).

The historically white universities structured admission policies in such a way that Black students were excluded from being part of their student bodies. The five universities which were created exclusively for White Afrikaans language speakers were Stellenbosch, Potchefstroom (now known as North-west University), Orange Free State (now known as the University of Free State), Pretoria, Rand Afrikaans University (now known as University of Johannesburg) and it was founded in 1968 (CHE, 2004; Du Plessis, 2006; Mabokela & King, 2001). These institutions were the proud beacons of the Afrikaner Nationalist party and served the interests of the Afrikaner regime.

The four universities established by the government for English-speaking students were UCT, Witwatersrand, Rhodes, and Natal (now known as University of KZN). The University of Port Elizabeth (now known as Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University) was founded in 1964 as a dual medium university catering for both Afrikaans and English-speaking white South Africans. Black students had to request permission from the Minister in order to gain access to white institutions and that was only done if the courses required were not offered at historically black institutions (Akojee & Nkomo, 2007).

The universities that were established in the 1960s and 1970s specifically for Black people were the University of the North (now known as the University of Limpopo) which was
meant for Sotho, Venda and Tsonga speaking Africans, the University of Zululand for Zulu-speaking Africans, the University of Fort Hare for Xhosa-speaking Africans, the University of the Western Cape for Coloureds and the University of Durban Westville for Indians (now incorporated into the University of KZN). At a later stage the universities of Venda, Transkei (now Walter Sisulu University) and Bophuthatswana (now incorporated into North-West University) were established in their respective homelands (Mabokela & King, 2001). This study is based on one of the historically white Afrikaans universities, the University of Pretoria.

1.3 A historical overview of the University of Pretoria

The University of Pretoria was established in 1908 as the Pretoria campus of the Transvaal University College (TUC). The UP archives show that when the Pretoria centre of TUC got underway it used a house known as Kya Rosa as its campus (University of Pretoria, 2008).

![Figure 1.1: The Pretoria branch of TUC](http://web.up.ac.za)

During its inception Kya Rosa campus had four professors, three lecturers and thirty-two students. The first men’s residence to be established at TUC was named Kya Lami and catered for both students and lectures. In 1910 the Pretoria centre of TUC was removed from the Johannesburg institution and moved out of Kya Rosa to find its own property in the east of Pretoria. One more man’s residence known as College was built in 1914. As TUC was advancing the following faculties were established: Agriculture and Theology in 1917, Law in 1918, Arts, Natural Sciences, Trade and Public Administration, and Veterinary Science in 1919 (University of Pretoria, 2011). The records show that the first ladies’ residence known as die Fant (now known as Vergeet-My-Nie) was built in 1925 and later occupied in 1926. As TUC progressed it founded its first student committee in 1909. Afterwards the Rag (which is a student-run organization) and initiation of first-years were established in the
1920s. TUC became autonomous in 1930 and was named the University of Pretoria (UP). The acronym TUK(TUKKIES) is still used as UP’s colloquial name. At the stage which UP was granted university status it was experiencing physical expansion and growth in its student population. Extra facilities were erected and these included the club hall, administration building, and a well advanced academic library. An additional medical faculty was founded in 1943 (University of Pretoria, 2011).

In 1983 the Minister of National Education Gerrit Viljoen amended the Extension of University Education Act giving white universities authority to admit a limited number of black students (Greyling, 2007). However UP remained a predominantly white Afrikaans university until it was declared open for all races in 1989. The change in South Africa’s political affairs prompted UP to re-evaluate its admission policies and transformed it from an exclusively White university to a multiracial institution. Throughout its transformation UP launched new campuses at Witbank in 1989 and Hammanskraal in 1994. The agency of serving a diverse student population prompted UP to come up with a new language policy in 1994 which transformed the University into a multilingual institution. Furthermore UP expanded due to a number of incorporations that took place. First, the veterinary science faculties of the University of Pretoria and Medunsa were joined. Second, UP was joined with the Teachers Training College Pretoria (now known as the Groenkloof campus) in the year 2000. Third, a UP branch called Gordon Institute of Business Science was opened in Johannesburg in 2000. Fourth, UP was merged with Mamelodi campus of Vista University in 2004 (University of Pretoria, 2011).
Currently UP enrols more than fifty thousand students (University of Pretoria, 2008). Some of the students are commuters and others are on-campus students. Students who seek accommodation at UP can choose to stay in one of its 27 residences. Eight of these residences are allocated to male students, twelve residences are reserved for female students and seven of the residences are co-educational. Residence management at UP includes Heads of Residences, Coordinators who include Residence facilities and House Committees or Residence Management Committees.

At the University of Pretoria intervention to integrate residences came in the late 1990s as a response to the practice of allocating black and white students to different residences (Sharp & Valley, 2009). Jansen (2009) gives a detailed account of racial tensions at the University of Pretoria. He argues that living together in the residences causes more racial tension than learning together in the classroom. In what Jansen (2009) calls “bitter knowledge” some high schools that serve white Afrikaans-speaking population indoctrinate the students with knowledge and ideas that make it difficult for them to adjust to racial diversity in the residences when they come to UP. At UP the tension was not only between black and white students but it was also between the English and the Afrikaans-speaking students. Afrikaans students treated Black and English students with contempt and they were provoked when they did not observe Afrikaans traditions. Even though the students at UP lived in the same residences some of the residences had separate living arrangements, separate club houses and separate television sets. Some residences still retained the symbols and statues of Afrikaner pride in their hallways (Jansen, 2009). At UP residence traditions used to be well established and valued and as a result, Black students felt excluded by these strong Afrikaner-orientated cultural practices and traditions (CHE, 2010).

However, UP has since mandated several changes which led to an improvement in residence interactions (CHE, 2010). It is a requirement for every residence to have Black students among its leadership at UP. Black staff members were also recruited to occupy vacancies as Heads of residences. UP structured policies that discouraged and forbade traditions that offended other cultures. The Council of Higher Education argues that changing residence culture and tradition has significantly advanced residence transformation at UP. In order to celebrate diversity, residence activities are structured to facilitate greater interaction and understanding (CHE, 2010). This study is focused on one of UP’s student residences which is called TuksVillage.
1.4 Introducing the research site: TuksVillage

TuksVillage was recommended by some of the seniors at the University of Pretoria as it was distinct from other residences because of the balance in its racial composition and living program. I therefore became interested in making it the site of my study. TuksVillage is named after the University of Pretoria’s colloquial name. The university established this co-ed residence in 2008 after it researched the needs of students in relation to accommodation.

TuksVillage is situated in the eastern part of Pretoria. When I arrived in the morning of a cloudless spring day the village offered a very refreshing atmosphere. I was mesmerised by well-groomed gardens and well-cut grass around the village. Peculiar to a city environment I could hear the birds singing instead of the monotony of roaring engines and other various noises common in a big city. The day was still young and most students were attending lectures at various campuses of the University of Pretoria and because of the quietness at this time I could feel the elements of the countryside which were integrated in a modern university residence. As the day went by the youthfulness of the residence could be heard from contemporary music played at different blocks. The residence had ten distinct blocks of four floors each. Each floor had two units and each unit had eight bedrooms, communal bathroom, toilet facilities, a kitchen and a living space. TuksVillage offered a commune type of accommodation and the residents did not participate in traditionally organised sport, cultural
or other formalised activities. Six hundred and forty students were accommodated at this residence, of whom, three hundred and twenty were males and the other three hundred and twenty were females. The residence itself was co-ed but each unit was either occupied by males or females. A unit at TuksVillage consists of eight rooms which are allocated to four White students and four Black students (www.up.ac.za). Inside the units the big window on one side of the living room presents an opportunity for the residents to view the green grass and the blooming flowers outside the village blocks.

At TuksVillage students from different racial backgrounds shared a communal bathroom, self-catering kitchen, laundry, lounge and dining room. Unlike other residences of the University of Pretoria, TuksVillage did not have a House Committee, but it was managed by the Residence Management Committee.

1.5 Problem statement
The democratic government of South Africa developed legislation that prohibited segregation. These included admission policies that led to desegregation of educational institutions. As a result historically White universities have experienced a vast intake of Black South Africans and international students which led to them moving away from having predominantly white student bodies to being multicultural and multiracial institutions. As universities admit cosmopolitan populations of students they are morally obliged to provide equal opportunities for students, and during the process they should not compromise any particular group or allow any group to dominate (Mclean, 2000). Opportunities catering for diverse groups should be provided in and outside the lecture halls and also including at the student residences.

Even though South Africa has made some progress in terms of democratic practices, there are still many challenges in terms of desegregation, and contact between different races is still shallow (Finchilescu, Tredoux, Mynhardt, Pillay & Muianga, 2007). These challenges bring South African university residences into the spotlight as administrators strive to make students who were intentionally placed apart by the apartheid regime to share their personal spaces. Racial problems and occurrences of racial conflicts are still common in South Africa and it is vital to acknowledge that racial dynamics on campus are influenced by the same stereotypes and differences that operate in the real world (Antonio, Chang, Hakuta, Kenny, Levin & Millem, 2004). In a university residence students that come from different racial and cultural backgrounds have to co-exist and their differences can pose challenges. Accordingly, based on the challenges caused by the current contact of people from diverse backgrounds in
South Africa, I am now interested in exploring how students from diverse backgrounds who live in a desegregated university residence interact with each other.

1.6 Research purpose
The purpose of this research was to understand how a group of diverse university students interact with one another while at the same time they negotiate their personal space with individuals that were previously seen as the out-group. I was interested in understanding how the group defies the legacy of apartheid and the history of stereotypes given the fact that South African politics did not allow people of different races to share personal space.

1.7 Research questions
The main research question in this study is:
How does a group of diverse students in a South African University residence interact with one another?

In addition to the main question the following subquestions apply to this study:
1. How do diverse students describe their experiences in an interracial student residence?
2. How do diverse students feel about sharing their personal space with people from different backgrounds?
3. How has staying at TuksVillage influenced students’ perceptions of one another?

1.8 The rationale for this study
A key motivation for this study was that the abolition of the laws of desegregation did not change much in relation to interracial relationships in South Africa. Melville (2004) indicates that some people still disassociate themselves from being in contact with others through security gates and check-points. I therefore believed that the stories of prejudice, discrimination or even progress of desegregation strategies in university residences may be a reflection of what is prevailing in the society concerned. University residences can be seen as a microcosm of society in which people co-exist and socialise in a comparatively small geographical area (Nesdale & Todd, 2000).

King (2001); McLean (2000); van der Merwe (2009) document the challenges of transformation of South African university residences. There seems to be a dearth of information regarding studies that explore exceptional or best practices at university residences where white students did not resist change and opt to live off campus because of the influx of Black students. I share the same view as Vandeyar (2009:72) that:
This focus on failure tends to distort our sense of the world, causing us not to see what is successful and working well and to create a distorted worldview that leads to development of cynicism and provides for educational inaction.

The quest underlying this study was to find a residence which does not replace an all-white university residence with an all-black university residence (Vandeyer, 2009). The rationale for my choice of TuksVillage is that the residence body is constituted by students from various races that reflect the change in the demographic profile of the university. Since this residence has only been recently established, it limits the risk of assimilation of the group that had been previously excluded by the institution. Moraka (2001) argues that students should not be expected to adjust to the old policies in institutions that are undergoing transformation as the policies excluded other cultures while they catered for a particular cultural group. In relation to this I think that TuksVillage offers a fresh environment with policies that are designed and developed during the present South African political landscape.

I am of the opinion that despite the negative impact of the legacy of apartheid, there are good examples of positive interventions aimed at making the possibility of a rainbow nation a reality. This study is important because of the recent political landscape in South Africa which was not a favourable one. Our country is overshadowed by conspiracy theory to such an extent that even the members of parliament and other politicians find it hard to conceal their resentment of one another and my concern is that they are usually caught uttering racially dividing speeches (Moodley & Adam, 2000). Moodley and Adam (2000) argue that the racially mixed representatives in parliament are not considered by the majority groups to be authentic representatives of their communal constituencies. In recent times the issue of reconciliation has been compromised on several occasions in South Africa. Although some occurrences remain in the shadows, the racial saga that took place at the University of the Free State triggered a racial dilemma in a young democratic nation. The incident involved black women taking part in humiliating activities which were orchestrated by white male university students. This caused apprehension in South Africa and around the world. The politics are no longer about the struggle for liberation but whether South Africans can co-exist in this democratic dispensation without racial intolerance and prejudice.

This study was also intended to reduce to the gap in literature that does not give much attention to diverse student interactions at South African university residences. The outcome of this research will further contribute to the contact theory which was initially formulated by Gordon Allport (1954). I think that exploring how students from different racial and cultural
groups interact and share their personal space will encourage other universities and the society at large, to confront their own histories of segregation and resilience to change. Community leaders in areas that need integration and policymakers in universities can learn from the challenges and achievements of TuksVillage. Although the result of this study may not convert all South Africans overnight I argue that if researchers can conduct studies on exceptional initiatives in our country, people can be propelled to explore new frontiers which may lead towards celebrating diversity and acknowledging the beauty of the rainbow nation.

1.9 Theoretical Frameworks
The theoretical frameworks that underpin this study are critical race theory and contact theory.

1.9.1 Critical race theory
Critical race theory (CRT) emerged in the 1970s. It was initially used in the legal system and was later adapted to educational studies in the mid-1990s (Ladson-billings & Tate, 1995). CRT questions the construction of traditional values and norms (Evans, 2007). Solorzano (1997) reports that there are five crucial tenets of CRT, namely the centrality and intersectionality of race and racism, the challenge to dominant ideology, commitment to social justice, the centrality of experiential knowledge and the interdisciplinary perspective.

Race is at the centre of desegregation of educational institutions in South Africa. In similar vein TuksVillage brought students from different races and cultures together. Therefore I believe that CRT enabled me to effectively analyse the findings of this study. Critical Race theory is discussed in detail under subsection 2.7.1.

1.9.2 Contact theory
The contact theory was coined by Gordon Allport in an attempt to explain and understand intergroup contact. Allport (1954) listed four conditions that are prerequisites for effective intergroup contact and these conditions are; equal status within the situation, common goals, intergroup cooperation and support of authority (Allport, 1954). The proponents of contact theory assume that cross-racial contact will produce more tolerant attitudes when members of different groups interact with each other within an equal-status situation (Allport, 1954). The contact must be prolonged and close enough to lead to development of common interests. It must also lead to recognition of common humanity amongst the group members and it must further be anchored by the institutional support (Antonio et al., 2004).
Students living in TuksVillage were from different backgrounds. They were compelled to share their personal space with people from cultures that they previously had limited contact with. The context of this study provided an opportunity to explore whether intergroup contact under certain conditions reduced prejudices. The contact theory is discussed extensively under subsection 2.7.2.

1.10 Research strategy

In order to outline the process by which the research was conducted I present the research strategy that facilitated the direction of this study.

1.10.1 Meta-theoretical paradigm

I used a social constructivism lens as epistemology during my study. The assumption of social constructivists is that individuals search for understanding of the world in which they live and work (Creswell, 2009). I embedded this enquiry on the views of the participants as they gave meaning to their experiences and the world around them. Meaning is fundamentally created socially when an individual interacts with the human community (Creswell, 2009). Accordingly sociological forces such as religion, human interest and group dynamics determine how people acquire knowledge (Phillips, 2000). This research was based on the basic belief that people in the world have their own assumptions, intentions, attitudes, beliefs and values. In order to know reality I explored experiences of the selected students at TuksVillage specifically regarding their interactions with the racial others (Niewenhuis, 2007a). The meta-theoretical paradigm is discussed in detail in Chapter 3 under subsection 3.2.1.

1.10.2 Methodological paradigm

As a researcher I have an obligation to use a methodological paradigm which complements the meta-theoretical paradigm which determines the lens through which I approach the study. In this study I used the qualitative research approach and portraiture methodology.

1.10.2.1 Qualitative approach

I chose to use a qualitative approach during the study because I wanted to interact actively with the participants. Denzin and Lincoln (2005) assert that qualitative research places the researcher in the world and they maintain that the qualitative researcher should make the world visible. In his definition of qualitative research Creswell (2007:46) mentions that “it is a type of educational research in which the researcher relies on the views of the participants,
asks broad, general questions, collects data consisting largely of words (or text) from participants, describes and analyses these words for themes, and conducts the inquiry in a subjective, biased manner”. My aim was not to generalise the findings of this research but rather to narrate the experiences, voices and stories of the participants. I discussed the methodological paradigm at length in Chapter 3 under subsection 3.3.1.

1.10.2.2 Portraiture
Portraiture methodology was selected for my study. In portraiture various qualitative methodologies which include life history, naturalistic inquiry and ethnographic methods are used (Dixson, Chapman & Hill, 2005). Those who are proponents of portraiture depart from the standpoint that there are stories of goodness in schools and these stories can also be evident in other contexts. The researchers inspired by these methods use Lawrence-Lightfoot’s search for goodness in the methodology of portraiture to narrate the stories (Dixson et al., 2005). The portraiture methodology is discussed extensively under subsection 3.3.2.

1.10.2.3 Case study design
I wanted to understand how the students at TuksVillage interact through employing a case study design. I therefore chose to undertake a single case study. Bassey (1999) argues that a researcher chooses a case study of singularity because of its interest to the researcher. Tietje (2002) states that a researcher may choose a single case study because he considers the case unique, prototypical, salient or relevant to the understanding of the phenomenon. TuksVillage was identified as having a unique residence program which allowed diverse students an opportunity to interact and I became interested in obtaining a better understanding of the phenomenon. In accordance with this I felt that it was worthy of a case study design. The study was conducted in a natural setting at the students’ own residence and it was consistent in terms of giving a picture of real people in a real situation. Case study design is discussed in detail under subsection 3.4.1.

1.10.3 Data Collection methods
I collected data through semistructured interviews, observations, document analysis and field notes. Data collection methods are discussed in detail under section 3.5.
1.10.3.1 Semistructured interviews

Yin (2002) argues that interviews are the most important part of the case study evidence because case studies are about what happens in people’s lives. In this study I interviewed eight students and one head of a residence. Three of the eight students were members of the residence management. The semistructured interviews which consisted of a series of questions were designed respectively for participants in management (Appendix C) and for participating students (Appendix D). The interviews were conducted at a time convenient for the interviewees and the time allocated for each participant was approximately 60 minutes depending on the responses of the participants. The aim of the interviews was to understand the personal backgrounds and perceptions of the students. The second phase of interviews was done with the management of TuksVillage. The idea was to familiarise myself with how TuksVillage developed and to access relevant policies for document analysis in order to understand some current information informing day-to-day activities at the residence. The third phase consisted of follow-up interviews, which provided the opportunity for member checking and adding of information. Interviews were audiotaped and transcribed. I also took notes and kept interview protocol so that I could use follow-up questions.

1.10.3.2 Observations

Creswell (2007:221) defines observations as “the process of gathering open-ended, firsthand information by observing people and places at a research site”. I captured some environmental conditions through observations (Yin, 2002). The purpose of observations during this study was to explore a possibility of a new dimension or field of data that I could not obtain through interviews. In this regard I observed the surrounding and the physical setting of the site. I had no intention of observing students in their personal spaces as that would have compromised their right to privacy. Photographs were taken during observations and were supplemented by field notes in the form of an observation protocol. During this process I looked for artefacts displayed at the research site, and other relevant information.

1.10.3.3 Document analysis

Case studies do not depend only on ethnographic interviews or participant-observer data (Yin, 2002). In this study I analysed documents accessed from the internet designed to inform the public about TuksVillage.
1.10.3.4 Field notes
According to Creswell (2007:224) “field notes are texts (words) recorded by the researcher during an observation in qualitative study”. I started by writing short notes each time I was at the research site. After each field session I then wrote extended notes. Furthermore I kept a field journal in which I recorded problems and ideas that arose throughout the process of the field work (Spradley, 1979, as cited in Silverman, 2010). Throughout the observations I used field notes to describe the physical setting of the site, particular events and activities. Moreover, I reflected on my personal thoughts, intuitions, insights, broad ideas and themes that emerged throughout the process (Creswell, 2007). I also made field notes during interviews. This enabled me to probe for further questions and also to have backup in case the audiotape malfunctioned.

1.10.4 Site and participant selection
I have chosen to use purposive sampling in order to report dynamic and unfolding interactions of events at TuksVillage. The type of research site was decided in advance as I was specifically searching for good practices. TuksVillage as a case was recommended by some of the senior staff members of the University of Pretoria who were knowledgeable about the dynamics of student residences. My choice of unit corresponded with what Stake (2005) classifies as an intrinsic case study because I intentionally searched for the unit that functioned well in relation to students interactions, because my objective was to pursue goodness. I searched for a unit that also had an ideal representation in terms of black and white racial mix. Hence, Equity unit was selected at a meeting held by the Residence management committee. I concentrated on a small group which comprised eight female students from the Equity unit. Likewise the sample comprised four black females and four white females. The small group enabled me to conduct an in-depth study, while at the same time it made it easier for me to explore and manage controversial and emotional topics. I did not generalise the results obtained from studying this sample to the wider population. Site and participant selection are discussed extensively under subsections 3.4.1.1 and 3.4.1.2.

1.10.5 Pilot study
I conducted the pilot study in order to test the interview protocol used in data gathering. Two participants that were selected for the pilot study were interviewed using the interview protocol designed for this study. I audiotaped the pilot interviews and transcribed them. The process of transcribing the interviews helped me to improve and review questions in the initial
Moreover I discussed the pilot study with the supervisor of the study, who made suggestions for improvement.

### 1.10.6 Data analysis

I conducted data collection and data analysis concurrently. In this study, I used content analysis as the main method of scrutinizing the data. This included analysing both verbal and non-verbal data in order to bring forth the meaning of the participant’s interactions (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2000). Content analysis is discussed at length under subsection 3.6.1.

### 1.11 Research assumptions

I put together a number of assumptions from literature I gathered from both the international landscape and the South African landscape.

**Assumption 1**: The influx of black people into historically white spaces including historically white university residence results in white flight (Austin, 2001; Durrheim, 2005; Hill, 2009; Hunter & Danahoo, 2004; Mclean, 2000; Nkuna, 2000; Woods, 2001).

**Assumption 2**: People choose to interact effectively with people that share their culture and common interests and they further avoid infiltrating spaces that are occupied by racial others (Alexander & Tredoux, 2010; Bobo & Zubrinsky, 1996; Boisjoly, Duncan, Kremer, Levy & Eccles, 2006; Douglas, 1998; Kurian, 2008; Mabokela, 2001; Moguerane, 2007, Pillay, 2010; Stearns, Buchmann & Bonneau, 2009).

**Assumption 3**: In South African university residences transformation policies are seen as a threat to white Afrikaans-speaking students who desire to preserve their culture and residence traditions (Barnard, 2010; Durrheim, Dixon, Tredoux, Eaton, Quayle & Clack, 2011; Southern, 2008).

**Assumption 4**: Black students retaliate when they feel that they are forced to conform to the dominant culture (Jansen, 2004; Moguerane, 2007).

**Assumption 5**: More contact of diverse people which is supported by conducive conditions leads to lower prejudice (Allport, 1954; Antonio et al., 2004; Pettigrew, 2008b; Tredoux & Finchilescu, 2010).
1.12 Quality criteria

“Interviewers and interviewees alike bring their own, often unconscious experiential and biographical baggage with them in the interview situation” (Cohen et al., 2000:121). I was aware that my personal, attitudes, preferences and perceptions could influence the findings of the research. Therefore I employed various quality assurance techniques in order to eliminate researcher bias and enhance the quality of the study. Denzin and Lincoln (2005) proposed four criterions for judging the soundness of qualitative research and they are confirmability, credibility, transferability and dependability.

1.12.1 Confirmability

Confirmability entails whether the data collected and the conclusions drawn can be confirmed by others investigating the same phenomenon (Ary, Jacobs & Razvich, 2002). The main strategy that I employed to demonstrate confirmability is audit trail. I carried out an audit trail through giving a transparent description of the steps that I took from the start of the project, throughout the project and also to report its findings. Audit trail records will allow other researchers to arrive at the same or sometimes different conclusions by tracing what had been done during an investigation. The audit trail includes raw data, data reduction, analysis product, and field notes.

1.12.2 Credibility

Credibility in qualitative research has to do with the accuracy of the truthfulness of the findings (Ary et al., 2002). The integrity of qualitative research depends on whether it is believable or not. As a researcher, I have the responsibility of representing the views of the participants as accurately as possible. To accomplish credibility I wrote a summary after each interview session. I employed member checking as the main strategy through which I ensured the credibility of my study. During member checking I gave a copy of the interview transcript to each participant so that they could review the accuracy of the data. During the process, the participants added more information or corrected actual errors. To enhance accumulation of accurate data, I used an audio tape. It was my intention to invest sufficient time in the study so that I could have prolonged engagement. I believe that it allowed me to identify characteristics in the situation relevant to the research.

1.12.3 Transferability

Transferability refers to the degree to which findings can be generalised or transferred to similar research settings (Ary et al., 2002). My intention was to portray the unique features of
the study site and therefore not to generalise or replicate the findings of the inquiry. However, I do acknowledge that it is important for a researcher to provide a detailed, clear and in-depth account of the study so that others can decide the extent to which findings from one study are similar to those of other studies (Cohen et al., 2000). Ary et al. (2002) argue that it is the responsibility of the reader to determine the degree of similarity of the context of the study to other contexts. But still, as a researcher, I had to provide enough information which extensively describes the time, place and context that would allow the reader to make an informed judgement. It was my responsibility to give detailed descriptions of the participants and to use multiple and comprehensive quotations to help the reader understand the context of the study. Moreover I also described my assumptions at the time of the enquiry.

1.12.4 Dependability
Dependability is the fit between what is recorded and what actually happens in the research field (Cohen et al. 2000). Multiple methods of collecting data promoted dependability of the study and in this case I used semistructured interviews, observations and document analysis. I also used an audit trail to establish dependability. I also recorded interviews using a voice recorder. I gave a detailed description of the sample under study and I kept a record of all the procedures followed. In those records I accounted for and gave descriptions of the changes that occurred in the context of the study. Criterions for judging trustworthiness of the study are discussed in detail under section 3.7.

1.13 Ethical considerations
Researchers have the responsibility to preserve the dignity of the participants and to take into account the effects of the study on them (Cohen et al., 2000). Throughout the study I made sure that I abided by the ethical guidelines set out by the University of Pretoria‘s Ethics Committee. After I successfully defended my research proposal I completed an ethics form through which proved I had taken care of the ethical considerations as required by the ethics committee.

The access to the research site was approved by the Director: Residence Affairs and Accommodations at the University of Pretoria and the Head of Residence at TuksVillage. I made a formal written request in which I informed the university of the aims of the study, the design and the methods I would use. I obtained written informed consent from the research participants. “Informed consent entails informing the research subjects about the overall purpose of the investigation and the main features of the design as well as any possible risks
and benefits from participation in the research project” (Kvale, 1996:112). I gave verbal and written information to the participants. To ensure confidentiality I withheld information on the participants which could reveal their identity. Cohen et al. (2000) argues that the standard protection of participants is the guarantee of confidentiality, withholding of names and other identifying characteristics. Ethical considerations that were observed during this study are discussed extensively under section 3.8.

1.14 My role as a researcher

As qualitative researcher I was immersed in the study because I needed to record the interactions in a real-life context (Niewenhuis, 2007a). Apart from conducting interviews, doing observations and studying documents I had to make ethical decisions. It should be noted: “Moral research behaviour is more than ethical knowledge and cognitive choices; it involves the person of the searcher, his or her sensitivity and commitment to moral issues and action” (Kvale, 1996:117). I acknowledge that I went into the field with preconceived knowledge and biases. I made myself familiar with ethical issues, ethical guidelines and ethical theories, so that I could strive for fairness and honesty. It was my responsibility to discuss ethical issues with the participants. I tried to monitor my biases, experiences and beliefs by recording them in a field journal. In this way I was able to make reflections which helped me to challenge my own perceptions.

In this study my voice as a researcher stood out as my intention was to paint a picture of the phenomena. I had to interpret and understand the views of the participants that required me to be a good listener, non-judgemental and adaptable. During interviews I had to ask for further explanations and actively interact with the group. At the same time I tried to avoid giving my opinions as that might have influenced the participants. Kvale (1996) warns that the researcher should have scientific responsibility towards the participant and researcher independence. I ensured that the findings of the study did not offer misleading information. I was determined to ensure that the study would yield knowledge worth knowing by verifying and controlling the data accumulated.

1.15 Limitations of the study

This study is focused on a very small sample which is restricted to female students only. I focus on a single case study which is one unit in one university residence. I have no intention of generalising the outcomes of this study.
1.16 Conceptualization of terms

Qualitative researchers are inclined to define the terms they use during their research. In order to clarify the concepts used in this study I present the following:

1.15.1 Apartheid: The term apartheid refers to a political system employed by the Nationalist Party regime to rule South Africa from 1948 to the early 1990s. Bernal and Villalpando (2002: 169) define apartheid as a “historical, rigid racial division between the governing white population and the non-white majority population in South Africa”. Melville (2004) states that because of apartheid people of South Africa were classified according to various races which were used to allocate them to different residential areas. South African people were also categorized according to different ethnic groups. Ramphele (2008) affirms that ethnic groups were used to ascertain how individuals were given access to resources in different areas. In relation to this Bernal and Villalpando (2002) assert that the white population in South Africa used apartheid as a means to perpetuate their dominance and to marginalize the ethos and principles of South Africa’s non-white population. During the apartheid years white dominance was also evident in the way resources were allocated in favour of the white minority.

1.15.2 Cultural Diversity: Pincus (2006:3) refers to cultural diversity as the importance of understanding and appreciating differences between groups. When effectively implemented, diversity does not replace one culture with another (Parekh, 2000). One of the core values of diversity is that both the majority and the minorities should acknowledge that a society is not mono-cultural but rather made up of groups with differing languages, religions and cultural values and principles (Castles, 2004).

1.15.3 Culture: Culture is referred to as a dynamic system which incorporates social values, cognitive codes, behavioural standards, world views and beliefs used to give order and meaning to our lives as well as the lives of others (Gay, 2000).

1.15.4 Discrimination: During the apartheid era South Africans were not entitled to the same privileges and the majority of people were discriminated against by the ruling party. Nieto and Bode (2008: 66) argue that “discrimination denotes negative or destructive behaviours that can result in denying some groups’ life’s necessities as well as the privileges, rights and opportunities enjoyed by other groups”. The reasoning within this is that when treatment to persons perceived to be members of some social group is unequal leading to one group being
denied certain types of employment, residential housing, political rights and other opportunities that they may wish, the group in question is being discriminated against (Allport, 1954; Pincus, 2006).

1.15.5 Diverse students: In the context of this study diverse students refer to students who are different in terms of culture, race and ethnicity.

1.15.6 Institutional discrimination: Institutional discrimination during the apartheid regime led to many Black students being denied access to some universities and some residences. According to Nieto and Bode (2008:68) “Institutional discrimination generally refers to how people are excluded or deprived of rights and opportunities as a result of the normal operations of the institutions”. Another relevant definition for this study is by Pincus (2006:22) who stated that: “Institutional discrimination refers to the policies of dominant group institutions, and the behaviour of individuals who implement these policies and control these institutions, that are intended to have a differential and/or harmful effect on subordinate groups.”

1.15.7 Interracial groups: For the sake of this study interracial groups refer to students from different racial groups who are at the same institution and have to be interacting with each other on daily bases. A racial group is a socially defined group that has certain biological characteristics that makes them different from other groups and these groups are an outcome of the environment and opportunity (Pincus, 2006). In this study the interracial focus is on black and white students who are residing at TuksVillage.

1.15.8 Prejudice: Prejudice is summed up as an unfavourable judgement that is directed towards a particular group and that judgement is ethically disapproved in the society (Allport, 1954). It is also referred to as an individual phenomenon which is shown by the portrayal of negative attitudes or behaviours towards a person because of his membership of a particular group (LeConteur & Augoustinos, 2001). In their definition Nieto and Bode (2008) stated that the attitudes and the beliefs of an individual are directed to the entire group and the further indicated that people may be prejudiced in favour of others.

1.15.9 Race and racism: Racism and race have been at the centre of South African politics for many decades. However, various researchers describe race as social construct which has never been proven to be biological (Kivisto, 2002; Moodod, 2007; Nieto & Bode, 2008). In
addition to that Back and Solomos (2000) referred to race as a political construct which has similar discourse as class. The dynamics of race have led to the phenomenon of racism. Nieto and Bode (2008) attest that racism is based on the belief that one group is more superior than others and to some extent leads to the goods and services being distributed according to such judgement of unequal worth. In relation to this MacDonald (2006) stated that racism has members of one racial group, usually whites, dominating members of different racial groups usually black for material or expressive reasons. It has been described as a matter of behaviour and in most cases hatred or contempt is manifested towards individuals who have particular physical characteristics which are different from one’s own and the argument put forward is that individual beliefs and practices are linked to wider social and institutional norms as a result of racism (Todorov, 2000).

1.15.10 Tolerance: Robinson et al. (2001) define tolerance as the full acceptance and valuing of others while recognizing the difference between them and oneself. A person who is tolerant has the capacity to bear something even though at the time it might be unpleasant and it is also indicated that to be tolerant means to endure the differences, not to embrace them (Nieto & Bode, 2008).

1.16 Outline of chapters

My research consists of six chapters which are organised as follows:

Chapter 1: Orientation to the study
In Chapter 1 I introduce the study by providing its background information. I proceed by giving an overview of the University of Pretoria which is succeeded by the introduction of the research site. Moreover I highlight the problem statement, the purpose of the study, the research questions and the rationale for this study. In addition I advance by giving a brief synopsis of the research strategy that I employed in this study, along with the ethical considerations I highlight the limitation of the study and research assumptions. I further provide conceptualization of terms and lastly, an outline of the chapters is given in Chapter 1.

Chapter 2: A review of literature
In Chapter 2 I look at relevant literature in order to substantiate the need of this study. This chapter reviews both local and international literature on student interactions. First, I review literature related to the construct of segregation. Second, I review literature related to diversity in institutions of higher learning. Third, I discuss the nature of interactions between diverse students. Fourth, I proceed with a discussion on interaction of diverse students in
international university residences. Fifth, I discuss interactions of diverse students in South African university residences. Sixth, I discuss summary of findings from literature. Seventh, I further review literature in order to build on the theoretical frameworks which help to explain and validate how the study unfolds.

**Chapter 3: Research strategy**

In Chapter 3 I discuss the paradigmatic assumptions and methodological paradigm of the study. Included in the methodological paradigm I discuss the qualitative research approach and portraiture methodology and how they fit in with social constructivism as a meta-theoretical paradigm. I explain in detail the reason for using case study research design as a strategy of inquiry. I describe the data collection methods I used and how I embarked on data analysis. I explain why I chose to use purposive sampling in this study. I also discuss quality measures such as confirmability, credibility, transferability and trustworthiness. I further present ethical considerations that were taken into account. The chapter concludes by highlighting the limitations of this study.

**Chapter 4: Findings of the study**

In Chapter 4 I present the findings of the study using the themes and subthemes that emerged during the interviews with major research participants. I present the portraits of diversity within the participants’ background. I also present the contextual portrait of the site within which the study is taking place. I present themes based on the interpersonal relations between the participants.

**Chapter 5: Discussion and analysis of findings**

In this chapter I situate the findings of my study in the reviewed literature. In addition I discuss the findings in relation to the theoretical frameworks used in this study. Echoing of literature highlights the similarities between the findings of this study and the literature review. I further present the difference between the findings of this study and the literature review. I also discuss the areas of silence and I conclude by presenting new knowledge that emerged from this study.

**Chapter 6: Recommendations and conclusion**

In this chapter I give the summary of emergent themes findings. I reflect on my study in terms of the limitations and the potential value of my study. I also revisit the research assumptions and I conclude by making recommendations.
1.17 Chapter summary

People of different races around the world were indoctrinated into believing that they are different and in the process were accustomed to spaces preserved for different racial and ethnical groups. With changes in race interaction various governments have to find ways of desegregating people who were intentionally put apart by the dominant groups in their respective countries. The challenges of desegregation are well documented with more evidence of negative interaction between diverse groups. However there is a dearth of studies documenting positive interventions during which diverse groups are making efforts to co-exist. This study is aimed at finding a university residence where white South African did not leave when black students were included in their residence.

In this opening chapter I have put forward the introduction and background of the study. This includes among others an overview of the University of Pretoria, introduction of the research site, the problem statement, the purpose of the study, the research questions and the rationale for this study. In addition I gave a brief synopsis of the research strategy that I employed in this study. Along with the ethical considerations I drew attention to the limitation of the study and research assumptions. I further provided conceptualization of terms and last, an outline of the chapters was given in this chapter. In Chapter 2 I review literature related to this study.
CHAPTER 2
A REVIEW OF LITERATURE

“Growing awareness of the link between human lives and their historical times has underscored the multiple levels, social embeddedness, and the dynamic features of the life course” (Elder, 1994:5).

2.1 Introduction
The purpose of this chapter is to review debates and current issues in the field of interactions of diverse students at university residences. I will compare, summarise and evaluate related research and at the same time attempting to place this study within broader debates in this field. Though I depart from the notion that there is goodness, the literature review I am going to present show deficiencies especially in relation to interactions of diverse groups presented by multicultural settings similar to the South African context in which this study finds itself.

I will review literature related to the construct of segregation. Second, I will review literature related to diversity in institutions of higher learning. Third, I will reflect on the interactions of diverse students at international university residences. Fourth, I will discuss interactions of diverse students at South African university residences. Fifth, I will also discuss relevant theories and concepts which underpin my research. In addition throughout the presentation of the literature review I will show how my work adds value to the field of student interactions. As already mentioned, to begin with, I discuss the construct of segregation.

2.2 The construct of segregation
The concept of the ‘rainbow nation’ as coined by Archbishop Desmond Tutu became the driving force behind uniting the different people of South Africa who were torn apart by the apartheid system. Even though segregation was evident before the Nationalist Party came to power, apartheid was formalised and supported by numerous racist policies during its rule (Finchilescu & Tredoux, 2010). The Population Registration Act No 30 of 1950 categorised the people of South Africa into different races. The people of South Africa were categorized into four main race groups: first ‘white’ referring to people of European origin, second ‘coloured’ referring to the people of mixed race, third ‘Black African’ referring to indigenous people of African origin and fourth ‘Indian’ referring to the people who originated from the Indian subcontinent (Finchilescu & Tredoux, 2010; Sennett, Finchilescu, Gibson & Strauss, 2003). The ‘Black African’ group was further divided into nine sub-nations (Gillepsie, 2010). The motive here was to enforce the notion of difference among the Black people. As their ethnicity was used to document their race and put them into various homelands (Curry, 2006;
Foster, 2005). One can detect why the African people were divided into smaller nations from statements like the one quoted from a speech by Mr M.C Botha which says:

As regards to all the various nations we have here, the White Nation, the Coloured Nation, the Indian Nation, the various Bantu Nations, something to which we have given too little regard is the fact that numerically the White Nation is superior to all other nations in South Africa. This has a very wide implication for us all... (Alexander, 1979 as cited in Gillespie, 2010).

Drawing insight from the preceding statement one can deduce that the aim of apartheid was to prevent contact between the different racial groups and to advance the superiority of the Afrikaans-speaking nation. The claim that the white nation was numerically superior to other nations in South Africa showed the cynicism of segmenting black South Africans into smaller nations. Clark, Chein and Cook (1952/2004) have given what I think is a shallow definition of segregation when it is related to the context of the history of apartheid in South Africa. To this effect, Clark et al., (1952/2004:495) define segregation as:

that restriction of opportunities for different types of associations between members of racial, religious, or geographic origin, or linguistic group and those of other groups, which results from or is supported by the action of any official body or agency representing some branch of government.

In South Africa it was not just some branch of government that perpetuated segregation; it was manifested in all policies of the government and was accompanied by ruthless consequences for those who opposed it. However, I agree with some of the conclusions drawn by Clark et al. (1952/2004) in terms of the following, namely segregation interferes with an individual’s awareness of social reality, segregation serves as a hindrance to communication and interaction between the separated groups, and segregation can result in a social climate characterised by incidences of racial conflicts and aggressive occurrences. Emphasis on segregation was well articulated by the South African segregationists with the policies that they indicated were not based on discrimination but on differentiation (South Africa Institute for Race Relations [SAIRR], 1969). With regard to this statement consider the following quotation:

In an address to the students of Rand Afrikaans University the Minister of planning, Dr Carel de Wet said that contact across the colour line, for example between students, nurses, teachers or municipal officials of different race groups, was desirable only if the aim was the advancement of separate development and if there were mutual problems, or if one organization could help the other. There should be no social mixing or integration (SAIRR, 1969:2).
With the demise of apartheid these formal boundaries were demolished. But there is irony in this new development because segregation is still persistent in most spheres of South Africa (Clack, Dixon & Tredoux, 2005; Christopher, 2005; Durrheim & Dixon, 2005; Finchilescu et al., 2007; Houssay-Holzhuch & Teppo, 2009). While the abolishing of formal segregation is laudable, the new trend of self-segregation is an appeal for concern. This trend of people separating themselves can be observed in public spaces and also in unwillingness to share one’s personal space with racial or ethnic others. Clack et al. (2005:2) defined this kind of segregation as a “micro-ecological process that shapes relations in contexts where members of different groups share proximity and co-presence and where racial boundaries are fleeting and informal”. Clack et al. (2005) argued that instances of self-segregation limit face-to-face interactions as they enhance detachment from the out-group.

There seem to be a number of reasons given to justify why people choose to segregate themselves from others. Some studies revealed that white people view segregation as a normal or natural phenomenon which is not motivated by racism (Bonilla-Silva, Goar & Embrick, 2006, Durrheim, Trotter, Piper & Manicon, 2004). For others it is about ‘collective identity’, common interests and the compassion often received from members of the same group (Alexander & Tredoux, 2010). Hence, Bonilla-Silva et al. (2006) attest that an argument put forward by social closure theorists shows that some people protected their boundaries in order to deny other groups opportunities. In this way they limit competition with other groups through avoiding proximity and thus protect their interests.

2.3 Diversity in institutions of higher learning

While it is true that South Africa’s people are still segregated, it does not mean that the present government does not explore ways to reconcile its nation. This includes attempts to ensure that people who were intentionally kept apart, be brought together using policies that acknowledge their diversity and differences. South Africa has one of the most lucrative and enticing constitutions in the world, with the Bill of Rights being the cornerstone of the country’s democracy. The Constitution emphasises that educational institutions need to redress the result of the past discriminatory laws and practices. It further affirms the value of human dignity and states that no person or institution may unfairly discriminate against the other (RSA, 1996). Cross (2004) argues that the broad aim of the South African constitution is to create and nurture a non-sexist, non-discriminatory and non-racial society in which all
people are aware of each other’s differences, while at the same time live in peace and harmony.

In 1995 the democratic government of South Africa instituted the National Council on Higher Education (NCHE) which was primarily mandated to advise the Minister of Education on how to reform higher education so that it could serve the diverse people of South Africa (Council on Higher Education [CHE], 2004). This resulted in the White Paper 3 of 1997 which is the National Plan for Higher Education. The National Plan was aimed at bringing together the various universities inherited from the apartheid system in order to redress the inequalities of the past and to serve the new social order (Department of Education [DoE], 1997). Taking this into account the ministry of education was projected at turning the old institutions into new universities with transformed identities and cultures that go beyond their history of segregation (CHE, 2000).

Like other national systems the Ministry of higher education in South Africa is concerned with diversity (CHE, 2000). Diversity is defined as “ways in which institutions seek to integrate and manage those individuals and groups not fully represented with them” (Thaver, 2009: 406). According to CHE (2000) institutions of higher education are required to demonstrate diversity in a variety of programmes that they offer, in their teaching and research competencies, in their human and physical assets, in the credentials of their staff and so forth. It is further indicated that institutions of higher learning in South Africa are mandated to defend the progression of democracy which is related to promoting good citizenship (CHE, 2000). In his definition of diversity Thaver (2009) attests that the process of diversity seeks to integrate individuals. To this effect some studies contend that it becomes a problem if the inclusion of people in programmes directs them to their incorporation in ways that subject them to existing standings (Sayed, Soudien & Carrim, 2003). Catering for diverse groups does not mean that institutions of learning should create access without recognising the differences of the groups included (Sayed et al., 2003). Moreover Sayed et al. (2003) warns against the practice of ‘window dressing’ during which institutions respond because there is a need for change without understanding the necessity to transform the institutions from within in order to cater for the different groups. Institutions that are unresponsive to managing diversity within their territory turn to promote assimilation of incoming groups so that they adapt to existing norms (Sayed et al., 2003).
Focusing specifically on institutional culture, the White Paper 3 recommends that universities should place emphasis on the importance of advancing the cultivation of institutional cultures which represent values and promote behaviour which is intended to unify, reconcile, build respect for difference and also promote common good (DoE, 1997). It is further indicated that South African universities should promote a campus environment which is responsive to racial and cultural diversity (DoE, 1997). It is important to acknowledge that South Africa’s history has led to more diverse races and ethnic groups. In this context this study is aimed at understanding how university students who are from these diverse cultures and races find ways of coexisting in their university residences given South Africa’s history of segregation.

Various institutions in the country have to modify their policies to respond to the demands of transformation as put forward by the Constitution and other relevant legislation. According to Ramphele (2008) transformation implies that there should be changes in the structures, institutional policies, arrangements and relationships within society. This statement concurs with Badat (2009) when he states that transformation in most instances is aimed at disbanding the existing social standings and establishments together with the legislation in order to come up with something that can be considered new. South African universities with diverse student populations are the microcosm of South Africa’s society. Universities thus have the potential to provide an environment that is conducive for culturally different students to share rich experiences brought from their diverse ethnic and cultural backgrounds (McLean, 2000). In addition to this they could play an important role as platforms for issues of tolerance, inclusion, access and structural inequalities to be addressed (Cross, 2004). This implies that institutions have to create opportunities that will help students to experience genuine racial integration and also encourage them to interact in meaningful ways (Gurin, Nagda, & Lopez, 2004). It is thus important for institutions to go beyond the enrolment increments of particularly previously disadvantaged groups because the achievement of simple numerical diversity does not guarantee interaction between diverse groups staying on the same campus (Gurin et al., 2004).

Professionals in student affairs have the responsibility to encourage students to embrace diversity and accept differences between them (Bleiberg, 2003). This can be done through ensuring that the policies of a university are consistent with the diverse nature of the institution’s population. Students who seek accommodation in university residences are from different racial, ethnic and/or religious backgrounds. Thus it is the responsibility of the university to encourage them to form relationships and learn from each other (Bleiberg,
2003). Efforts of encompassing diversity in South African university residences are often met with intense resistance from students who are still trapped in extreme racial worlds. However, there are instances in which institutions are managing issues of diversity and inequality to the extent that it might be possible to change the institutional culture to reflect a more inclusive paradigm (Nkomo, Vandeyar, Malada, Phatlane, Tabane & Phurutse, 2009). In the light of the above arguments it is obvious that institutions that encompass diversity will observe practices that are consistent with human rights, ensure equality among their population and educate their people to live together irrespective of differences.

2.4 The nature of interactions between diverse students

Interactions between diverse people can either be positive or negative. In an ideal environment positive interaction is extended further than just bringing together diverse people in one institution (Gurin, Dey, Hurtado & Gurin, 2002; Strayhorn, 2008). The process should include getting to know each other’s backgrounds, beliefs, and over and above to know each other as individuals (Gurin et al., 2002). It is also indicated that where the environment was unrestricted and transformative, students from different backgrounds would interact and meet on equal status (Banks, 2008; Stearns et al., 2009). If students meet and deliberate as equals they will develop constructive racial and ethnic attitudes that will enable them to survive in a multicultural society (Antonio, 2001; Banks, 2008; Halualani, 2010). To this effect the results of a study by Halualani (2010) show that students preferred the kind of interactions where preconceived stereotypes are acknowledged and dealt with in order to create a conducive environment for a multicultural society (Halualani, 2010).

Furthermore research shows that university residences allow for the development of friendships between diverse students (Lee, 2006; Rinn, 2004; Sias et al., 2008; Stearns et al., 2009). Hence, Rinn (2004) argues that students who live at university residences may be inclined to associate with one another. Rinn further states that once people with common interests are brought together friendships usually emanate. To substantiate this Stearns et al. (2009) contends that students who share their rooms with others from different racial groups proved to have a higher number of cross-race friendships.

On the other hand the results of the study by Johnson (2003) highlight that though students of different races may behave civilly towards one another; the possibility is that some of them may be harbouring hostility towards other races. To support this notion Johnson (2003) reveals evidence from a study which proved that the tendency to put constraints on how far
some students were willing to interact with diverse students was evident by their reluctance to share rooms with those of a different race or culture. In another study results did not report explicit racism, although interactions between diverse students were still negative (Lewis, Chesler & Forman, 2000). There were instances in which explicit racism could be detected amongst student interactions in some university residences. For example: racial insults written in elevators (Harwood, Huntt & Mendenhall, 2009), white students treated badly by other white students for interacting with black students (Lorenz, 2009), graffiti that expressed racism and flags hanging from a residence window written ‘Niggers go home’ (Davis, Dias-Bowie & Geenberg, 2004).

Moreover evidence from research shows that when students talk about their challenges and conflicts they often find ways to cooperate. With regard to this point, Lee (2006) outlines how comparable problems caused by untidiness were treated differently by two students in one university residence. One student chose to tidy up the mess caused by others and kept quiet about it. Though the action taken was commendable, this student was found to be depressed about the situation at hand. Another student chose to call a meeting that came up with ground rules. The results showed that when diverse students communicated they did not associate their conflicts with negative connotations. However they enhanced exchange of information and interactions (Lee, 2006). In the following section I present the international landscape based on interactions of diverse students.

2.5 Interactions of diverse students: the international landscape

This section of the chapter highlights some of the studies undertaken in the international sphere on integration of students at some universities. First I chose to draw attention to the lack of integration at university residences, second I chose to review literature based on integration in the United States of America (USA), third, I highlight how walls of lack of integration were demolished in the United States of America, fourth I chose to take a brief look at the progress of integration in the USA’s educational institutions, and fifth I review literature in other parts of the world.

The lack of integration at university residences between students of diverse races and cultural backgrounds is apparent from a vast volume of literature (For example: Antonio, 2001; Breaux, 2002; Kaya & Weber, 2003). Some studies suggest that living arrangements in several university residences were seen as a way of segregating diverse students (Brown, 2009; Peacock & Harrison, 2009; Thornton, Brichenno, Iyer, Reid, Wankhede & Green, 2010;
Ward & Masgoret, 2004). A study conducted in the United Kingdom and India revealed that at certain universities, the authorities usually allocate international students to specific residences (Thornton et al., 2010). The same trend was described by Koehler and Skvoretz (2010) in their study conducted at an American University. They discovered that incoming black students were allocated residences that already had a high percentage of black residents. They attributed this lack of integration to the preferences of black students. Trying to make sense of diverse student interactions at an Irish university, Dunne (2009) reports that local students stated that their international counterparts lived in separate residences; a move which limited interaction between them. In view of such scenarios, a number of authors (for example: Thornton, et al., 2010; Ward & Masgoret, 2004) concur with the argument advanced by Brown (2009) that the same pattern of segregation can also be observed in dining halls and other social settings. I am of the opinion that this kind of living arrangement limits contact between diverse students.

Even though there are numerous studies in the area of student integration throughout the world, there is sadly very little evidence of studies conducted within multicultural societies such as those presented by South African higher education institutions since most of them document interactions between host students and international students. The USA however, has offered research documenting a landscape of racial desegregation in universities which is more relevant to my study. Although some of the literature in the USA landscape is not necessarily most recent, it is still appropriate to refer to it in the context of this study. Consequently I have decided to give a more detailed version of how USA universities went through desegregating black students in predominantly white universities from early years to the current era. One cannot even begin to talk about these universities without reflecting on the society in which they exist. In relation to this Hurtado (1992) states that what happens on a campus is influenced by the common practices in society. Isolation of black and white people was formalised in America through legislation from the time when the states were established (Bittle, 1959). It is further indicated that the perseverance of racial segregation in American neighbourhoods implies that most of the American students lived in separate black-only communities before joining institutions of higher learning (Gurin et al., 2002). This separation still persists because of the legacy from white families who wanted to maintain the racial homogeneity of their surrounding areas between the 1920s and the 1970s (Hill, 2009). Accordingly the influx of black people to the territory of white people led to racial tensions and what Hill (2009); Hunter and Danahoo (2004) referred to as white flight. One notable event was when the district known as Prince Edward County closed its public schools and
introduced private schooling in order to deny the integration of black students (Hunter & Danahoo, 2004). The court viewed the decision as a way of propagating racial discrimination and put it on hold (Hunter & Danahoo, 2004).

In another study Bobo and Zubrinsky (1996) examined attitudes on residential integration in America. They noticed that some humble improvement in residential integration occurred between 1980 and 1990 but blacks continued to be segregated from whites more than any other ethnic groups found in the USA. During this time white people were viewed as members of the in-group while blacks were cast out as members of the out-group. The assumption made by Bobo and Zubrinsky (1996) was that the detachment between black and white people was attributed to what was preferred by the in-group members rather than the evasion of the out-group members. Inconsistent with the assumption of Bobo and Zubrinsky (1996) the respondents in their study viewed prejudice as central to the restraints of residential integration. Furthermore restrictions of integration were invigorated by ‘white flight’ which according to some respondents resulted from some white people’s perception that desegregation of residences was destabilizing established status quo which positioned whites as a privileged and superior race (Bobo & Zubrinsky, 1996).

Moreover a study based on racial segregation and disparities in quality across US nursing homes was conducted by D. B. Smith, Feng, Fennell, Zinn and Mor (2007). Findings from this study indicated that racial segregation was prevalent in US’s nursing homes as they replicated the dispositions of a divided society. To this effect D. B. Smith et al. (2007) claim that it was the norm for blacks to be assigned to nursing homes that were not in ideal condition. In relation to this Martin, Karabel and Jaquez (2005) highlighted that there was a rise in segregation in the US which is partly accredited to the termination of desegregation plans that were ordered by the courts. In my opinion this separation of black and white people did not promote interactions of racially diverse groups in the US. Such dynamics of segregation in the society can also be observed at university campuses as claimed by Buttny (1999).

2.5.1 How the walls of segregation were demolished in the United States of America

The focus of this section is on the context of segregation with regard to education in the USA and how it was challenged by those who resisted and opposed it. In a nutshell this section first looks at the attempts to integrate universities in USA. Second, it looks at the admission of black students to historically white universities. Third, it looks at the allocation of student
accommodation in such institutions. Fourth, it deals with access to student facilities in these institutions and lastly, it explores the issue of student societies.

To begin with, in order to ensure that no one defected from their segregationist policies in educational institutions, some states in the US used to punish those who conducted mixed classes, taught multiracial students or attended racially diverse schools (Bittle, 1959; “The Anita Hill chair,” 1996). For instance, in 1941 the state of Oklahoma put in place a law which made it illegal for white schools to admit black students. This law also applied to higher education institutions (“The Anita Hill chair,” 1996). Even though the education system was based on what was referred to as ‘separate but equal’, Coleman (2010) argues that the segregation policies in education were used to hinder the progress of black children. It is also evident that the claim of separate but equal did not always prevail. This view is supported by evidence from the University of Oklahoma which offered a variety of qualifications which were meant for white students only, and Langston University which only presented undergraduate degrees that were specifically created for black Americans (“The Anita Hill chair,” 1996).

Due to such disparities in education the status quo was challenged by a number of legal cases brought against the various boards of education in the USA. Some of the cases will be referred to in this literature review. Most of the studies documenting desegregation of educational institutions in the USA report and dwell at length on deficiencies and very slightly on instances of successful integration. This view is supported by Padgett (2001) who observed the lack of published research on harmonious instances of desegregation in USA institutions, especially in the Southern states.

Given the historical context of segregation in the USA, attempts to integrate some of the universities were seriously challenged. For example, the first attempt to integrate the University of Oklahoma occurred in 1946 when Ada Louis Sipuel applied for admission and her application was rejected (“The Anita Hill chair,” 1996). A second attempt at integrating the University of Oklahoma was rejected in February 1948 when George W. McLaurin applied for admission (Bittle, 1959; Johnson; 1954; Padgett, 2001; Slater, 1996; “The Anita Hill chair”, 1996). Findings showed that in response to such actions a court decision ordered that G.W McLaurin be admitted to the University of Oklahoma (Bittle, 1959; Johnson; 1954; Padgett, 2001; Slater, 1996; “The Anita Hill chair,” 1996). Nevertheless there is one court case which stands out in relation to the desegregation of educational institutions in the USA.
and that is the 1954 case of Brown v. Board of Education (Coleman, 2010; Padgett, 2001; “Unappreciated hero,” 2001; Zirkel & Cantor, 2004). The decision made on Brown v. Board of education case clarified the right of black people in America to attend predominantly white schools. That verdict also led to the eradication of formal racial segregation in the USA education systems (Hunter & Danahoo, 2004; Padgett, 2001; Zirkel & Cantor, 2004). As a result the process of integrating black students was started in USA’s educational institutions.

Even after the Brown v. Board of education verdict, challenges of integration still prevailed. In February 1956 another attempt to integrate students got underway at the University of Alabama when Autherine Lucy was granted admission. However the occurrence was brought to a standstill three days after her admission when a furious crowd of students threw rocks, tomatoes, and eggs on her (“The Alabama College,” 2005; Slater, 1996). As a result the University of Alabama expelled Autherine Lucy for safety reasons. Elsewhere a tarnished incident was documented at the University of Georgia (Cohen, 1996; “Race sensitive admissions,” 2000; Slater, 1996; Sokol, 2006; “Unappreciated hero,” 2001). This occurred in 1959 when two teenagers were refused admission and the university claimed that there was no space for them in the student residences (Slater, 1996). Moreover an attempt to integrate the University of Mississippi (also known as Ole Miss) started in 1961 when James Meredith applied for admission at Ole Miss and this led to another dragging court case in Mississippi (Bryant, 2006; “Chasing the confederate,” 2002-2003; Cohodas, 1997; Eubanks, 2004). Cohodas (1997) explains that during the initial application Meredith did not disclose that his race was black; as a result the university encouraged him to continue with his application. The encouragement was however terminated when Meredith made it known to the university that he was black and as a result his application was rejected (Cohodas, 1997).

The various refusals to integrate predominantly white universities led to more court cases which paved the way for the admission of blacks in historically white universities. During the early years of integration findings show that blacks were only admitted to white universities for courses that were not available at the institutions that they were restricted to. In addition, they were supposed to get permission from the state regents of higher education (Bittle, 1959; Johnson, 1954). As the process of integration unfolded the demise of segregationist laws forced most state universities to admit black students to their institutions. Here are some notable examples: First in 1960 a court ordered that Charleyne Hunter and Hamilton Holmes be admitted to the University of Georgia. This led to their enrolment in 1961. The event was met with resistance from some of the students. Second in 1962 the court ordered the
admission of Meredith at Ole Miss (Byrant, 2006; Cohodas, 1997; Eubanks, 2004). In a different study “At Duke University,” (2000) indicates that Duke University made the move to reconsider its admission policy after a television program revealed the extent to which racial segregation prevailed on the university campus. Accordingly the enrolment of black students triggered resistance to integration by some white students (Byrant, 2006; “Chasing the confederate,” 2002-2003; Slater’ 1996; “The Alabama College,” 2005).

Moreover the admission of black students in some predominantly white universities was undermined by the occurrence of racial confrontations. A study by Eubanks (2004) showed that students and other segregationists got together to oppose integration a night before Meredith was registered at the University of Mississippi and that led to the death of two people and many injuries. The interaction between Meredith and white students at Ole Miss were negative to such an extent that he could not move freely on the campus. In relation to this Meredith’s activities were monitored. He was also guarded at his residence by the state security (Byrant, 2006; “Chasing the confederate,” 2002-2003; Eubanks, 2004). In similar circumstances the white students at the University of Georgia demonstrated overt racism that blemished the first attempt to integrate black people. Cohen (1996) indicates that the protesters set fire in the forest next to a residence accommodating one of the black students at the University of Georgia. In addition they threw bricks and other objects at her room. As the demonstrations got violent the two black students were suspended for their own safety but were later reinstated through a court order (Sokol, 2006). In this state of affairs most students were determined to remain unfriendly as they felt that they could not tolerate interacting with outsiders (Cohen, 1996). Meanwhile some of the white students stayed away from interacting with black students because of peer pressure (Cohen, 1996).

The findings of a study conducted by Sokol (2006) reveal mixed perceptions of students in relation to the admission of black students at the University of Georgia. He studied essays written by one of the classes at the University of Georgia based on the topic “What do you think of integration?” The dominant view among those who supported segregation was that integration was a threat to white hegemony. It was apparent that the beliefs inherited by some of the students informed their views. Among other stereotypes they indicated that all blacks were inferior, had no morals, were lazy and primitive (Sokol, 2006). This cohort of students treated black students as intruders and took a resolution that they should be alienated. Sokol (2006) attests that some white students wanted to sustain segregation as they explicitly indicated that the court’s decision to integrate blacks into the university was being imposed on
them. At this point positive interaction of diverse students was limited and in accordance with this interracial contact at the University of Georgia brought despair for black students. In spite of that some of the white students supported integration (Sokol, 2006). Some of the students that supported integration felt that segregation undermined democracy and was morally wrong whereas some were of the opinion that white people were responsible for the circumstances around black people and also believed that blacks should be offered the same education as whites in order to improve their living conditions (Sokol, 2006). Although there were challenges to integration, most state universities in the USA were prompted to open their doors to people of different races without prejudice.

In spite of the decision to enrol black students in predominantly white universities student residences were still segregated (Bittle, 1959; Johnson, 1954). A lack of integration in student residences was also revealed by Breaux (2002, 2010) at the University of Iowa which had already enrolled black students in 1915. The findings show that white students and white administrators took a decision to prohibit black students from living in the student residences. What was more unfortunate was the fact that such racism often resulted in lack of off-campus residences for black students (Breaux, 2010). It is reported that the decision to integrate male student residences at the University of Iowa came into effect in 1946. The university also limited the provision of accommodation to female students who resided in the state of Iowa (Breaux, 2002, 2010). Other than that in the 1930s Ohio State University turned down two female students from taking a course in Home Economics because it required them to stay at a university residence occupied by white female students (Tyran, 2011). Elsewhere a study by O’Connor (2004) highlighted that in 1949 there was remarkable support for integration of black students at the University of Washington. This led to the eventual admission of black students in 1952. However, interactions with white students were restricted by segregation in student residences.

According to Bittle (1959) initially at the University of Oklahoma integration was limited to the lecture room only. Black students were not accommodated in the university residences and had to commute from Oklahoma City. Johnson (1954) however argues that at a later stage black male students were usually integrated with white male students but were not allocated the same rooms. Female student residences were not integrated, so black women were often assigned to residences that were less comfortable (Johnson, 1954). Similarly, this is what happened at the University of Mississippi where the first black students to be enrolled at the university were assigned to share a room in a residence that was secluded from the
white student residences (Cohodas, 1997). Moreover, it was observed that the first black student at the University of Maryland was barred from staying in the university residences and as a result the student dropped out within a year (Slater, 1996). In addition when the University of Colorado was put under pressure its administrators agreed to admit black students but they were housed in private cottages (Hays, 2004). What is more poignant for me is that during athletics outings of the University of Colorado, the black team members were allocated separate accommodation. Hinkle (2001) describes the uphill battle of Herman Wells who initiated the integration of black students in the university residence facilities at the University of Indiana, a battle which lasted for 15 years. As the years progressed student residences were integrated, although studies show that a lack of interaction continued within the residence halls (Bittle, 1959; Breaux, 2002; Eubanks, 2004).

Findings from other previous studies show that students were later given the same treatment during room allocation at the University of Oklahoma, as they were concentrated in residences of low preference since the university alleged that they had applied late (Bittle, 1959). It is also reported that only in 1949 the residences where opened to all students at the University of Iowa. Even though it might sound praiseworthy racial segregation continued to occur within the residences where room allocation was determined by race (Breaux, 2002). By the time administrators accepted black students in residence halls at the University of Colorado, they were allocated separate rooms as officials felt that white students might refuse to share bathrooms with them (Hays, 2004). Recent studies indicate that the Universities of Colorado and Indiana have since overcome the challenge of integration since black students who were living in inadequate facilities, now live in the residence halls with their white classmates. This allows for interaction between diverse students to take place (Hays, 2004; Hinkle, 2001). Even though students were no longer assigned rooms according to race at the University of Mississippi, there have been points of tension between black and white students (Eubanks 2004). In particular the points of tension included racially diverse roommates not talking to each other, avoiding being in the room at the same time, and other detrimental disputes (Eubanks, 2004). Challenges of integration were not limited to student residences only as they were also detected in the barring of black students from using other campus facilities.

Apart from student residences, black students at some universities could not take advantage of the facilities available for white students during the early stages of desegregation. For example available research shows that the first student at the University of Oklahoma was
allocated a different sitting area which had access to view the main classroom which was a white preserve (Bittle, 1959; Johnson, 1954). In addition to that he was allocated a different table in the library which was out of sight of the white students. He was also allocated a different time to buy food in the cafeteria. To add to that he was allocated a different toilet (Bittle, 1959; Johnson, 1954; Padgett, 2001; Slater, 1996; “The Anita Hill chair”, 1996). A study by Hays (2004) painted a very blurred picture of racial integration at the University of Colorado. Hays points out that the faculty administrators declined to provide facilities and access to the general dining hall to black undergraduate or graduate students on campus during the 1930s (Hays, 2004). Not only were black students excluded from campus facilities, but they were usually denied service at local restaurants (Breaux, 2002). By the time all students had access to eat in the cafeteria and socially meet in the common rooms, there was an indication of self-segregation as the students isolated themselves in terms of their racial groups (Bittle, 1959). Apart from student facilities the denial to integrate was also depicted in student societies.

Moreover student societies and organisations were characterised by a lack of interaction between black and white students. For instance in an attempt to put emphasis on segregation at the University of Mississippi student groups like ‘Rebel underground’ and ‘Knights of the Forest-University of Mississippi’ emerged (Eubanks, 2004). The two groups advocated that there should be ‘preservation of racial heritage’ that was aimed at limiting intergroup contact with black students. According to Eubanks (2004) segregation was also evident in the extent to which fraternities (male students’ social groups in universities) and sororities (female students’ social groups in universities) were dominated by white students. These social groups upheld the dominant culture, heritage and traditions which served as a barrier to intergroup contact. In agreement with this, members of fraternities and sororities at the University of Mississippi kept provoking symbols like the confederate flag which was an icon of white supremacy (Cohodas, 1997; Eubanks, 2004). As an indication of the persistence to preserve white supremacy and to reject transformation, the first house which was built to accommodate the black fraternity was burnt down by white students in 1988 at the University of Mississippi (Cohodas, 1997). In view of the reviewed literature the early years of integration were characterised by tensions.

In an attempt to make sense of the tension between black and white students, Eubanks (2004) explains that many of the white students never attended the same schools as black people nor resided next to them. Black students came from areas where boundaries between racial
groups where strongly emphasised. It is argued that such hindrances made it difficult for some black students to adjust to their new residences and consequently some started to isolate themselves while others transferred to predominantly black universities (Eubanks, 2004).

In spite of all the challenges highlighted in this section, findings show that institutions made efforts to improve the interaction of diverse students (“At Duke University,” 2000; Breaux, 2002; “The Anita Hill chair”, 1996). Hence according to “Chasing the confederate,” (2002-2003) the University of Mississippi is now at the forefront of bringing together racially diverse students. It is also indicated that the University of Oklahoma has since made a remarkable improvement with regard to the integration of racially diverse students (“The Anita Hill chair”, 1996). It was further mentioned that Duke University has since succeeded in eradicating the reputation of negative race relations (“At Duke University,” 2000). On the other hand Breaux (2002) argues that racism was never abolished at the University of Iowa but had just changed its form.

In the foregoing section, I focused on the following pertinent issues with regard to student integration: first, attempts to integrate universities in the USA, second, admission of black students in historically white universities, third, allocation of student accommodation, fourth, access to student facilities and fifth, student societies. In the following section I therefore examine how the integration of diverse students progressed in educational institutions of the United States of America.

2.5.2 Progression of integration in educational institutions of the USA

Having dealt with the integration of diverse students in universities in the early years of desegregation in the USA I decided to also give a brief overview of how it progressed in a number of educational institutions. In this section I pay particular attention to the following concepts: self-segregation, institutional practices, theme housing, and student social groups.

The United States is usually regarded as a democratic society with unrestricted opportunities for all (Pewewardy & Frey, 2002). However, there are instances where studies report on separatism at university campuses (Bonilla-Silva et al., 2006; Jones, Castellanos & Darnell, 2002). To this Hughey (2007) attests that even though the US higher education remains segregated along racial lines, it is no longer hostile. Central to this lack of integration are the stories of self-segregation which come as a result of segregated eating spaces, ethnically divided fraternities, racial theme residences, etc.
University residences bring students from diverse backgrounds together. Some of these students have to live together at university residences. A study by Li (2008) revealed that segregation still occurs in most university residences. Various studies show that students segregate themselves according to race and ethnicity (Antonio, 2001; Buttny, 1999; Douglas, 1998; Fisher & Hartmann, 1995; Koehler & Skvoret, 2010; Lewis et al., 2000; Li, 2008; S. S. Smith & Moore, 2000; Stearns et al., 2009; Villalpando, 2003). A study based on a black student population was conducted by S. S. Smith and Moore (2000) at a predominantly white university. What is interesting from the findings of this study is how segregation occurred even when the opportunity for interracial contact had been created. During the first few weeks of the academic year diverse students were allocated tables with their housemates in the dining halls to support unity and encourage a sense of community. Students were not obliged to sit with their housemates throughout the year. S. S. Smith and Moore (2000) report that some black students perceived their time in the dining hall as an opportunity to bond and interact with other black students. For that reason they left the allocated tables and joined the table referred to as the black table (mostly occupied by black students). This resonates with the claim that black students form their own social groups to deal with alienation and hostility from the larger campus community (S. S. Smith & Moore, 2000). In some instances black students were against interracial dating and friendships as such actions were seen as betrayal of the black race (S. S. Smith & Moore, 2000). Contrary to this, some black students did not see the necessity of bonding only with blacks while detaching themselves from whites (S. S. Smith & Moore, 2000).

Another study was conducted by Douglas (1998) at a public predominantly white university which is located in the Midwest of the United States. The assumption made by Douglas was that segregation between diverse students took place willingly. Some of the participants in the study claimed that every student felt content around people they were familiar with. Apparently self-segregation was also evident in social activities with black and white events conducted at different venues. In addition the venues were inequitable in view of the fact that black students organised their gatherings in lounges and dining areas whereas white students organised their gatherings in fraternity houses. Some of the black students felt that they had to deal with interactions which were based on racial ignorance. Black students in the study indicated that they were extremely cognisant of their race because of the way the white students stared at them. In spite of this some interracial friendships developed in the student residences although strangely those friendships were confined to residences as students in those friendships did not associate together in dining halls and other social spaces. The
students in the study attributed their limited interactions to the fact that they did not relate to the same challenges and to the differences in cultures (Douglas, 1998).

Another study conducted by Fisher and Hartmann (1995) at Southwest Missouri State University showed related results. The findings of this study revealed that many black students did not desire more interracial contact and they separated themselves to form predominantly black groups. Most of them expressed the need to stick with their own people and interpreted socialising with other races as the same as selling out. The dominant view was that students preferred to be among people with whom they shared the same preferences and had collective goals. The tendency to self-segregate was also observed among white students and some of the participants argued that segregation of black students and white students prevented beneficial contact between them. The results indicated that black students were also left out by white students from activities in residences. On the other hand findings show that black and white students were of the same opinion that opportunities for constructive interracial and multicultural learning are important in resolving cross-racial challenges among students (Fisher & Hartmann, 1995).

The study by Lewis et al. (2000) revealed the phenomenon of assimilation of black students into white territories at a predominantly white university. In student residences black students indicated that they were compelled to adapt and seek likeness with their white peers who in turn expected black students to demonstrate explicit racial or ethnic stereotypes. Moreover in accordance with these black students who assimilated and behaved like white students were applauded for fitting in by their white counterparts. Typical to an environment that does not celebrate diversity, the result of the study by Lewis et al. (2000) exhibited the occurrence of ‘colour blindness’ where roommates tried to overlook racial differences. With regard to this Lewis et al. argue that by ignoring racial disparities, the race or culture of black students was being dealt with as unimportant or a worthless part of their lives. Evidently the interaction between black and white students was strained by the lack of acceptance of diverse cultures. That led to black students segregating themselves to form support groups within the campus. Some of the black students felt that assimilation contributed to their lack of knowledge with regard to their culture, history and traditions (Lewis et al., 2000). In contradiction white students had some difficulty in understanding why black students accentuated the need to appreciate diverse cultures and why they could not just fit in.
Additionally institutional practices also determined the extent to which diverse students will interact with each other. In some instances universities are making attempts to teach students to appreciate diversity (Nagda, Kim & Truelove, 2004). Whereas in some instances they are being accused of subscribing to a practice of ‘racial neutrality’ and ‘colour blindness’ (Villalpando, 2003). Starting with how institutions can positively intervene in creating a platform for the interactions of diverse students Nagda et al. (2004:196) argued that “teachers and social scientists are called upon to articulate a more empowering legacy for education, to prepare students to understand, live, and participate in a multicultural world”. Hence, in the context of student residences managers can influence the racial and ethnic compositions with policies that illustrate explicit support for intergroup mixing (Stearns et al., 2009). Accordingly, some universities initiated residence hall programmes aimed at dealing with issues of racial and ethnic diversity (Lopez, 2004). At an institution studied by Lopez, some programmes were held to commemorate black history and Asian consciousness. As a consequence positive intergroup attitudes were enhanced by such activities. An article written by Braxton and McCledon (2002) suggests that institutional practices may inspire positive social interactions at university residences. For instance campus dining facilities should be arranged in such a way that they promote social interaction among diverse students. This could be achieved by creating lounges or open-plan seating with chairs arranged in a way that allows students to interact (Braxton & McCledon, 2002). Research shows that university residences provide an environment which is conducive for informal cross-race interactions which can contribute in increasing knowledge about members of the out-group (Saez, Ngai & Hurtado, 2007; Stearns et al., 2009).

Furthermore studies show that some institutions favoured theme housing which categorised students according to their different cultures and ethnicities (Afshar-Mohajer & Sung, 2002; Harwood et al., 2009; Pouncey, 1993). On one hand, it is evident that Cornell University did not discourage self-segregation as it initiated ‘ethnic’ or ‘identity’ residences (Afshar-Mohajer & Sung, 2002). For example it established a residence called Ujamaa for black students with an interest in black heritage, it later established the Latino living centre and lastly, it established Akwe:kon for people with an interest in native American culture (Afshar-Mohajer & Sung, 2002, Salz & Trubowitz, 1998). What seems to be propelling segregation amongst the diverse groups at Cornell University is the fact that these ethnic residences advertise themselves using stereotypical features of their different races (Afshar-Mohajer & Sung, 2002). On the other hand, residence options at Amherst University took into consideration an African American cultural residence and an Asian cultural residence (Afshar-Mohajer &
It is also indicated that Columbia University allowed students with a common interest to live together (Afshar-Mohajer & Sung, 2002). From the preceding examples, one can deduce the salient intentions to use race as a factor for choosing roommates and residences which is often clearly revealed in the mission statements of some of the residences which were aimed at creating racial awareness and distinctiveness (Afshar-Mohajer & Sung, 2002). As a consequence interactions between diverse students are limited by this kind of living arrangement.

Likewise the trend of lack of interactions between diverse students can also be observed in the composition of student social groups, in particular the fraternities and the sororities in US higher education (Gumprecht, 2006; Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Hughey, 2007; Lorenz, 2009; McCabe, 2011, “The University of Alabama,” 2001). For instance the first fraternity house known as Alpha Delta Phi was built in 1903. It was a white and Christian preserve. The first black fraternity house known as Alpha Phi was established in 1906. Meanwhile, the first Jewish fraternity house known as Zeta Beta Tau was established in 1907 (Gumprecht, 2006). “The University of Alabama” (2001:22) indicates that “Fraternities and sororities as social groups seek out people like themselves, people with similar backgrounds, interests and experiences.” Hence, fraternities and sororities are seen to be endorsing racial separation that prevails by means of traditions and preferences. In addition Hughey (2007) portrayed these student societies as racially prejudiced and narrow-minded.

The University of Alabama is one of the institutions that supported the system of racial separation in students’ social groups. To this effect one of the professors John Pat Herman called for the forced integration of white fraternities and sororities. John further referred to these societies as the ‘Apartheid Greek System’ because no black students were allowed to join them (“The University of Alabama,” 2001). Similarly, at the Catholic University of Loyola, fraternities and sororities did not accept black members (Lorenz, 2009). Many institutions attributed ethnic and racial segregation at university residences to the social organisations’ freedom of choice (Afsher-Mohajer & Sung, 2002). It is apparent that allowing students to choose their roommates promotes racial stereotypes and also limits interaction between diverse students (Afsher-Mohajer & Sung, 2002).

The literature review in this section of Chapter 2 was conducted to highlight the interactions of diverse students in educational institutions in the USA. A number of studies (For example: Byrant, 2006; Cohodas, 1997; Coleman, 2010; Eubanks, 2004; Johnson, 1954; Padgett, 2001;
Slater, 1996; “The Anita Hill chair,” 1996; Zirkel & Cantor, 2004) indicate the plight of black students during the initial attempts to integrate universities. Other studies indicate that when black students were finally allowed to enrol at predominantly white universities, the process was met with resistance in some universities (Byrant, 2006; “Chasing the confederate,” 2002-2003; Cohen, 1996; Eubanks, 2004). In addition, there is an indication that after the initial stage of admission of black students, student residences in most universities remained segregated (Bittle, 1959; Breaux, 2002, 2010; Cohodas, 1997; Hays, 2004; Hinkle, 2001; Johnson, 1954; O’Connor, 2004; Slater, 1996). Furthermore, studies confirmed that black students were also denied access to other facilities including dining halls (Breaux, 2002; Padgett, 2001; Slater, 1996). It is noted that by the time most universities authorized all students to access university accommodation and other facilities, self-segregation started to emerge (Antonio, 2001; Buttny, 1999; Douglas, 1998; Fisher & Hartmann, 1995; Lewis et al., 2000; Koehler & Skvoret, 2010; Li, 2008; S. S Smith & Moore, 2000; Stearns et al., 2009; Villalpando, 2003). Other studies show the emergence of culturally inspired theme housing in various university residences (Afshar-Mohajer & Sung, 2002; Harwood et al., 2009; Pouncey, 1993). Some studies revealed that institutional practices can have an impact on the nature of interactions between diverse students (Braxton & McCledon, 2002; Lopez, 2004; Nagda et al., 2004; Stearns et al., 2009). Lastly, findings of the literature review show that segregation in student social groups still persists (Gumprecht, 2006; Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Hughey, 2007; Lorenz, 2009; McCabe, 2011, “The University of Alabama,” 2001). Based on this evidence, I conclude that most of the studies in the area of interactions of diverse students conducted in the USA report only deficiencies. Hence, the need to conduct studies searching for good practices.

The above subsection has focused on the progression of integration of universities in the USA. I have also paid attention to the following concepts: self-segregation, institutional practices, theme housing, and student social groups. In the following subsection, I discuss interactions of diverse students in other parts of the world.

### 2.5.3 Diverse student’s interactions in other parts of the world

In this section, I present a review of literature based on the interactions of diverse students in different parts of the world. I have based my discussion on the following selected countries: namely the United Kingdom (Britain), Northern Ireland, Netherlands, Australia and other countries in Africa.
2.5.3.1 United Kingdom (Britain)

Bringing multicultural people together is a challenge which predominantly dominates white areas in the United Kingdom (UK) (Johnston, Wilson & Burgess, 2004). First, Britain’s people are segregated by race and second, they were segregated by faith (Crozier & Davies, 2008; Reed, 2005). Accordingly, there is lack of interaction between members of different ethnic groups who function as separate entities (Johnston et al., 2004). Further studies show that schools in Britain are demonstrating a higher level of segregation than the neighbourhoods in which they are located (Burgess, Wilson & Lupton, 2004; Burgess & Wilson, 2005; Johnston et al., 2004; Johnston, Burgess, Deborah, & Harris, 2006; Johnston, Burgess, Harris & Wilson, 2008; Peach, 2007). In the context of Britain, schools lack of interaction can be largely observed between British ethnic groups and Muslims. To begin with, Muslims started to be part of Britain in the 18th century with a large number of them immigrating to the country in the 1960s and the 1970s (Samad, 2004). This influx of Muslims converted a homogeneous Britain into a multicultural society. The Muslims brought with them a distinct faith which made them stand out from most immigrants. In accordance with this the level of segregation for South Asian pupils (who are mostly Muslim with origins from India, Pakistan and Bangladesh) is higher than for black pupils of African heritage and that of black Caribbean pupils (Burgess & Wilson, 2005; Burgess et al., 2004). The discrepancy is evident in the dominance of approximately all white schools and approximately all Muslim schools especially in England (Burgess et al., 2004; Peach, 2007).

A study conducted in Britain by Crozier and Davies (2008) focused on religious and cultural discord with attention paid to Muslims. The results of the study confirm lack of interaction between diverse students in schools. Teachers in the study repeatedly blame the South Asian students for not socialising with their white counterparts. Crozier and Davies argue that for these teachers and members of the dominant ethnic group, integration actually purport that the minority should assimilate. This simply means that for them to be part of the mainstream they just have to blend in. To complement this argument Reed (2005) reports that white British citizens are of the opinion that immigrants who become British citizens, should be persuaded to know how to speak English and give the assurance that they will be devoted to the British society. Muslim students in the study by Crozier and Davies (2008) study are accused of keeping away from university residences and avoiding participation in university social activities. On the contrary, the Muslim students reported racial harassment by white students. For instance one participant gave an account during which a Muslim student was pushed down the stairs by white students. It is further indicated that Muslim girls have their
hijabs (headscarves) pulled off. As a result the Muslim students preferred to socialise at their homes with friends and family. This concurs with Johnston et al.’s (2004) observation which indicates that individuals desire to live among members of their own social group in order to protect themselves from prejudice and to strengthen their social ties. In the mist of all the challenges met by Muslim students, teachers in the study refuted the existence of racism in the school.

Moreover the events of September 11 escalated the isolation of Muslims in Britain (Appleton, 2005; Hopkins, 2010; Reed, 2005). A study by Appleton (2005) revealed that islamophobia increased after the 11th September 2001 bombing of America. Apparently students in a study by Michael felt that Muslims were being targeted and assaulted in the streets by the state security. It was also mentioned in a study by Hopkins (2010) that government policies in the UK made Muslims feel like they were invading white spaces on campus. However, to a certain extent respondents in the study by Appleton (2005) experienced the university environment as positive. This finding is further supported by Hopkins (2010) when she indicates that Muslim students considered the university environment as tolerant and open-minded.

Based on the results of the study by Hopkins (2010), Muslim students attested to institutional racism. The dominant view was that their use of space on campus was constrained. This was noticeable in the use of bars for socials and meetings and to do so was to detach Muslims from gatherings as association with alcohol is against their religion. Also imperative is the concern that a mosque had been separated from other places of faith and for the students in the study it made it clear that the institution was segregating against them. Although students in the study by Hopkins (2010) felt that the campus was liberal and diverse, they also felt that they were excluded in their everyday use of campus resources. These conflicting perceptions put a strain on interactions between white students and Muslim students.

2.5.3.2 Northern Ireland

Studies based on the lack of interaction between diverse groups have also been conducted in Northern Ireland (Cairns, Hewstone, Hughes, Jenkins, Schmidt & Campbell, 2007; Ladd, Fiske & Ruijs, 2010; Lloyd & Robinson, 2008; Schmid, Tausch, Hewstone, Hughes & Cairns, 2008). Studies show that ‘Northern Ireland is a divided society where members of the two main religious groups, Catholics and Protestants have limited opportunity to meet and interact with each other’ (Niens, Cairns & Hewstone, 2003 as cited in Lloyd and Robinson, 2008:1).
There was a lack of opportunities for young people to come into contact with members of other groups as a majority of them went to schools that were segregated (Hargie, Dickson & Rainey, 1999). Nevertheless the results of the study by Cairns et al. (2007) indicated that social ties were stronger within separated communities than in integrated communities. Schmid et al. (2008) revealed the paradoxes of living in a mixed community in Northern Ireland. On one hand participants reported positive contact with individuals belonging to other religious groups while on the other hand some participants reported that mixed communities exposed them to higher levels of hostility and threats by members of the out-group (Schmid et al., 2008). Even so people in mixed communities showed their approval of living in integrated communities and supported cross-religious mixing (Cairns, et al., 2007).

Attempts to make friends and to pay no attention to the rift caused by religious affiliations were observed at a university in Northern Ireland in a study by Hargie et al. (1999). In this respect, students censored their intergroup interactions to avoid sensitive topics. However, some students felt that the university clubs and societies were segregated and not accessible to Protestants. In addition to that, some students alleged that Catholics made little effort to interact and were usually sceptical towards Protestants (Hargie et al., 1999). For reasons such as these, students preferred residences with high a percentage of members from their own religious communities. Although students in the study by Hargie et al. (1999) reported the formation of cross-group friendships, the salient of in-group friendships was also emphasised. This was attributed to the assumption that most Christian groups avoid spending their leisure hours with non-Christians (Hargie et al. 1999). Under these circumstances segregation of diverse students still persists in Northern Ireland.

2.5.3.3 Netherlands
Research shows that even though residential integration was improving in Netherlands, its schools were continuing to be segregated (Ladd et al., 2010; Musterd & Osterndorf, 2007; van der Laan Bouma-Doff, 2007). What is important to note from the studies is that consistent with other European countries, Netherlands was historically considered to be a racially homogeneous country with Dutch the main ethnic group (Karsten, Felix, Ledoux, Meijnen, Roeleveld & van Schooten, 2006). Prior to the early 1950s Dutch communities and schools were desegregated along religious affiliations which were mainly Protestants, Roman Catholics and Secular society (Karsten, et al., 2006; Ladd et al., 2008). Between the late 1950s and 1960s European countries started experiencing an economic boom which led to the influx of untrained and less educated immigrants who inhabited Netherland cities (Ladd et
al., 2010). As the influx of immigrants continued segregation changed its manifestation and advanced from religious separation to ethnic separation (Karsten et al., 2006). Because of the contemporary ethnic diversity, the Netherlands started to experience ethnic conflicts and social isolation in some neighbourhoods (Karsten et al., 2006).

It is imperative to consider that the Netherlands practiced ‘Freedom of Education’ which entailed that parents and schools had the right to decide what type of education to be involved in (Ladd et al., 2010). The problem that arises here is that because of this system schools were segregated by immigrant status and this phenomenon led to purely Islamic, Hindu, Orthodox, and Protestant schools (Karsten et al., 2006; Musterd & Ostendorf, 2007). In urban areas where ethnic minorities make an attempt to integrate predominantly Dutch schools, the impaired practice of ‘white flight’ occurs (Karsten et al., 2006; van der Laan Bouma-Doff, 2007). Dutch parents chose to enrol their children in private schools where people like themselves were in the majority. Resilience to desegregate schools could be observed in the manner in which private schools restricted access to their schools by enrolling learners whose parents were in accord with specific ideals (Ladd et al., 2010). Consequently disparities in education as privileged schools were concentrated in predominantly white areas (Musterd & Ostendorf, 2007). The reviewed literature showed that there was less contact between the various races in the Netherlands. Even though there is a dearth of literature based on the interactions of diverse students in the universities in the Netherlands, I argue that the dynamics of interactions in the societies and the schools will influence how university students interact.

2.5.3.4 Australia

In Australia research reports some challenges between white Australian and Arab-Australian students (Mansouri, 2004; Mansouri & Trembath, 2005). The article by Mansouri and Trembath (2005) revealed that the events of September 11 changed the state of interactions between Arab-Australians and other Australians. It is important to take into account that Arab-Australians have Australia as their country of birth. Their predicament came more to the fore because of the fact that Arab and Muslims were put in a ‘singular homogenous’ group (Mansouri & Trembath, 2005). Consequently student interactions were influenced by occurrences like this. In this instance Arab-Australian students felt that some people did not accept them as Australians (Mansouri & Trembath, 2005). In resonating with this female students were specifically worried about the negative treatment of Muslim girls and women in Australia which included insults and physical violence (Mansouri, 2004). In this regard being
Muslim was seen as a unifying factor which symbolises social cohesion and their distinct cultural identity (Mansouri & Trembath, 2005). Accordingly most Muslim students chose to live within Arab-Australian communities which provided them with protection from racism and social support. Even so developing intercultural relationships was viewed positively by some students in the study by Mansouri and Trembath (2005). Many of the participants felt that student interactions were less problematic since they appeared to be positive with other cross-group young people. However tension was mostly associated with teacher-student relations (Mansouri & Trembath, 2005).

2.5.3.5 Some countries in Africa

In some instances the challenges of interaction included issues relating to gender bias, battles between residences and initiation experience of new students (Mills, 2006; Odejide, 2007). A study by Mills (2006) at Makerere University in Uganda highlighted the dominant position of male students. Female students were tightly controlled by males to an extent that the males did not allow the females to participate freely during residents’ meetings. In the study by Mills (2006) the male hostility of the gendered nature of university residences was matched by lack of respect for female students. Consequently there was an incident in which some male students put pepper and glass in food that was intended for two female residences (Mills, 2006). The interactions sometimes turned into physical aggression caused by battles between students from different residences within Makerere University. Students’ interactions at Makerere University residences deteriorated to an extent that affluent students started to look for accommodation outside the campus (Mills, 2006). Elsewhere a study by Odejide (2007) revealed the exploitation of female students in a Nigerian university residence. More specifically women students in residences provided domestic services for males (Odejide, 2007).

Race was also used to formalize segregation at a university in Zimbabwe. Gaizanwa (2007) gave an account of the racial disposition of campus interactions during the early years of the University of Zimbabwe, which among others, was characterised by racially separated residences.

The literature reviewed in this section of Chapter 2 reveals that there is lack of interaction between different races and different religious groups specifically in Britain (Burgess et al., 2004; Burgess & Wilson, 2005; Johnston et al., 2004; Johnston et al., 2006; Johnston et al., 2008; Peach, 2007). It is also revealed that schools were more segregated in terms of
Catholics and Protestants in Northern Ireland than the surrounding neighbourhoods (Cairns et al., 2007; Schmid et al., 2008; Ladd et al., 2010; Lloyd & Robinson, 2008). The literature also reveals that in certain universities students preferred residences with a high percentage of members from their own religious group. Other studies reveal that in the Netherlands where attempts to integrate occur, they are usually met with ‘white flight’ which encourages less contact between races (Karsten et al., 2006; van der Laan Bouma-Doff, 2007). Even though there are few studies which report on the interaction of diverse students in other African countries, there is nevertheless evidence of studies that reveal that gender and race impact on the nature of interactions between diverse students (Gaizanwa, 2007; Mills, 2006; Odejide, 2007). In this section I focused on the interactions of diverse students in different parts of the world. I based my discussion on the following selected countries; namely the United Kingdom (Britain), Northern Ireland, Netherlands, Australia and other countries in Africa. In the next section I present the literature based on the interactions of diverse students at university residences in South Africa.

2.6 Interaction of diverse students: The South African landscape
This section has two main parts: the first discusses the interaction of diverse students before and during the apartheid era in South Africa and the second part deals with student interactions at university residences in the post-apartheid era.

2.6.1 Lack of diverse student interactions before and during the apartheid era
Interracial mixing was formerly prohibited during the apartheid era. To this effect various policies were put in place. The Extension of the University Act of 1959 was put together to exclude Blacks, Coloureds and Indians from being admitted to white universities (Finchilescu & Tredoux, 2010). This act was also extended to create less association between students of different ethnic groups with universities formed at various homelands (Anderson, 2003). Moreover the act was complemented by the Group Areas Act of 1950 which barred historically white universities from accommodating students of other racial groups (Greyling, 2007). Because of this exclusion contact between students from different races was limited in South African universities. However there were incidences on which black students were admitted to historically English universities (Cross & Johnson, 2008; Greyling, 2007; Perez & London, 2004). The admission in this regard would only happen with the permission from the minister of education in instances where the course applied for was not offered at their local university (Greyling, 2007; Mabokela & Wei, 2007).
Various researchers conducted studies with segregation as a subject at Rhodes University (Maylam, 2005; Goga, 2008; Greyling, 2007). These studies gave a detailed version of what transpired in the early years at Rhodes University. Maylam (2005) revealed that the ruling body at Rhodes University voted against the admission of non-white students in 1933. This revelation highlights one of the inconsistencies of the past since historically Rhodes University was referred to as an ‘Open university’ which meant that they had the power to include other races in their enrolment. It can be argued that since it was before the inception of apartheid directives the university was under no obligation to segregate (Maylam, 2005). In this occurrence one can argue that those who made decisions at Rhodes University segregated out of their own prejudices and their desire to legitimate white privilege. The implication here is that student segregation existed prior to the apartheid laws at the time when the British colonialists were still in power. In the 1940s very few black students were admitted to Rhodes University. In accordance with this period the non-European students were not allowed to live in residences with their white peers, but had to seek accommodation somewhere else (Greyling, 2007; Maylam, 2005). Interestingly in 1963 Chinese students were provided accommodation in the university residences as they were referred to as ‘honorary whites’. In contrast Indian students were prohibited from staying on campus and had to find accommodation in the Indian side of Grahamstown (Greyling, 2007).

At Rhodes University the paradox of segregation was noteworthy in 1967 when the university hosted the National Union of South African Students (NUSAS) which was a multiracial body. Initially the council agreed to provide segregated accommodation for black delegates on campus (Maylam, 2005). However, the council later retracted its decision and told black delegates to look for accommodation in the townships (Goga, 2008; Greyling, 2007; Maylam, 2005). What is important to note from these studies is that segregation in this regard went beyond allocation of residences. Racial segregation was extended to dining halls and social functions (Greyling, 2007; Maylam, 2005). Although plausible that the NUSAS provided a platform for interaction of diverse students, the implications of social and residential segregation had overwhelming side effects. Rhodes University advanced the Group Areas Act which made it illegal for the university to provide accommodation for non-whites at the university residence as a reason for segregation of NUSAS delegates (Greyling, 2007). Despite the restrictions put forward by the apartheid laws Rhodes University was able to accommodate the black NUSAS delegates in 1968. However, the placement was done in terms of racial groups (Greyling, 2007).
In 1978 a significant number of black students were accommodated in residences at Rhodes University (Greyling, 2007). Even though they lived in separate buildings the dining halls were integrated. The problem that arises here is that the government persisted to deter the university from allowing students to live in university residences. As a result a separate residence to accommodate blacks was put in place (Greyling, 2007). Despite the government’s denial proper integration was introduced in 1980 at Rhodes University. Nevertheless students still preferred less contact with other racial groups and that inflated racial tensions over shared facilities (Greyling, 2007). In 1987 the universities were at liberty to apply to be exempted from the Group Areas Act (Greyling, 2007).

The University of the Witwatersrand (Wits) also experienced challenges relating to integration of students residences. Cross and Johnson (2008) attest that Wits had trouble fostering a sense of community among diverse students. Strategies of facilitating mediation and negotiation of shared space among students did not yield the envisaged results. Even though Wits opened its doors to black students during the apartheid era, the elements of discrimination were evident in how the interactions between students were limited by university administrators. Black students were restricted from living on campus and were also prevented from participating in extramural activities with white students (King, 2001). Student housing at Wits reflected the legacy of apartheid with black students prohibited from accommodation at the university and around the neighbourhood next to it. In the mid-1980s, a university owned residence called Glyn’ Thomas was established specifically for black students in Soweto Township. This arrangement prevented cross-racial relations and disadvantaged the black students who had to commute to the university on a daily basis.

This practice of segregation was also experienced at the University of Cape Town (UCT) (Luescher, 2009; Perez & London, 2004). The study conducted by Perez and London (2004) shows that the admission of black students to UCT’s medical faculty began in the 1940s. However they were restricted from joining university societies, taking part in sport, living in the university residences or even socializing with white students. It is indicated that the university did not provide on-campus accommodation for black students because of the restrictions put forward by the Group Areas act of 1950. UCT helped the students to find accommodation in the non-white areas. The institution went to the extent of establishing a semi-official residence in Gugulethu which is a neighbouring black township (Luescher, 2009). Consistent with this contentious situation most white students did not respond when
they were greeted by black students after medical residences were integrated in the late 1980s. Similar practices were observed by other historically white universities in South Africa.

The above discussion has focused on the lack of interaction of diverse students in universities during the apartheid era. The discussion has been useful in providing the historical background of segregation between diverse students in South Africa. Having dealt with lack of interaction between diverse students in the apartheid era, the following section is focused on the interaction of diverse students in the post-apartheid era.

2.6.2 Student interaction at university residences in the post-apartheid era

The experience of apartheid still impacts negatively on post-apartheid South Africa with striking evidence of resistance to integration by some people (Seeking, 2008). A study by Southern (2008) shows challenges of integration at the University of the Free State (UFS) in the 1990s. He mentions that the attempt to integrate resulted in violent clashes between black and white students. In reaction to this the management of the university came up with a compromise, which resulted in some residences being mainly black and some white. Even after this step was taken, the university had the responsibility to desegregate and continue integrating its hostels more thoroughly. The management created the integration policy in 2007, which a predominantly white student organization called the Freedom Front Plus (FF+) described as forced integration (Marais & de Wet, 2009). The intensity of FF+’s resistance to integration was evident when they took the university to court in an attempt to stop the implementation of the policy (Marais & de Wet, 2009). The FF+ argued that forcing people from different cultural backgrounds to share a residence is equal to discrimination (van der Merwe, 2009).

Southern (2008) states that students used language and other preferences to resist transformation. In this regard he pointed to Afrikaans-speaking students who complained about meetings which had to be conducted in English. The politics were also evident in television preferences when white students complained about black students who wanted to watch soccer when they would rather watch rugby. The meaning the students attributed to language and preferences was used to justify some kind of physical separation (Southern, 2008). The integration at the University of the Free State did not reduce prejudice, particularly white prejudice against blacks even after they were allocated separate residences (Gibson & Claassen, 2009). As Gibson and Claassen (2009:17) notes:
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In March 2008 reports about terrible racial incidents at the University of the Free State (UFS) in Bloemfontein were plastered throughout the South African and international mass media. A video was publicly distributed featuring several, white, male, Afrikaner students from the Reitz residence at UFS leading the mock initiation of the female African cleaning staff who serviced the students’ living quarters. The most infamous sequence involved one student seemingly urinating in some food that the women were later encouraged to eat from bowls placed on the ground.

With reference to this Phatlane (2009) argues that the incident could be interpreted as a forum for protest by the three white students against racially integrated residences. In the light of this incidence it is evident that transforming residence life to be in line with the Constitution based on human rights is still a challenge at UFS. This lack of integration can also be observed in the surrounding white residences of the Free State (Christopher, 2005).

The study by Woods (2001) showed that after black students were integrated at residences at Wits University, the number of white students declined significantly. This supports the argument advanced by King (2001) that even though Wits acknowledge the benefit of a racially diverse environment its residences are still racially segregated. The few white students who live at the residences disassociate themselves from black students and have their own territories (Woods, 2001). Similar attitudes are observed at the University of Kwa-Zulu Natal where campus residences accommodate mostly black students, while the majority of white students prefer to seek accommodation off-campus. Most Indian students are accommodated at their homes (Durrheim et al., 2004). A trend of white flight, where black students are increasingly filling the university residences while white students are steadily departing, was also experienced at the University of Port Elizabeth which is now the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University (Austin, 2001).

At some universities segregation is not only a matter of black and white. The trends that were highlighted in international literature, showing foreign students segregated from locals and females from males, are also evident in South African studies (Durrheim et al., 2004; Soudien et al., 2008). International students who were not from Southern African Development Community (SADC) were given better accommodation at some historically black universities (Soudien et al., 2008).

A study conducted at the University of Natal (now known as the University of KwaZulu-Natal) showed that desegregation does not necessarily lead to integration (Durrheim et al.,
2004). These authors based the discussions of their study on three observations: first they analysed the institutional policy, second they reviewed the changes in staff and students and staff demographics and third they conducted a study on students’ lived experiences of segregation on campus. Student enrolment showed a change in racial demographics at the University of KwaZulu-Natal (UKZN). It is indicated that in 1994 the majority of students were white (61%) whilst black students were about 24%. During the time of the study, the demographics changed drastically with white students dropping to 26% whilst seeing a 54% increase in black students. These changes resonate with the trend of desegregation during which more black people, who were previously marginalized, move into historically white spaces.

Although the demographic profile of UKZN has drastically changed, Durrheim et al. (2004) question the notion that the university has transformed from a ‘racist order’ to an order that encompasses every race. Further, Durrheim et al. (2004:154) argue that “the success of university transformation could be gauged by the degree to which black and white students both experience the campus as an integrated, equitable and non-discriminatory place”. What I conclude from the findings of Durrheim et al.’s study is that transformation at UKZN cannot be rated as successful. To start with, student residences show high levels of segregation with black students separated from whites, locals from foreigners and males from females. Moreover it is indicated that the majority of students in residences are Black, White students prefer to live off-campus whilst Indian students live at home with their parents or relatives. The same developments can be observed at the University of Zululand which is in the same province of KwaZulu Natal (Morrow, 2008). Pertaining to this lack of contact, I think that diverse students at UKZN are detached from one another and consequently student interactions become inefficient.

Durrheim et al. (2004) also attest to the use of different spaces by students belonging to different race groups. It is highlighted that Indian students socialize on the library lawns and their space is called Bombay. One of the residences (Eleanor Russell Hall) which is dominantly occupied by black students is called Sobantu Village (named after a local township) and another residence Umhlanga Rocks (a wealthy historically White suburb). This lack of contact is also evident in lack of cross-race friendships between the students. Most of the students forward cultural differences and personal preferences as reasons for segregation. However black students assume that segregation is being orchestrated by the
university (Durrheim, et al., 2004). Inasmuch as UKZN changed its admission policy to accommodate every race, their policy needs to aim at socially integrating diverse groups.

Another study which focused on informal segregation was conducted at a South African university by Alexander and Tredoux (2010). Their findings indicate that the students acknowledge that the campus is racially segregated. Consistent with the findings of the study by Durrheim et al. (2004) some of the students attribute the phenomenon of informal segregation to two important factors, which are ‘culture difference’ and ‘common interests’. They make a claim that racial identity does not influence their interaction preferences. Contrary to this claim, participants indicate that they find it difficult to get into the spaces that are usually occupied by another race group. These conflicting responses reveal that people choose to avoid accrediting racial boundaries between black and white students to racial identities.

Some studies found that the constructs of masculinity and sexuality also have an influence on how students interact (Harnes, 2007; Pattman, 2007). Students increasingly reported intolerance in relation to their sexual preferences at the University of Western Cape (Harnes, 2007). The study revealed that gays and lesbian students often received threats of what is commonly referred to as “corrective rape”. For this group of students the residences are unsafe and unwelcoming. Contests over power and authority fuelled hostility between Zulu and Tswana male students at the University of KwaZulu-Natal (Pattman, 2007). Findings highlight that Tswana males are associated with wealth and that makes them popular with female students. In contrast Zulu males are threatened by their lack of monetary power and resolve to violence. Pattman (2007) further indicates that there is a distinction between the interactions among male and female students. Female students are portrayed as more polite and helpful to each other whereas males humiliate each other through initiation rituals and bullying.

Student interactions were also the subject of the study conducted by Moguerane (2007). The study was based at a historically Afrikaans university in South Africa. The findings of the study indicate that even in students’ residences that are declared to be integrated, students preferred to live with people of their own races. According to Moguerane (2007) Student Village (the pseudonym he used for the site of his research) did not demonstrate characteristics of a racially integrated student residence but an arena inculcating ‘racial tolerance’. His argument does not only emphasise the lack of integration among students of
different races but goes further to questioning the effectiveness of transformation policies in South Africa. A discovery which is contradictory to transformation policies is that at the Student Village there were vacant rooms in some units that were reserved for whites only and were not allocated to black students in search of accommodation (Moguerane, 2007). Similar to Moguerane’s findings a study which was based at Northern University (pseudonym) by Walker (2005a) showed that black students were never mixed with white students in double rooms. On the basis of White Paper 3 (1997) the then Minister of Education Sibusiso Bengu made it clear that institutions of higher education should encourage racial and cultural diversity on campus. What is important to note from the White paper 3 (1997) is that diverse students have to be exposed to cultures and traditions other than their own. This is in contrast with Moguerane’s findings which suggest that the lack of integration on campus is fuelled by the difference in cultures.

Most of the historically Afrikaans university residences are still upholding residence cultures and traditions that exclude students that do not conform to their specific practices (Barnard, 2010; Jansen, 2004; Moguerane, 2007; Pillay, 2010; Soudien et al., 2008; Walker, 2005b). Research shows that it is common for Afrikaans-speaking students to choose an institution at which to study because of what their parents experienced in the residences during their days as students (Barnard, 2010; Jansen, 2004). For these students traditions and university culture are passed from generation to generation. Meanwhile for black students university residences are just places to stay (Jansen, 2004). The discourse of culture as a hindrance to integration is also brought forward by Pillay (2010). She mentions a notable concept of “Preservation of white Afrikaner culture”. Included in this concept are common language and religion and the exclusion of non-Afrikaans speakers. This makes it clear that this concept is an element of resistance to change which resonates with the core principles of apartheid policies. In accordance with this some students argue that transformation policies that were being implemented at residences threatened and infringed residence culture which had been cherished throughout generations (Barnard, 2010).

The racial division fuelled by conflicting cultures was also evident in the practices of black students (Moguerane, 2007). He explains that black students in residences mobilized each other into upholding township life. The study revealed that students brought into cognisant their ‘blackness’ and emphasised the need to appreciate their common identity (Moguerane, 2007). In relation to this Jansen (2004) mentions that black students in residences retaliated when they felt that residence culture was being imposed on them. In my opinion these
conflicting ideologies become a stumbling block to effective interaction between different groups.

Another study was conducted at the same historically white Afrikaans university (Northern University) by Walker (2005b). In this study she focused on a group of black and white undergraduate students as they narrated their personal experiences. The findings of her study showed that even though students were living in close proximity there was too little interaction between different race groups. One of the participants in the study stated that she does not associate herself with other students but rather interacted with some of the black cleaners. This is consistent with an argument brought forward by Jansen (2004) when he indicates that racially diverse students in residences meet on equal status, which becomes an unusual position as they have to treat each other with respect. Jansen (2004) further argues that whites are used to coming into contact with blacks as domestic workers or labourers. I think this offers an explanation for some of the participants in this study who felt more comfortable when they interacted with the cleaners who were not their peers and might have been considered to be of different status. The salience of language is seen as an influencing factor for contact between students. For both whites and non-whites language is used to exclude members of a different ethnic group or unite the members from similar ethnic groups (Walker, 2005b). As Walker concludes, she indicates that there is potential in the transformation policy of Northern University. She acknowledges that apartheid has been restrained but has not been completely eradicated. In her words Walker (2005b:142) says “what is clear is that all of the students’ lives are marked, whether acknowledged or not, by race, by racialized subjectivities, and by a past or racial separateness.”

A study conducted at the University of Stellenbosch introduced a student residence called Metanoia which is different from other long established residences (Barnard, 2010). It is important to mention that Stellenbosch University is one of the historically Afrikaans universities. Metanoia was established in 2006 and its programs are meant to accommodate diversity and put more emphasis on academic richness. The problem that arises here is that some students were uncomfortable in this kind of residence and they argued that it is a “threat to the Afrikaans character of the university” (Barnard, 2010:45). What is important to note from the findings of this study is that some of these students were resisting transformation by forwarding ‘Afrikaans character’ as a commodity which they could use to exclude other racial groups. This makes it clear that “the Afrikaans value system associated with residence culture” (Barnard, 2010) was still dominant in students’ residences at the University of
Stellenbosch. This resonates with an argument by Visser (2004) that schools and universities were the channels through which the Afrikaner community taught their youth specific ethics. The interactions of diverse students at the University of Stellenbosch also suggested that desegregation does not always lead to integration (Barnard, 2010). There was still a persistent desire for students to interact with those belonging to their own racial groups in residences. This is also evident in the way students occupy various social spaces (Barnard, 2010) which shows lack of intergroup contact in public spaces around the residences and the university as a whole. In this article the author focused on the racial views among white Afrikaans speaking youth who are living outside Metanoia. In this regard the experiences depicted are not of the racially diverse students at this integrated residence. An argument can certainly be made that stories of students who were living together at Metanoia can present a different viewpoint of the interactions of students from different cultural backgrounds. This emphasises the relevance of my study which is aimed at understanding the views of students who live in a residence such as Metanoia as they will be interpreting their own interactions.

Contrary to these findings students at the University of Western Cape have shown some gratification (CHE, 2010). Many students are happy with the integrated residences and they experience the campus space as one of comfort and protection. However, they cite the sharing of bathroom space by men and women as problematic.

In the light of the above I am of the opinion that the paradoxes of residence transformation reveal harsh contemporary realities that deter the effectiveness of integration at South African university residences. I am going to intentionally look for a residence which has a transformation policy that is aimed at integrating students rather than just achieving desegregation. I will further look for a group of students that are exemplary and try to understand how they interpret their experiences. In most of the student residences there is evidence of self-segregation by the members from different races. The emergence of TuksVillage has provided a microcosm of society which has the potential to overcome the legacy of apartheid and triumph over the history of stereotypes and prejudice. The study by Barnard (2010) has brought to light a residence with a program similar to that of TuksVillage. However the author directed his attention to deficiencies which mostly were the views of the non-residents of Metanoia. In the above section I reviewed literature from the South African perspective. In the following section I present a summary of the findings of the literature that I reviewed from the international and the South African landscape.
2.6.3 Summary of findings from the literature review

In this section I first present the summary of findings from the international perspective and further on I present the summary of findings from the South African perspective.

2.6.3.1 Summary of the literature reviewed from the international perspective

This summary of the literature review synthesises findings from the international landscape. It also draws implications from the literature review relating to the interactions of diverse students in universities and repercussions thereof. The literature I searched included recent and not so recent studies which were deemed relevant to the advancement of this study.

Findings from the international perspective identify the following factors as those that contribute and facilitate the interactions of diverse students at university residences: different political eras, racial diversity, diverse religions, room allocation, self-segregation, friendship formation, culture, cultural/ethnic theme housing and institutional practice.

First, the body of literature shows that the interactions of students in the university residences are influenced by what happens in the broader society and this includes politics (Bobo & Zubrinsky, 1996; Gurin et al., 2002; Hurtado, 1992). Available research shows that the USA experienced many challenges during the early years of desegregation with some incidences leading to court cases. At that stage the tendency to resist transformation by the dominant group was accompanied by violent protests (Cohen, 1996; Sokol, 2006). As political affairs evolved many universities opened their doors to all citizens and as a result tensions between diverse students changed form. It is noted from literature that different political eras show varying dynamics of diverse student interaction.

Second, a number of authors reveal that the deficiency in student interactions is mainly attributed to the salience of race (Bittle, 1959; Breaux, 2010; Byrant, 2006; Coleman, 2010; Eubanks, 2004; Gaizanwa, 2007; Hays, 2004; Hinkle, 2001; Hunter & Danahoo, 2004; Padgett, 2001; Sokol, 2006; Zirkel & Cantor, 2004). These studies revealed that the racial composition of the country has an impact on the extent to which social cohesion will prevail. It is also noted in the literature that tension between the black and the white race can be highly detected in the USA community.

Third, diverse religions were considered to be at the centre of lack of interactions between diverse people in some instances (Appleton, 2005; Burgess et al., 2004; Cairns et al., 2007;
Crozier & Davies, 2008; Hopkins, 2010; Ladd et al., 2010; Lloyd & Robison, 2008; Reed, 2005; Schmid et al., 2008). For example literature establishes that in Northern Ireland there was limited interaction between Catholic and Protestant students and elsewhere in Britain the Muslim students were found to be alienating themselves from other students. It was also noted that at some instances Muslim students found some university campuses to be discriminating against their faith (Hopkins, 2010).

Fourth, at some institutions black students were denied accommodation at university residences and had to commute from black residential areas an issue that led to integration being limited to classrooms only (Bittle, 1959; Hays, 2004; O’Connor, 2004). The reviewed literature emphasises that when universities decided to integrate their residences most of them initially allocated rooms according to race as they often feared that white students might refuse to share facilities with their black counterparts. As time went by diverse students received the same treatment in relation to room allocation.

Fifth, it is noted in the literature that where policies to desegregate were put in place self-segregation or informal segregation started to be evident in the manner in which the students used the space around them (Antonio, 2001; Li, 2008; Villalpando, 2003), for example in dining halls, residences and other social settings. Some researchers ascribe self-segregation to the preferences of students (Douglas, 1998). Findings show that in some predominantly white universities blacks avoided interracial contact and formed their own enclaves of predominantly black groups (Fisher & Hartmann, 1995). Some researchers established that minority groups created their own social spaces for support and for a sense of belonging (Douglas, 1998; Fisher & Hartmann, 1995; S. S. Smith & Moore, 2000).

Sixth, some studies uncover constraints in the development of cross-group friendships at university residences (Douglas, 1998; S. S. Smith & Moore, 2000). It is also mentioned that some black students particularly in the USA see interracial friendships as betrayal of the black community and as a result it is discouraged. The literature also reveals that most of the interracial friendships that developed in student residences were restricted because most the involved students did not stay together in other social spaces. Even with evidence of development of cross-group friendships, the importance of in-group friendships was accentuated.
Seventh, the literature also establishes culture as a dividing factor for diverse groups and a unifying factor for the in-group. It is apparent from the literature that those who advocated for the dominant culture emphasised the need to preserve their culture, traditions and heritage, as a result that advanced the development of separate schools, student societies and residences (Cohodas, 1997; Eubanks, 2004; Gumprecht, 2006; Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Hughey, 2007; Lorenz, 2009; McCabe, 2011). Most students chose to socialise with people from their own communities as a way of sustaining their culture, an issue that put constraints on intergroup contact.

Eighth, in some instances literature confirms that some universities encourage the development of cultural and ethnic theme residences (Afsher-Mohajer & Sung, 2002; Harwood et al., 2009; Pouncey, 1993). It is also noted in the literature that theme-based residences were found to promote informal segregation as they categorise students according to their different cultures and ethnicities. The literature reveals that the use of stereotypical features to promote such residences fuelled discrimination (Afsher-Mohajer & Sung, 2002) therefore, theme based residences promote re-segregation and reduce interaction of diverse students.

Last, the literature also establishes that institutional practices can influence the interactions of diverse students. Some university administrators introduced policies that encourage students to accept diversity and difference (Lopez, 2004; Nagda et al., 2004; Stearns et al., 2009). Meanwhile some universities perpetrate racial neutrality and colour blindness (Villalpando, 2003) which promote assimilation during which subordinate groups are compelled to adapt (Lewis et al., 2000). In some institutions the influx of black people has triggered the phenomenon of white flight (Burgess, et al., 2004; Hill, 2009; Hunter & Danahoo, 2004; Musterd & Osterndorf, 2007).

From this summary of key findings from the literature on international perspectives, it is apparent that there is a dearth of literature documenting exemplary institutions as far as interactions of diverse students at university residences are concerned. Hence in this study, I decided to search for an exemplary institution and investigate how diverse students interact. In the next section, I therefore present a summary of the literature focusing on the South African landscape.
2.6.3.2 Summary of the literature reviewed from the South African landscape

This section presents the summary of literature I reviewed from the South African landscape. Most of the literature that I used in this section was published recently. Since interracial contact was prohibited during the apartheid era it was difficult for me to get research material published during that time. However, some recent researchers have investigated the events of interactions that took place during the apartheid era. Many of the studies in this section report challenges of interactions between diverse students at university residences.

To illustrate the emphasis on deficiency by the reviewed literature, the following themes that emerged from the findings from the South African landscape will be highlighted: segregation before apartheid, student accommodation during apartheid, student socials during apartheid, resistance to integration, that desegregation did not lead to integration, ‘White flight’, self-segregation and residence culture.

First, the literature from a South African perspective showed that segregation of students existed before the Nationalist party ruled South Africa when the British colonialists were still in power (Goga, 2008; Maylam, 2005). In spite of a few universities which were referred to as ‘open’ universities granting enrolment to black students they chose not to provide accommodation for them at university residences. Even though these universities were known to be liberal they chose to discriminate against blacks according to their own mandate.

Second, researchers also observed that apartheid laws formalised segregation which put some constraint on contact between people (including the students) of different races (Anderson, 2003; Finchilescu & Tredoux, 2010; Greyling, 2007). As a result accommodation of black students at predominantly white universities was formally prohibited. When historically white universities hosted the NUSAS conference during the apartheid era they initially accommodated white students only in the university residences and black students were accommodated in black townships. At that point they were also compelled to extend racial segregation to dining halls. It is also noted that when the universities decided to accommodate all students they provided separate accommodation according to race (Greyling, 2007; King, 2001; Kurain, 2008; Luescher, 2009; Maylam, 2005; Perez & London, 2004).

Third, it is also noted from the literature that the few black students who secured admission to predominantly white universities were prohibited from socialising with their white classmates (Cross & Johnson, 2008; Goga, 2008; King, 2001; Luescher, 2009). It is also mentioned that
black students were barred from joining student societies and could not participate in extramural activities (King, 2001).

Fourth, researchers have also identified resistance to integration of university residences in the post-apartheid era (Durrheim et al., 2011; Southern, 2008). Student organisations like the Freedom Front Plus described desegregation of student residences as forced integration and equated it with discrimination (Marais & de Wet, 2009; van der Merwe, 2009). Studies showed that some students forward language and cultural preferences as excuses to dispute integration (Flusk, 2008; Southern, 2008; Walker, 2005b). In some instances, researchers noted that some students perceived the integration of residences as an infringement of residence culture.

Fifth, the literature also established that desegregation does not necessarily lead to integration (Barnard, 2010; Jansen, 2004; Koen & Durrheim, 2007; Walker, 2005a, 2005b). Accordingly researchers questioned the effectiveness of transformation policies. It was observed that admission policies have been changed in all South African universities. As a result enrolments show a change in racial demographics. However, researchers highlight that even though diverse students were living in close proximity there was little interaction. They attribute the lack of interaction to the fact that student residences show a high level of segregation. Some researchers observed that some residences were either predominantly black or white. A study conducted by Walker (2005b) reports that even where residences were integrated students were never successfully mixed across races. Because of the prevalence of segregation at university student residences interracial proximity did not reduce prejudice against black students in some universities (Gibson & Claassen, 2009).

Some of the reviewed literature suggests that desegregation of student residences has led to white flight (Austin, 2001; Durrheim et al., 2004; King, 2001; Morrow, 2008; Woods, 2001). It is noted from the literature that the number of white students declined as black students were increasingly filling some university student residences. Not only does the literature agree that white students prefer to live off campus, some literature highlights that Indian students prefer to live at home or with relatives.

Seventh, much of the literature points out that the phenomenon of self-segregation is common among diverse student communities. This occurrence was evident in the manner in which some students demarcate social space to be used by certain racial groups (Alexander &
Tredoux, 2010; Durrheim et al., 2004; Koen & Durrheim, 2007). These studies observed that university students are integrated in the classroom but display a lack of intergroup contact in public spaces. Some researchers noted that in certain instances segregation was attributed to ‘cultural difference ‘and ‘common interests’. Further, Research showed that even in integrated residences people preferred to live with those of their own kind and it was rare to find black students mixed with white students in double rooms (Moguerane, 2007; Pillay, 2010; Walker, 2005b).

Literature reviewed in this study discovered that historically Afrikaans universities still uphold residence cultures (Barnard, 2010; Jansen, 2004; Moguerane, 2007; Pillay, 2010; Soudien et al., 2008). It is further indicated that most white students choose universities because of their history of residence culture. On the one hand some Afrikaner students advocate the need to preserve their culture as they view transformation of residences as a threat to the Afrikaner character of the university (Barnard, 2010; Pillay, 2010). On the other hand some black students form their own groups in order to appreciate their common identity and to rebel against the imposed cultures (Moguerane, 2007). The literature has also noted that residence culture in historically Afrikaans universities alienates students who are not part of the main stream and that further fuels the lack of interaction between diverse students (Jansen, 2004).

In the light of the literature reviewed in this study, one may argue that there are challenges facing university residences. The problem with most literature conducted on students’ interactions in universities and university residences is that it put more emphasis on deficiencies and less effort is being put on finding good practices. Recently “the political change in South Africa brought a shift in the way South Africans used to perceive each other” (Finchilescu & Tredoux, 2010:224). And I believe that there is something good in this change of perception and it is my intention to find that example of goodness. This chapter therefore has demonstrated that there is a lack of literature based on good practices. In the above section I presented a summary of the literature that I reviewed from the international and South African landscape. In the following section I present the theoretical framework employed in this study.

2.7 Theoretical frameworks

In this study I will use a combination of the critical race theory and the contact theory to understand and interpret interactions between participants.
2.7.1 Critical race theory

It is almost impossible to ignore the salience of race and racism when conducting a study involving diverse students in South Africa. My motive behind utilizing critical race theory as a lens is that it places race in all social settings and actions. I am not out to prove that the University of Pretoria is promoting white supremacy but I intend to challenge the traditional philosophies in relation to racial concepts and stereotypes.

The critical race theory (CRT) was developed in the legal studies in the 1970s to address the Civil Rights concerns of the African American community and was later adapted in educational studies in the mid-1990s (Brayboy, 2005; Iverson, 2007; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Lynn & Adams, 2002; Parker & Lynn, 2002; Rashid, 2011; Yosso, 2002). Donnor, (2003:233) defines critical race theory as a “contemporary theoretical framework that critiques the dominant white hegemonic discourse and power, analyses social disparities between races, and challenges popular construction and employment of race, racism and power”. Yosso (2005) affirms that the CRT is a theoretical and analytical framework that is aimed at disputing how race and racism influence arrangements, traditions and discourse in education. The CRT is considered a significant instrument for ‘reconstruction’, ‘construction’, and ‘deconstruction’ (Ladson-Billings, 1998). It has the potential to advance reconstruction of human agency, to deconstruct systems of domination and to construct impartial and power relations that are fair within the society (Ladson-Billings, 1998).

Various researchers show that there are five tenets that are highlighted in the CRT (Bernal, 2002; McDowell & Jeris, 2004; Pascale, 2008; Smith-Maddox & Solorzano, 2002; Solorzano, 1997; Solorzano & Bernal, 2001; Solorzano & Yosso, 2002a; Solorzano & Yosso, 2002b; Yosso, 2005). First, the centrality of race and racism and intersectionality with other forms of subordination. Second, the challenge to dominant ideology. Third, a commitment to social justice. Fourth, an emphasis on experiential knowledge, and fifth the importance of interdisciplinary approaches.

The centrality of race and racism is the most important tenet of the CRT. The theory begins by acknowledging that racism is normal (Ladson- Billings, 1998). The CRT encourages education practitioners to promote the discourse of race. Unfortunately some people use the word “culture” as a euphemism for race, because culture is considered to be neutral (McKinney, 2007; Pascale, 2008) and this deters the interrogation of race and its consequences. The underlying assumption of the CRT is that race is a central unit of analysis.
when engaging the discourse of race, racism and power (Lynn & Adams, 2002; Tyson, 2003). The CRT interrogates how race is constructed (Parker & Lynn, 2002) and those who campaign for this theory are of the perception that race is socially constructed (Chaisson, 2004). When researching in a racial context, it is difficult to disconnect the obvious existence of race from the historical construction of race (Hughes & Giles, 2010; Pascale, 2008). Race has always been used to determine proximity between people and to expose people to a system that determines one’s place in the society (Pascale, 2008). This argument is also supported by Warmington (2009) who indicates that the way people live in the society is brought about by race groupings, discriminations and the approach to distribution.

It is further indicated that the construct of race was used to allocate enduring hierarchy of racial supremacy and advantage (Warmington, 2009). The literature reviewed in this study showed that some university residences in South Africa allocated rooms according to established racial groups. Where efforts are being made to integrate diverse students there is evidence of self-segregation which indicates that proximity between different racial groups is still a challenge. Based on this one can conclude that the construction of race has positioned the discourse of race as an important indicator of social interactions (Chaisson, 2004). The value of the CRT lies in its capacity to unearth racism in its different versions (Ladson-Billings, 2003). In addition those who advocate the CRT seek to critique and question how societal barriers and access to opportunities are constructed specifically in relation to race.

Even though these studies put race at the centre they affirm that race intersects with other forms of subordination. The discourse of race and racism should be dealt with in conjunction with gender, class and sexuality (Solorzano & Yosso, 2002b; Yosso, 2002). The CRT does not only look for eradicating white supremacy but it is also against all forms of discrimination.

The CRT aims to challenge the dominant ideology by questioning the traditional claims of objectivity, meritocracy, colour-blindness, race-neutrality and equal opportunities. The CRT disapproves the claim of colour-blindness and brands it as a fabrication maintained by those who first become aware of race and afterwards deny that race exist (Powers, 2007). McDowell and Jeris (2004:82) declare that “colour blind approach to race attempts to deny the material and experiential consequences of racism in favour of an “equal but different” system of meritocracy that assumes a level playing field while turning a blind eye to discrimination”. As the CRT is working against the colour-blind approach it forwards the
disruption of status quo in order to make way for remarkable racial equity (McDowell & Jeris, 2004). The colour-blind philosophy declares that institutions of learning are race neutral and purport the non-existence of colour (Evans, 2007).

I have already mentioned my intention to look for an exemplary residence. In this respect I will deliberately look for a residence that is not based on observing traditional principles but has policies that promote inclusion of diverse groups. The CRT promotes the idea that strategies targeting desegregation should go beyond proclaiming the system unlawful as that does not properly deal with inequality (Powers, 2007). Institutions influenced by the colour-blind ideology do not fully transform established policies of racial segregation because they avoid addressing issues of race by claiming not to see colour (Powers, 2007). Most of them find themselves enrolling students from various races because of the burden imposed by eradication of discriminatory policies (W. A. Smith, Yosso & Solorzano, 2007). Moreover Villalpando (2004) affirms that institutional policies that promote race neutrality are disseminating race and ethnic discrimination. In line with this Teranishi, Behringer, Grey and Parker (2009) argue that the CRT can play an important role in the evaluation of policies and programmes that are designed to deal with racial inequality. Furthermore institutions that are committed to a holistic and more meaningful transformation should start by acknowledging that some students might be experiencing racism in their surroundings (Villalpando, 2004).

In the CRT racial pragmatism is integrated with people’s lived experiences. This rationalises the construction of race in modernity and makes available historical and international contexts in which to make sense of the present racial dilemma (Ladson-Billings, 2006). The CRT takes into account the construct of ‘voice’. The theory emphasises that the experiences of those who are excluded should be heard through their personal narratives and stories (Dixson & Rousseau, 2005; Teranishi et al., 2009). In relation to this Dixson and Rousseau (2005) argue that when people are given an opportunity to tell their stories they are provided with a ‘voice’ through which they can use to give different stories which can be used to counteract or challenge the dominant story which is in favour of the influential group. Furthermore, in agreement with this Bernal and Villalpando (2002) states that non-white researchers are equipped with views different from white researchers and if their perspectives can be considered they may help to eradicate discrimination. The CRT assumes that the stories told by individuals are at the centre of what is real in the society and therefore should be treated as legitimate and acceptable.
Rousseau and Dixson (2006) attest that challenging whiteness as a property is one of the key constructs of the CRT. It is mentioned that institutionalisation of whiteness as a property has been used as the right to exclude and establish a system of exclusivity in which access and rights are based on race (DeCuir-Gunby, 2006; Evans, 2007). This entails that the implementation of desegregation policies should not threaten the superior status of whites. Using whiteness as property is in contrast to the strong emphasis by the CRT that all people should be free to be who they choose to be and not be discriminated against as a result of gender, race, religion or ethnicity (Denzin, 2000). The theory further argues that eradication of stereotypes, along with the elimination of derogatory images and words regarding marginalised people may reduce racial discrimination (Delgado, 2003). In South Africa skin colour was used to access property. I think it will be interesting to find a group of people who have been allocated social resources not because of the advantage associated with the colour of their skin. In this regard the CRT will enable me to understand how these people overcome the stereotypes inherited from the historical relations of South Africa’s racial landscape.

2.7.2 Contact theory

Allport’s (1954) contact theory points out four conditions that are conducive to successful inter-group contact. These conditions are equal status within the situation, common goals, inter-group cooperation and support of authority (Allport, 1954). This theory assumes that cross racial contact will produce more tolerant attitudes when members of different groups interact with each other within an equal status situation (Allport, 1954). Describing equal status as an optimum condition of contact, Pettigrew (2008b) states that when diverse groups come together on an equal status they should be provided with an equal opportunity to share power. In a previous study Pettigrew (1998) argued that it is not easy to accomplish equal status when different groups are battling for power to the extent that it creates conflicts for the entire desegregated group. Moreover Pettigrew (2004) states that members of different groups should believe that their groups are meeting with equal status. The contact must be close enough to lead to perceptions of common interests and humanity amongst the group members. In addition it must be sanctioned by institutional support, for example the university administration and policies (Antonio et al., 2004; Pettigrew, 1998; Pettigrew, 2008b; Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005). The institutional policies may be structured around developing interventions that promote and ensure that positive intergroup contact is sustained (Pearson, West, Dovidio, Powers, Buck & Henning, 2008).
The contact theory has been tested by various researchers and in most cases has been proven to be successful. Research shows that contact, which is structured under the optimal conditions specified by Allport, will typically promote greater reduction of prejudice (Chavous, 2005; Foster, 2005; Gibson & Claassen, 2009; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008; Schrief, Tredoux, Finchilescu & Dixon, 2010; Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005; Turner, Crisp & Lambert, 2007). The theory emphasises that factors that transform representations of members who participate from two groups to one group can reduce intergroup bias conflict (Dovidio, Gartner & Kawakami, 2003; Gurin & Nagda, 2006).

When diverse groups are brought together they can understand diverse opportunities and the groups can build commitment to collaborative opportunities (Nagda, Gurin, Sorenson, Gurin-Sands & Osuna, 2009). Further, Finchilescu & Tredoux (2008) argue that the university campus is the best context to explore intergroup contact because students meet with equal-status. Moreover South African university residences offer an acceptable context to test the contact theory because they bring together students from different racial identities that share a history of contentious relationships, which among others, deprived them of an opportunity to engage in a meaningful way (Finchilescu & Tredoux, 2008; Nagda et al., 2009). This sentiment is also shared by Trail, Shelton and West (2009) when they indicate that roommate relationships in colleges give researchers a chance to study the dynamics of interaction between the same people over time. With this theory it is not simply a matter of bringing students into the same institution, but it is also about creating positive relations by recognizing that individuals are different from one another and should not be subjected to group stereotypes (Antonio et al., 2004). The Contact theory advocates that encounters between groups should be developed and sustained in order to encourage co-responsibility for personal and social change (Nagda & Zuniga, 2003). It purports that through extended contact interracial friendships could develop between people who were previously segregated (Turner et al., 2007). This is in accordance with the notion that the extent and quality of contact determine the outcomes of intergroup contact (Brown, Eller, Leeds & Stacey, 2007; Finchilescu, 2010)

Contact theory researchers have since expanded Allport’s original theory and have suggested that there are other mediators that play an important role in the contact situation apart from the four optimum conditions initially advocated by Allport (1954). It is indicated that previous experiences and attitudes could also influence whether individuals will be interested or keep away from contact with out-group members (Pettigrew, 1998; Schmid et al., 2008).
Cross-group friendship potential was proposed by Pettigrew (2008a, 2008b) as having a high capability of reducing prejudice and can also improve attitudes. Pettigrew, Tropp, Wagner and Christ (2011) argue that, friendship brings into play some of Allport’s optimal conditions in the sense that friends usually meet on equal status. They have to cooperate in most instances and furthermore most friendship provides an opportunity for development of common goals. Another development of the contact theory is that indirect contact improves the attitude towards the out-group members (Pettigrew, Christ, Wagner & Stellmacher, 2007). The inference here is that when one has an in-group friend who happens to have an out-group friend there is a possibility of reducing prejudice at the same level with having direct contact. Finchilescu (2005) has documented the role of meta-stereotypes in obstructing intergroup contact. She explains that when people think that members of an out-group hold certain stereotypes about their group they may avoid intergroup contact. In relation to this some studies show that intergroup anxiety can influence whether individuals avoid or support intergroup contact (Tausch, Hewstone, Kenworthy, Cairns & Christ, 2007; Voci & Hewstone, 2003). Furthermore, if the members of an out-group have cultural knowledge and willingness, their aspiration to take part in intercultural interactions will be enhanced. Based on the above one can deduct that there are other factors that play a role in cross-contact and the reduction of prejudices than the four optimal conditions proposed by Allport (1954).

Studies were conducted based on these advances of the classic contact theory. Pettigrew et al. (2007) conducted a survey of German adults during which they explored the relationship between direct contact and indirect contact. Their assumption was that by having an in-group friend who has an out-group friend one’s attitudes improved and prejudices towards the out-group will be reduced. The results show a relationship between direct contact and indirect contact. This has great implications for Allport’s contact conditions since the person whose prejudices are being reduced does not participate in the active contact with the out-group. According to Pettigrew et al. (2007) the effectiveness of indirect contact proves that intergroup contact enhances positive results not only for the active participants but also for the non-participants who observe the intergroup contact with their acquaintances.

Some researchers criticized Allport’s optimum conditions as the basic requirements for positive intergroup contact. Some argue that these conditions should not be taken as fundamentals in the reduction of prejudice but be considered as having the ability to facilitate change of attitudes (Pettigrew et al., 2007). Another claim is that Allport’s optimal contact requirements do not always produce similar patterns of prejudice for minority and majority
status groups (Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005). On the other hand these optimal goals are often unclear or unstipulated (Glazier, 2003). The contact theory has been censured for alleging that intimate contact plays a major part in reducing prejudices (Miller, 2002). Miller also questions the issue of generalization by contact researchers. He argues that those who advocate for the contact theory fail to provide evidence that positive attitudes towards certain individuals of an out-group can be generalized to all the other members belonging to the out-group. According to Miller (2002) this tendency to generalize brings out a serious limitation of the contact theory. Michael, Kimbro and Yancey (2002) accuse the contact theory of being too restrictive and incapable of being used as a major theory in understanding racial change. Michael et al. (2002) assert that contact theory should include behaviour in its focus. They are of the opinion that both behaviour and attitudes are important for race relations. In another study Glazier (2003) argues that even if people can meet on equal status at school it will not be easy for them to forget that outside the school situation their status is different and that will influence the nature of contact. Another criticism is the tendency of contact theory to concentrate only on the elimination of prejudice while at the same time it ignores construction of relevant behaviour (Glazier, 2003).

2.7.2.1 International studies based on the contact theory

A vast body of contact research has come to light in the international field. One of these was conducted by Clack et al. (2005) at a cafeteria found in a city northwest of England. It was a study focused on investigating the micro-ecology of segregation in everyday space. Their assumption concerning this study was that contact between culturally and racially diverse people has a tendency of promoting positive attitudes towards social, ethnic and racial diversity. In their opinion face to face contact has the potential of reducing prejudices. Although the cafeteria was accessed by people from various ethnic groups their discussion is based on the interactions between whites and Asians. The results of the study show that self-segregation was prevalent as individuals associated with people of their own ethnic groups. Clack et al. (2005) distinguish between the seating patterns displayed by male and females and in relation to this they indicate that females are more segregated than males. Moreover the results of their study further prove that contact alone will not promote integration.

In addition due to limited contact between the Protestants and the Catholics Northern Ireland has also attracted contact researchers. Tausch et al. (2007) draw attention to the fact that the Catholics are the minority group in Northern Ireland. In the 1960s they experienced much discrimination which barred them from employment, accessing proper education and housing.
and they were also barred from local elections (Tausch et al., 2007). The level of inequality between the Protestants and the Catholics sparked civil rights movements which led to changes during the 1970s. The Catholics have since been afforded entitlement to proper houses and equal opportunity to access higher education. Though the changes are commendable, economic inequality is still predominant in Northern Ireland (Tausch et al., 2007). Aligned with this background Tausch et al. (2007) conducted a study which was aimed at exploring the relationship between cross-community contact and out-group attitudes in post-agreement Northern Ireland. In addition the purpose of their study was to explore whether perceived status difference does predict or moderate out-group attitudes. Their assumption was that unequal status will encourage intergroup conflicts as individuals who conclude that they have a relatively low status will demonstrate low results of contact. Tausch et al. (2007) administered a questionnaire to Protestant and Catholic students at three universities in Northern Ireland and the results of their study were consistent with their assumptions. They confirm that if one perceives one’s group to be of low status the effects of intergroup contact can be undermined. The findings of their study are also aligned with original conditions coined by Allport (1954) which, among others, indicate that equal status facilitates intergroup contact.

Based on a similar context Schmid et al. (2008) conducted another study in Northern Ireland. The purpose of their study was to investigate the consequences of living in segregated and mixed neighbourhoods for in-group bias and the tendency to act offensively to an out-group. The results show that living in a desegregated community can have positive influence on how members of out-groups perceive each other in Northern Ireland. What is distinctive in their findings is that participants in desegregated areas were less likely to prefer the in-group to the out-group (Schmid et al., 2008). The results of their study are consistent with the assumption put forward by those who advocate the contact theory indicating that prolonged intergroup contact reduces prejudices. However their analysis also showed that living in mixed communities can also have negative effects.

Another study was conducted by Voci and Hewstone (2003) to examine intergroup contact with immigrants in Italy. Italy provides yet another favourable environment to study intergroup contact. According to Voci and Hewstone (2003) there are few foreigners in Italy who amounted to 2.5% of the entire Italian population during the time of their study. They further attest that there is evidence of racism and prejudice emerging in Italy. First, their participants included African students studying in two Italian universities. Second, they
examined the contact between Italian workers and their colleagues from outside Europe. What is worth noting about the participants of their study is that the students were meeting on equal status whereas the workers were working at a hospital which provided institutional support for intergroup contact (Voci & Hewstone, 2003). The intention of their research was to explore whether reduced anxiety mediates the effects of frequent and positive contact and judgements concerning the out-group. The findings suggest that a lower level of intergroup anxiety leads to a positive attitude towards intergroup contacts. The findings are aligned with the contact theory with evidence showing that support by the hospital authority has led to positive effects on attitudes towards colleagues.

The work of Chavous (2005) focused on the relationship between racial climate and integration outcomes among African American and white students from a predominantly white university. In his justification for choosing university students to explore the intergroup contact, Chavous (2005:239) argues that “The university campus represents a distinct type of community, with a climate created and perpetuated by physical structures, policies and social norms that guided its functioning”. I am inclined to agree with Chavous (2005) and other researchers that universities provide a favourable environment to explore the intergroup contact theory. In agreement with this claim the findings of the study by Chavous (2005) show that the manner in which the students feel about the racial climate in their institution will determine their interpersonal diversity at the university. Another interesting finding is that there is a relationship between both the African American and the white students’ personal intergroup associations and the average behaviour on campus and cooperation between the two groups. Showing consistence with the contact theory institutional support at the university examined by Chavous (2005) promoted intergroup contact.

2.7.2.2 South African studies based on the Contact Theory

The downfall of apartheid has been accompanied by the departure of segregationist policies that kept South Africa’s people apart. This brought to an end the Extension of the University Act of 1959. South African universities have since brought people who belong to different racial and ethnic groups together. This has prompted a numbers of researchers to conduct studies at universities and elsewhere to find out whether the contact between groups that were previously separated is improving. Some researchers used the contact theory to make sense of this phenomenon.
Research showed that when studying intergroup contact in South Africa the salience of race cannot be ignored (Dixon, Tredoux & Clack, 2005). In most of the studies the focus is limited to black and white racial groups. Dixon, Tredoux and Clack (2005) give a description of how racial segregation was used to control everyday interactions and prejudice. They reviewed ‘The atlas of apartheid’ by A.J Christopher which details the system of apartheid in South Africa. They revealed how proximity of different racial groups was prohibited to ensure that white people did not share their personal spaces with non-whites. The implementation of Separate Amenities Act of 1953 which was later amended in 1960 made certain that even in the domestic realm the contact between whites and non-whites remained that of master and a servant and that of a maid and a madam. At this point the contact between black and whites was not of ‘equal status’. In these circumstances the maid resided far from the main house and was compelled to use different facilities. It is worth mentioning that for apartheid policies different did not mean equal but required that all the best facilities were reserved for the use of whites. In this study I am also going to seek an understanding of how the diverse students came to terms with sharing things like toilets, kitchen, living rooms and other facilities at TuksVillage.

In his study entitled “Socio-spatial practice and representations in a changing South Africa” Durrheim (2005) investigated the way black and white people used a beach. He reminds the readers that under apartheid black and white people were not allowed to share spaces. As a result all the resources that were regarded as top of the range were kept aside to be used by the privileged white minority. With the eradication of apartheid laws most of the preserved spaces started to be desegregated. In this regard Durrheim (2005) attests that in South Africa the process of desegregation has been dominated by the movement of blacks into spaces that were previously preserved for whites. I am persuaded to agree with Durrheim (2005) in this instance because in my observation it is predominantly black people who move, for example, to historically white residences, former model C schools and historically white universities. He further argues that change should not be limited by desegregation only but also on how the places are used by all the diverse groups who access them.

Patterns of racial migrations at the beach were observed during the study by Durrheim (2005). The results show that during summer holidays recurrently whites preferred to use the beach earlier and they would slowly vacate the spots they occupied as blacks started arriving. These findings prove that in relation to desegregation, legislation alone cannot change racist ways of thinking with which most people were indoctrinated during the apartheid era (Durrheim,
The author argues that segregation was still used as a means to maintain white privilege. The type of contact in the study was not accompanied by optimum conditions that are mentioned by the contact theory. In this study some of Allport’s optimum conditions will be met. For instance students meet with equal status, the contact between them is supported by the institution, and they have to cooperate as they will be sharing most of the facilities. Their contact has been a prolonged one that also allows friendships to develop.

However, intergroup contact on equal status alone does not necessarily mean that people will integrate. Schrieff, Tredoux, Dixon and Finchilescu (2005) conducted a study entitled ‘Patterns of racial segregation in university residence dining-halls’. They carried out quantitative observations which they limited to black and white race groups at two dining-halls chosen from the catering residences of the University of Cape Town (UCT). The results of the study show that informal segregation prevails between black and white racial groups with each race occupying separate wings in each dining-hall. In accordance with the patterns observed in the two dining-halls the authors argue that the trend of boundary formation between black and white spaces can be attributed to the way the previous government of South Africa divided its people. Schrieff et al. (2005:441) explain that “the spatial identity of groups is defined in terms of the spatial zones within which they operate comfortably; it involves knowing one’s place and having a sense of who belongs there with us”. The authors hypothesise that friendship patterns may be the cause of self-segregation in dining-halls. However, if that is the case it means that there is dearth of cross-race friendships between the students observed at the UCT dining-halls. I agree with Schrieff et al. (2005) when they say that the apartheid policies did not only serve to segregate people of different races but these policies had also marked racial connotations and identities in the reality of how social spaces were controlled.

In a more recent study, Schrieff, Tredoux, Finchilescu and Dixon (2010) conducted a longitudinal research during which they also observed seating patterns in a university dining-hall in the UCT. In their study they observed males and females respectively and also administered a questionnaire to them. Even though the study included Coloured, Indian and Asian participants their discussion were only limited to black Africans and white students. Their findings are consistent with the findings of Schrieff et al. (2005) as they prove that self-segregation is still persistent in university dining-halls. However, their results also highlighted the formation of new cross-race friendships which is in contradiction with the
hypothesis they coined during the previous study. This new development acknowledges the potential of university residences in reducing prejudices.

A different study was also conducted at UCT by Tredoux, Dixon, Underwood, Nunez and Finchilescu (2005). Their study focused on the seating patterns in a public space at a specific space on the campus of UCT. The results of their research also show patterns of self-segregation which take place at a space which is accessible to everyone. Their findings certify that the space they studied is highly utilised by whites and avoided by blacks. One explanation is that of the absence of optimum conditions which are highlighted by those who advocate for the contact theory. Elsewhere Tredoux and Dixon (2009) conducted a study at a club in Cape Town. As in other studies different racial groups maintained the boundaries between them showing the persistence of self-segregation in South Africa’s public spaces.

An article by Finchilescu (2005) set out to give an account of how public spaces are racialised even in places where diverse groups have equal status. She starts by drawing attention to the diverse cultures among different races of South Africa. This cultural difference is evident in a number of traditions and preferences. The problem that arises because of the variety of cultures is that people fear to come into contact with the out-groups and to do so they detach themselves from the cultural others. In these circumstances Finchilescu (2005) introduces the reader to the concept of ‘Meta-stereotypes’. She defines meta-stereotypes as “the stereotypes that members of a group believe that members of an out-group hold of them and carry a range of emotional and behavioural consequences (Finchilescu, 2005:465). Meta-stereotypes imply that the way people behave is influenced by how they think. She further outlines what happens when a person thinks that he/she is being negatively stereotyped. To begin one experiences the feeling of being de-individualised which according to Finchilescu (2005) entails the notion that one’s personal virtues and experiences are not taken into cognisance. Following this the self-esteem is lowered and the self-concept is at risk as one feels that there is nothing to do in order to defend one ‘self (Finchilescu, 2005). An environment of this nature leads one to develop a negative attitude towards the out-group and as a result intergroup contact will be minimized.

In another recent study, Finchilescu (2010) conducted research at three South African universities. Two of the universities were historically white (English medium universities) and another was a historically Coloured university. The aim of her research was to explore the role of meta-stereotypes and prejudices in intergroup anxiety. The results of the study
apparently show that meta-stereotypes are a significant factor in influencing intergroup anxiety. The participants mentioned that they felt anxious when they interacted with members from different race groups. The findings are consistent with the argument put forward by Finchilescu (2005) when she indicates that the way people behave is influenced by how they think. The concept of meta-stereotypes showed that it is not only the ideal conditions coined by Allport (1954) that will ensure successful intergroup contact but also how a member of particular group believes he is perceived by members of the out-group.

In an attempt to make sense of why South Africa’s different races do not mix Finchilescu et al. (2007) embarked on a study involving black and white South African students from four universities. Their assumption was that black and white students will put forward different reasons for desegregation. The findings suggest that the legacy of apartheid has an influence on the lack of contact between the two different race groups. Among others the system of apartheid classified people according to different races, and those races determined a person’s social status, where to live and who to be in contact with (Powell, 2010). Finchilescu et al. (2007) revealed that the majority of white respondents indicate that blacks are preoccupied with race issues. Whereas most of the black students did not promote cross-race friendships as they believed that it would be seen as disconnecting themselves from their own race.

Moreover socio-economic status was also cited as an obstacle to interracial mixing among South African university students. Alexander (2007) attests that South African university students are showing a tendency to avoid interracial contact even though the university setting provides them with an opportunity to be in contact with each other. When a student from one race group enters the territory of another race group he/she is perceived as an intruder and that brings about uneasiness and nervousness (Alexander, 2007). Research shows that lack of contact between different groups is mostly attributed to the need for one to stick to one’s own group (Clack et al., 2005; Kurian, 2008; Mabokela, 2001; Walker, 2005b). This study offers an opportunity to find a space where ‘influx’ of black people was not followed by the ‘withdrawal’ of white people as observed by Durrheim and Dixon (2005).

In this section of the study I focused on the theoretical frameworks used in this study. I discussed the critical race theory and the contact theory. I also discussed the international and South African studies that were based on contact theory. In the following section I give a summary of literature review based on contact theory.
2.7.3 Summary of literature based on contact theory

In this section of the chapter I highlight some of the empirical studies undertaken utilising the contact theory. I base the summary on both the international and South African perspectives.

First, much of the international and South African literature using contact theory points out that self-segregation is prevalent even when opportunities for contact are presented to diverse students. The study by Clack et al. (2005) revealed that individuals associated themselves more with people from their own groups. Elsewhere the findings of a study conducted at a university residence showed that informal segregation prevailed between black and white students with each group inhabiting separate wings in the dining halls (Schrieff et al., 2005; Schrieff et al., 2010). It is also noted in the literature that different racial groups maintained racial boundaries between them by avoiding certain spaces even though the spaces were accessible for all groups (Finchilescu, 2005; Tredoux & Dixon, 2009). Accordingly, it is noted that when a student from another racial group enters the territory of a particular group he/she is considered to be trespassing (Alexander, 2007).

Second, the findings from the literature indicated that friendship patterns may be the cause of self-segregation in dining halls. Even though some of the studies highlight the formation of cross-race friendships, it is also clear that there is a dearth of interracial friendships in universities. Accordingly there was recognition in the literature that some black students did not support cross-race relationships as they viewed them as betrayal of their race group. Furthermore there is debate in contact theory literature that lack of cross-race friendships can be attributed to the need for one to stick to one’s own group. Nevertheless the overall impression from contact theory literature is that prolonged contact between diverse students at university residences has the potential to lead to the formation of cross-race relationships.

Third, it has become evident through this literature review that some people feel anxious when they come into contact with people from different cultural groups. According to Finchilescu (2005) stereotypes that individuals belonging to a particular group believe that members of another group hold of them, lead to fear of contact between diverse groups. There is a perception that people will develop a negative attitude when they feel that they are negatively stereotyped.

Fourth, the contact theory literature also identified that white flight is prevalent when there is an influx of black people in previously white preserve spaces. It is acknowledged in the
literature that desegregation mainly involves migration of black people into spaces that were in the past reserved for whites. In response to the breaking up of territories of historically white spaces, white people are slowly vacating the spaces to go in search of new secluded spaces.

Last, it is clear from the literatures reviewed that living in desegregated communities has a positive influence on how members of out-groups perceive each other. It is also mentioned that the way students feel about the racial climate at the university will determine their interpersonal relations. However the reviewed literature indicates that the optimal conditions of intergroup contact as coined by Allport (1954) should be present in order to allow a positive environment for intergroup contact to prevail.

2.8.1 Conclusion

In this chapter I have reviewed studies associated with the interactions of diverse students in universities and university residences. To begin with, I reviewed literature related to the construct of segregation. Second, I reviewed literature related to the nature of interactions between diverse students. Third, I reviewed literature related to diversity in institutions of higher learning. Fourth, I reflected on the interactions of diverse students at international university residences. Fifth, I gave a summary of literature based on international studies. Sixth, I discussed the interactions of diverse students at South African university residences. Seventh, I also discussed relevant theories and concepts which underpin my research. Eighth, I presented a summary of studies that were primarily conducted using the contact theory. In Chapter 3 I present the methodology of this study.
CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

“...the world is, of course, always coming at us in scattered bits and pieces that we must assemble into patterns and meanings” (Morgan, 2008:11).

3.1 Introduction
In the previous chapter I presented the literature review that placed my study in the context of other related studies. I also presented the theoretical framework that informed my study, namely contact theory and the critical race theory. The main focus of this chapter is to give details of the meta-theoretical and methodological paradigm that I have used in this study. In addition I clarify the research design and justify the data collection methods that I have used. Next I present a description of how the data was analysed. Furthermore I give details of the selection of the research site and the participants. I also give a description of the methods that I utilised to advance the trustworthiness of the study. Thereafter the chapter concludes with a section that highlights the limitations of the study. In the section that follows I present the paradigmatic assumptions.

3.2 Paradigmatic Assumptions
As a researcher I positioned my study within a particular paradigm. A paradigm refers to “a set of very general philosophical assumptions about the nature of the world (ontology) and how we can understand it (epistemology) (Maxwell, 2008:224). The significance of a paradigm is also highlighted in one of the classics by Guba and Lincoln (1994). They argue that the significance of a paradigm is that it is a fundamental belief system or world view that gives direction to the research and delineates the nature of the world and how each individual is positioned within it, and his relationship to that world. A paradigm explains for those who believe in it the nature of the world and their place in it. In a simpler definition a paradigm refers to world views or ideas that guide a particular community of researchers to generate knowledge (Fossey, Harvey, Dermott & Davidson, 2002). Since I am researching interactions of diverse students at university residences I seek to understand how students interpret and make sense of the world in which they live. Therefore, for that reason my philosophical assumptions are based within social constructivism paradigm and qualitative research methodology. According to Ponterotto and Grieger (2007) as a researcher I have to detail my personal frame of reference in conducting this study. Therefore, in this section I present the theoretical and methodological orientations and indicate how they influenced the phenomena that I researched.
Table 3.1: Outline of the research methodology and process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARDIGMATIC ASSUMPTIONS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meta-theoretical paradigm</td>
<td>Social constructivism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodological paradigm</td>
<td>Qualitative approach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESEARCH METHOD</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portraiture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESEARCH DESIGN</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case study, single case study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purposeful sampling</td>
<td>Selection of one unit which is working well. 8 females in the unit, among them 4 white and 4 black</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA COLLECTION</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data collection methods</td>
<td>Semistructured interviews, document analysis, researcher’s journal, observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data documentation techniques</td>
<td>Verbatim transcriptions, research journal reflections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content analysis: coding, formation of meaning units, identifying themes, indexing, charting, mapping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUALITY CRITERIA OF THE RESEARCH</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confirmability, credibility, transferability, dependability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS OF THE RESEARCH</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Securing access, informed consent and confidentiality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.1 Meta-theoretical paradigm: Social constructivism

With the introduction of the outcome-based education in South African schools, content and teaching methodologies were revised. As a teacher I had to alter my practice in order to shift from a traditional way of teaching which purported that learners were empty vessels and needed to be supplied with knowledge. I had to adjust my way of thinking to accommodate the idea that learners were social beings and capable of socially constructing knowledge. This influenced my ideology as a researcher and therefore, I support the notion that reality is socially constructed. Social constructivism can be traced back to Vygotsky who believed that individuals naturally cannot exist in isolation as they are automatically attached to other...
people (Ivic, 1994). According to Hartas (2010) in social constructivism there is an assumption that reality is understood through human activities and cannot be discovered, hence it does not exist before it can be socially constructed.

Having chosen the social constructivism lens as an epistemology means that I acknowledge that individuals are connected with the social realm. In other words every individual member brings to the social setting their personal input which is interchanged at different levels and between different individuals (Liu & Matthews, 2005). My assumption as an affiliate of social constructivism is that individuals search for understanding of the world in which they live and work (Creswell, 2009). Social constructivism purports that reality is a product of the society’s language, culture, economic or political divisions and other norms and ideals (Bredo, 2000; Palincsar, 1998; Stetsenko & Arievitch, 1997). In this paradigm the emphasis is on ‘multiple reality’ which the researcher sets out to explore (Healy & Perry, 2000).

In this study I relied on the views of participants as they interpreted their experiences and the world around them. My relationship with the participants was interactive and aimed at uncovering the deeper meaning that participants place on their environment (Ponterotto, 2002). Creswell (2009) attests that meaning is basically socially created by interacting with the human community. This brings to light the significance of language as a cultural mediator which implies that human development depends on continuous interaction with other people (Stetsenko & Arievitch, 1997). Sociological forces such as religion, human interest and group dynamics determine how people acquire knowledge (Jackson & Klobas, 2008; Ornstein & Hunkins, 2004; Phillips, 2000). This research is based on the basic belief that people in the world have their own assumptions, intentions, attitudes, beliefs and values that they employ when they interpret actions and events in the world (Jackson & Klobas, 2008). In order to know reality a researcher must interact and explore the experiences of others regarding a specific phenomenon (Niewenhuis, 2007a; Stetsenko & Arievitch, 1997). Social constructivists advocate that the world is dynamic and ever-changing; therefore people recreate knowledge on every encounter (Morgan & Smircich, 1980).

3.3 Methodological paradigm
In this section of methodological paradigm I discuss how I went about understanding and interpreting the interactions of diverse students at a particular university residence (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). Research methodology is referred to as a “set of rules, principles and formal conditions which ground and guide scientific inquiry in order to organize and increase our
knowledge about the phenomena” (Gelo, Braakmann & Benetka, 2008:270). This study is based on the qualitative research paradigm.

3.3.1 Qualitative research

Some researchers are of the notion that there has been an over-dependence on quantitative studies (Berg, 2001; Guba & Lincoln, 1994). According to Guba and Lincoln (1994) those who advocate qualitative studies show that the tendency by quantitative researchers of paying attention to specific variables limit consideration of other variables that exist in the context by applying strict controls or randomization. They argue that one cannot understand behaviour by detaching meanings and purposes that participants put to their activities (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). Qualitative researchers believe that meaning is socially constructed by individuals who interact with the world around them and therefore they maintain that reality is neither fixed nor measurable (Merriam, 2002). Creswell (2008:46) defines qualitative research as a “type of educational research in which the researcher relies on the views of the participants; asks broad, general questions; collects data consisting largely of words (or text) from participants; describes and analyses these words for themes; and conducts the inquiry in a subjective, biased manner”.

To begin qualitative research places the researcher in the world of study (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). In this study I had an opportunity to be in close proximity and to have direct contact with the participants. I was able to enter a community of culturally and racially diverse participants with the aim of understanding and learning about their experiences and the meaning they attach to their daily activities within their residence as a social setting (Berg, 2001; Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Ponteretto, 2002). In this regard the qualitative research method allowed me to understand how interactions of diverse students are shaped by the unique conditions in which they occur (Maxwell, 2008; Orb, Elsenhauer & Wynaden, 2000). As a qualitative researcher I was the main instrument of data collection and data analysis (McCaslin, & Scott 2003; Merriam, 2002) and that permitted me to gather the perspectives of participants through detailed interviews and document analysis.

Qualitative researchers believe in multiple realities. They perceive reality as a socially and psychologically constructed entity where the knower and the known are jointly constructing reality (Gelo et al., 2008). In accordance with this I was able to use a variety of empirical materials. For instance semistructured interviews, document analysis and field notes (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). Denzin and Lincoln (2000:4) describe a qualitative researcher as a
‘Bricoleur’ and a ‘Quilt maker’. This simply entails that a researcher can make use of different tools, methods and techniques of representation and interpretation during the research process. As a ‘Bricoleur’ a qualitative researcher is involved in performing a number of tasks which involve self-reflection and introspection (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). Doing a qualitative study gave me an opportunity to stay in the field for a prolonged time and that enabled me to use some of the various empirical materials available for a qualitative researcher and it also allowed me to probe the interactions of the participants in detail (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2005).

Qualitative studies rely on multiple data collection methods. Accordingly, the variety of methods that are used during a qualitative study produce a wealth of detailed and in-depth data that have the ability to produce a rich description of the phenomenon (Labuschagne, 2003; Merriam, 2002). The eclectic data sources may include among others documentation, archival records, interviews, physical artefacts, direct observation and participant observation (Baxter & Jack, 2008). The selection of data methods is important in qualitative research since it does not solely depend on the research question but also on the type of research situation and what will work best in that particular situation in order to access sufficient data (Maxwell, 2008). In this study I decided to use semistructured interviews because I wanted to learn more about people’s experiences and how they interpreted their perceptions. Gubrium and Holstein (2003) argue that through interviewing we can learn about places we have never been and about settings in which we have not lived. For ethical reasons I limited my observations to the physical setting as observing participants in their personal spaces will have compromised their confidentiality. However I took into cognisance the need to complement the primary data collection method that I used by including a research journal, field notes and document analysis. It is important for a qualitative researcher to engage in reflexive writing (Cooper & Burnett, 2006). Macbeth (2001) believes that the reflexivity in qualitative research is an exercise which is beneficial to the researcher. The rationale for reflexive writing is to facilitate the researcher’s findings and to make available an audit trail which will enable others to evaluate the trustworthiness of the research process. Hale, Terhane and Kitas (2007) advise that researchers should acknowledge their context and their subjectivity through open reflexive writing. While it is impossible to eliminate researcher theories and values in qualitative research, it is important to be explicit about how these values and expectations influence the research process (Maxwell, 2008).
This qualitative study was not aimed at generalising the findings but rather at narrating the experiences, voices and stories of the participants. According to Merriam (2002:5) “the understanding of qualitative research is an end itself, so that it is not attempting to predict what may happen in the future but to understand the nature of that setting...” In this study I tried to understand what it means for diverse students to be in a racially mixed residence and how they interpret their interactions (Merriam, 2002). Qualitative research is aimed at narrating the findings and as a result my voice as a researcher will be heard throughout the interpretations.

3.3.2 Portraiture

In this study I was inspired by the methodology of portraiture. Portraiture utilises a combination of qualitative methodologies which include life history, naturalistic inquiry and ethnographic methods (Dixson et al., 2005). The standpoint of portraiture is that there are stories of goodness in schools and these stories can also be evident in other contexts. The researchers inspired by these methods use Lawrence-Lightfoot’s search for goodness in the methodology of portraiture to narrate the stories (Dixson et al., 2005). According to Lawrence-Lightfoot and Davis (1997) social researchers have a tendency of documenting malfunctions in education. Therefore it is the intention of portraiture methods to look for successful institutions. However these methods do acknowledge that expression of goodness is also stained by flaws. “In the search for goodness, it is essential to look within the particular setting that offers unique constraints, inhibitions and opportunities for its expression” (Lawrence-Lightfoot, 1986:14). Portraiture gave me an opportunity to intentionally choose to explore the strength of the phenomenon under inquiry and the way in which it is approached and managed (Vandeyar & Jansen, 2008).

My voice as a researcher is a vital element in portraiture. In accordance with this Chapman (2005) argues that during the narration of the data the multifaceted nature of the voice must be recognised, evaluated and incorporated when one is using the methodology of portraiture. Even when the data are rigorously controlled, the person of the researcher is more evident in portraiture (Lawrence-Lightfoot, 2005). My role as a researcher goes beyond describing the focus and the field of the inquiry (Lawrence-Lightfoot, 2005). Portraiture allowed me to develop an active relationship with the participants as they described their activities, and also to interpret their stories. In presenting the findings of this study portraiture allowed me to use words to paint a picture of participants’ interactions.
Portraiture is not intended to be generalised or replicated but on the contrary, the driving force behind this methodology is to communicate a meaning that can have an effect on the understanding of attitudes and actions of the readers (Bloom & Elardson, 2008). Also taken into account in portraiture is the commitment that the researcher demonstrates to the research participants while at the same time he or she illustrates the occurrences (Dixson et al., 2005). In this study I aspire to generate a multifaceted narrative that reveals vibrant interactions of values, personality, structure and history (Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis, 1997). In the section that follows I discuss in detail the strategy of inquiry used in this study, which is a case study approach. I also discuss the selection of the case and the participants.

3.4 Strategy of inquiry

Research methodologies make use of research designs and various sampling methods. A research design is defined as “a plan of action or structure which links the philosophical foundations and the methodological assumption of a research approach to its research methods in order to provide credible, accountable and legitimate answers to the research question” (Gelo et al., 2008:270). There are several types of qualitative research designs. For example narrative, case study, phenomenological, grounded theory, ethnography and etc. This study used a case study research design.

3.4.1 A case study approach

I decided to use a case study research design which allows a qualitative researcher to investigate a single bounded system(case) or multiple bounded systems(cases) by using well detailed and in-depth data collection methods which involved a variety of data sources (Creswell, Hanson, Clark Plano & Morales, 2007). Stake (2005) classifies case studies into three types. First, the intrinsic case study which a researcher chooses in order to get a better understanding of the phenomenon. Second, the instrumental case study which a researcher chooses in order in order to give insight into an issue or to advance theory. Third, the collective case study which a researcher uses when there is a need to involve multiple cases. Both the intrinsic and instrumental case studies involve the use of a single case. In this study I chose to use a single case study which I think was appropriate because my aim was to explore a university residence as a case. Within the university residence I based my study on one particular unit which becomes a subcase. By choosing to pay attention to a single case study I was able to describe the phenomenon in detail (Creswell et al., 2007).
The type of a case study that I used was an intrinsic case study. Stake (2005) attests that an intrinsic case study is undertaken because a researcher wants to get a better understanding of the phenomenon. The university residence that I chose had the potential to answer my research question. I wanted to understand how diverse students interacted at a South African university residence and by the demographics it offered a composition which was of interest to me. An intrinsic case study is relevant to my study because the case that I chose to explore offers a unique program which is different from other mainstream university residences.

Benbasat, Goldstein and Mead (1987) state the key characteristics of a case study. Among others they indicated that a phenomenon was examined in a natural setting, data are collected by multiple methods, one or few entities are examined, the complexity of the unit is studied intensively etc. The case is bounded by the fact that I collected data at the residence where a group of racially and culturally diverse students were staying and I conducted the interviews at their own unit. I used multiple methods of data collection in which I conducted semistructured interviews with the participants, I analysed documents related to the research site, I observed the physical setting of the site and I kept field notes. Using multiple methods of data collection has its own advantages and according to Baxter and Jack (2008), conducting a qualitative case study gives the researcher an opportunity to explore the phenomenon using multiple lenses that allow multiple features of the issue to be brought to light. Moreover, staying for a prolonged time in the field allowed me to explore the complexity of the research site and further helped me to investigate and report the complex dynamics and unfolding interactions of diverse students at a university residence in South Africa (Cohen et al., 2000).

The significant benefit of a case study research design is that it allows the researcher to obtain firsthand information about the phenomenon (Benbasat et al., 1987). This became beneficial because I had to give broad interpretations of what I had learnt from exploring the case (Creswell et al., 2007). A case study follows the interpretive tradition which allowed me to interpret the meaning attached by the participants to their interactions by giving a narrative account of their stories (Cohen et al., 2000). However there are concerns of generalization as far as case studies are concerned. It is impossible to generalise from one case to the population as a whole since case studies do not involve the use of statistics (Stark & Torrance, 2005). My study was based on examining one group of diverse students and my aim was not to generalize the findings to the whole population but was mainly to understand the interactions of diverse students within the selected case.
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3.4.1.1 Selection of the case

To achieve the aim of this study, I wanted to pursue a study in the field of diversity in education. This involved studying people from different backgrounds. Accordingly the type of my research site was decided in advance as it was supposed to fit in the field of diversity in education (Mabry, 2008; Stake, 2005). My interest in this field was triggered by what I observed at a multiracial school which was attended by my son. On several occasions I arrived at the school during breaks and realised that there was a visible lack of intermingling between students of different races. Furthermore this interest was fuelled by a book written by Professor Saloshna Vandeyar and Professor Jonathan Jansen titled ‘Diversity High’ which was based on a study of an exemplary practice at a certain school. The university residence that I chose was determined by my quest to explore exemplary institutions. I was made aware of a new model of a university residence which was alleged to be different from the other residences at a particular university. The model was challenging since it deflected from the traditional way of room allocation and placement of students, which took into account their various racial groups.

The residence that I chose gave me an opportunity to study the interactions of diverse students in their own context. Merriam (2002) attests that it is important for a researcher to select a case from which in-depth information on a researched phenomenon can be obtained. The residence was recommended by some of the seniors at the university as it was distinct from other residences because of the balance in its racial composition and living program. The co-ed residence was established in 2008 after the university researched the needs of students in relation to accommodation. The residence has ten distinct blocks of four floors each. Each floor has two units and each unit has eight bedrooms, a communal bathroom, toilet facilities, a kitchen and a living space. It offers a commune type of accommodation. Residents in this building do not participate in traditionally organised sport, cultural or other formalised activities. Six hundred and forty students are accommodated at this residence, of whom three hundred and twenty are male and the other three hundred and twenty female. The residence itself is co-educational but each unit is either occupied by males or females. A unit consists of eight rooms which are allocated to four white students and four black students. Students from different racial backgrounds share a communal bathroom, self-catering kitchen, laundry, lounge and dining room. The decision for selecting the research was made because of its potential to provide participants who could help acquire a significant understanding of the phenomenon under study (Berg, 2001). In the context of South African universities the
student residence I chose offers a unique situation which is worthy of an intrinsic case study research design.

3.4.1.2 Identification and selection of participants

In this study I used purposeful sampling. According to Cohen et al. (2000) purposeful sampling allows a researcher to select study participants on the basis of the researcher’s judgement of the distinctive characteristics of the case. I worked with a small group which comprised eight female students from one unit. The sample comprised four black females and four white females. I replaced the names of the participants with pseudonyms.

Table 3.2: Diversity within the sampled students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Racial Group</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Duration at the student residence</th>
<th>Residential Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joy</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3rd year</td>
<td>Predominantly Afrikaans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2nd year</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kgadi</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2nd year</td>
<td>From a black township to a predominantly Afrikaans suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elise</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2nd year</td>
<td>From a predominantly white neighbourhood to a multiracial suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercy</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4th year</td>
<td>From a black township to a multiracial suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malebo</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3rd year</td>
<td>From rural area to predominantly white suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3rd year</td>
<td>Black township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melisa</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3rd year</td>
<td>Predominantly Afrikaans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to come up with a sample that fit the description of an exemplary constituent, I had to solicit the help of managers at the research site. Enquiries were made with the management committee about a unit that worked well in terms of interactions between the unit mates. Two units were identified; one was for first-years and the other for senior students. Purposeful sampling was employed in order to select a sample that could provide rich information on the phenomenon under study (Maxwell, 2008). In this regard a decision was made to sample a unit of senior students who in my opinion had in-depth experience of the phenomenon under study and had already acquired a wealth of information about the case, and in addition they had the ability to effectively express their experiences (Ponterotto & Grieger, 2007). What
was exceptional about the unit that was sampled is that three participants were part of the residence management and that allowed me to obtain a management perspective within the unit.

Furthermore, I included the head of the residence as part of the participants. My decision to include the head was based on the fact that valuable information could be obtained by interviewing high profile people since they held key positions which allowed them to provide information on the policies and history of the case under study (Marshall & Rossmann, 2011). In the section that follows, I present the research process.

3.5 Research process
The research process of this study included pilot study, semistructured interviews, document analysis, field notes, observations and reflective journal.

3.5.1 Pilot study
A pilot study gave me an opportunity to identify faults in the interview protocol, develop data collection and analysis plans, and to gain experience with the participants (Beebe, 2007). The pilot test for this study was carried out at one of the residences of the University of Pretoria. I conducted the pilot study in order to test the interview protocol used in data gathering. Two participants that were selected for the pilot study were interviewed using the interview protocol to be tested. I audiotaped the pilot interviews and transcribed them. The process of transcribing the interviews helped me to improve and review questions in the initial protocol. Moreover, I discussed the pilot study with the supervisor of the study, who made suggestions for improvement.

3.5.2 Semistructured interviews
This study used semistructured interviews as the main method of data collection. Interviews vary from highly structured where specific questions are predetermined, to unstructured where neither the questions nor the order are determined beforehand (Berg, 2001; Merriam, 2002). The benefit of using semistructured interviews is that one can include both more structured and less structured questions (Merriam, 2002). Using semistructured interviews assisted me to negotiate conversation with the participants (Hale et al., 2007). Moreover, in this study I was interested in understanding interactions of diverse students and in accordance with that Miller and Glasner (2004:127) attest that “those who aim to understand and
Document others choose qualitative interviewing because it provides us with means for exploring the point of view of our research participants”.

Semistructured interviews allowed for in-depth interviewing. Beale and Hillege (2004) indicate that in-depth interviewing is an equalitarian method of inquiry which gives the researcher an opportunity to relate to the participants and also to develop an understanding of the participants through the manner in which they interpret their experiences and perceptions. Through the semistructured interviews, I asked various questions which permitted me to access perceptions, meanings, definitions of situations and constructions of reality that were held by research participants (Punch & Punch, 1998). Since the interview protocol that I designed was guided by a list of questions that needed to be explored in order to understand interactions of diverse students at university residences (Labuschagne, 2003) I therefore included questions relating to biography, friends and family, school background, their perceptions, etc. The questions were to a certain extent predetermined. However, as I asked each participant questions I probed in order to obtain more information which went far beyond the answers to the questions I brought to the interview setting (Berg, 2001). Berg (2001) argues that probing can assist the researcher to approach reality from the participant’s point of view.

The interviews that I conducted were one-on-one. To this end, Creswell (2007) argues that for one-on-one interviewing a researcher needs people who will not be reluctant to speak and share ideas. Consequently, during this study I interviewed university students rather than for example high school learners because of their level of education they were to a certain extent eloquent and helpful during our conversations. Each participant was willing to provide comprehensive narratives of her thoughts, feelings and the role they played in their environment (Gubrium & Holstein, 2003). In addition the one-on-one interviews assisted to elicit information as privacy of the interview enabled the participants to reveal how certain occurrences shaped their way of thinking and also to divulge opinions pertaining to their daily experiences without fear of victimization (Gubrium & Holstein, 2003).

I planned to conduct two phases of interviews. The interviews were conducted during times that were convenient for the interviewees. To ensure that I secured appointments with each of the participants, I contacted them telephonically and by use of e-mail. The time allocated for each participant was approximately 60 minutes depending on the responses of the participants.
The first phase of interviews consisted of face-to-face interviews with the residence management. However these interviews overlapped with the second phase because some of the participants represented both the students and the residence management perspective. The main reason behind conducting interviews with the management was to understand policies and some current information informing day-to-day activities at the residence. Participants who are part of the management are more knowledgeable about the case in question. In relation to this, Rubin and Rubin (2005) argue that interviews gain credibility when the research participants have first-hand information and are well conversant with the research problem. The second phase of interviews which involved face-to-face encounter with the student participants was aimed at understanding how students interpreted the nature of interactions with their counterparts at the residence. The third phase comprised follow-up interviews, which provided the opportunity for member checking and adding of information. All interviews were audio-taped and transcribed. Audio-taping the questions and the responses help to keep an accurate record of the conversations (Creswell, 2007). I also took brief notes and kept interview protocol which assisted in the completion of follow-up questions. Follow-up interviews were conducted in order to seek clarity.

3.5.3 Document analysis

Case studies do not depend only on ethnographic or participant-observer and interview data (Yin, 2002). In this study I included document analysis as part of the data collection. According to Merriam (2002) documents can include public records, personal documents and physical material. These can be found in written, oral, visual or cultural artefacts (Merriam, 2002). The benefit of using documents in research is highlighted by Labuschagne (2003) who indicates that such documents produce extracts and quotations. I decided to access documents on the research site from the internet. This category of documents falls under a category which Merriam (2009) refers to as ‘popular culture documents’. The internet can serve as a source of public documents designed to inform the public about various aspects that are of interest to them. I accessed and analysed documents such as written communications, code of conduct and newspapers.

3.5.4 Field notes

There are different ways of keeping field notes (Berg, 2001). According to Pope and Mays (1995) field notes refer to an umbrella term given to records of qualitative data collected through observation, talk, interview transcripts, documentary sources and field diaries. On
the other hand Creswell (2007:224) defines field notes as “texts (words) recorded by the researcher during an observation in a qualitative study”. In this study the main field notes were compiled by transcribing audio-taped interviews. This served as the main source of data analysis. Furthermore, I wrote field notes to record certain information on the research setting. In doing this I included information on the physical appearance of the research site, the appearance of the participants, the time of interviews and the pseudonym was given to each participant (Berg, 2001). The significance of using field notes is that they can either be descriptive, during which the researcher portrays the physical setting and the appearance of the participants, or reflective, as it happens when the researcher uses field notes to reconstruct dialogue (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003). Hence, I wrote field notes when I was at the research setting and also after I had left the research setting. Keeping field notes helped me to keep track of the research process and also to reflect continually on what was happening (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003).

3.5.5 Observations
Creswell (2007:221) defines observations as “the process of gathering open-ended, firsthand information by observing people and places at a research site”. During the study, I engaged in naturalistic observations wherein I acted as a non-participant observer. The case explored has not been purely historical since it was established in 2008. Therefore some environmental conditions were captured through observations (Yin, 2002). The purpose of observations was to explore the possibility of a new dimension or field of data that I could not get through the interviews. In this regard I observed the surrounding and the physical setting of the site. I had no intention of observing students in their personal spaces as that would have compromised their right to privacy. Photographs were taken during observations and were supplemented by field notes in the form of an observation protocol. The photographs helped me to extract rich descriptions of the research site. I looked for artefacts displayed at the research site and other relevant information.

3.5.6 Reflective journal
Throughout the research process I kept a reflective journal. Making use of a reflective journal can be a strategy that promotes reflexivity during research (Ortlipp, 2008) because it enhances internal dialogue which enables the researcher to analyse and understand vital issues during the research process (B. A. Smith, 1999). The research journal can benefit both the researcher and the reader. According to Borg (2001) a research journal can be an important form of support for the researcher who cannot discuss his or her research experience with
other researchers. As a writer, journal writing allowed me to record a more personal account of my journey through the research experience. I was able to acknowledge my failures, feelings, challenges, ideas, prejudices etc (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003). The advantage of using a researcher journal is that I was able to divulge my values without being pressurized to control them (Ortlipp, 2008). In a more specific way the writer benefits from journal writing as the journal can serve as an important source of data. This is in accordance with what Borg (2001) advocated in relation to a journal as a database from which information can be extracted.

The researcher’s journal has the potential to let other researchers view the experiences of the writer. According to B. A. Smith (1999) “an audit trail of ethical and methodological decision making, made explicit in the researcher’s journal gives readers a panoramic view of the researcher’s horizon”. This sentiment is shared by Ortlipp (2008) who indicates that the availability of a researcher’s journal can serve as a step by step trail of how the methodologies were adjusted. As a result the reader will be able to assess the credibility of the researcher’s work. In this study I used Borg (2001)’s ‘process benefits’ to help me document my experience in a research journal. In the section that follows, I discuss data analysis.

### 3.6 Data analysis

In qualitative research data analysis is a continuous process which goes concurrently with data collection (Creswell, 2007, 2008; Maxwell, 2008; Merriam, 2002). The advantage of collecting and analysing at the same time is that the researcher is able to make adjustments to the manner in which data is collected and to refine the questions that are being asked during interviews (Merriam, 2002; Pope, Ziebland & Mays, 2000). Qualitative data analysis aims to organise non-numerical data in order to discover patterns, themes, forms and qualities found in the collected data (Labuschagne, 2003). The main focus of qualitative data analysis is to portray people’s experiences from their own expressions (Labuschagne, 2003). In this study I decided to use content analysis which is one of the various methods that can be used to analyse qualitative data.

### 3.6.1 Content analysis

Content analysis as a method of qualitative data analysis involves reducing data into meaningful segments, categorizing strategies such as coding and thematic analysis and memos and displays (Creswell, 2008; Maxwell, 2008). According to Creswell (2008) the process of qualitative data analysis is inductive which means that it starts from the specific (which implies interview transcripts) to the general, (the codes and the themes). My data
analysis started with the process of transcribing the interviews. I decided to transcribe the interviews verbatim since this helps to eliminate researcher bias (Lacey & Luff, 2001). As a novice researcher, I was overwhelmed by the idea of transcribing the audiotape material by myself. After my first attempt, I felt that the process was tedious and time-consuming. However, I refuted the idea of using an independent transcriptionist as that would have detached me from the data. The advantage of having transcribed the data on my own was that I became aware of the data that I collected and noticed possible themes emerging as I was transcribing the data. I followed the five steps of data analysis as suggested by Pope et al. (2000). These steps are: familiarisation, identifying a thematic framework, indexing, charting and mapping. So I began by familiarising myself with the data. During this stage I listened to the tapes, read the document and transcripts in order to identify key ideas and text relevant to the research question. As I was navigating through the transcripts, I changed the names of the participants and other identifiable names (this was done for ethical reasons). I proceeded by identifying a thematic framework. This involved noting key issues, concepts and themes that I used to scrutinize the data. LeCompte (2000) attests that the researcher should identify relevant items by looking for repetition which means that an item can be identified because it appears more often. A researcher can look for omissions; this means that an item can be identified because it never appears and also by declaration, where an item is identified because participants declared that it exists and the researcher has verified its existence.

I advanced my data analysis by indexing the data. Pope et al. (2000) purport that during indexing the researcher should mark the data with codes. At this stage I used textual codes to identify particular excerpts of data which could be related to the identified themes (Lacey & Luff, 2001). I started by using open coding which I later refined and recoded as the analysis continued. Recoding of data led to the stage of charting. At this stage I used identified themes to rearrange the data into relevant divisions of the thematic frameworks. This helped me to compile summaries of views and experiences of the participants (Pope et al., 2000). I located patterns throughout the data and I assembled them to check whether they were confirmed or unconfirmed by other parts of the data (LeCompte, 2000). At this stage I was able to collapse subthemes into major themes. The last stage of data analysis entails mapping and interpretation (Pope et al., 2000). According to Lacey and Luff (2000) mapping and interpretation entail finding patterns, associations, concepts, and explanations from the data aided by visual displays and plots. Furthermore this allowed me to identify quotations that would enhance the richness of interpretations. In the section that follows, I present quality measures employed during this research.
3.7 Quality criteria

Qualitative researchers have a mandate of employing various procedures for establishing authenticity and trustworthiness of their studies (Merriam, 2009; Seale, 1999). In this study I used semistructured interviews as the main method of data collection. Cohen et al. (2000) observed that both the participants and the interviewers are likely to bring their own baggage to the research situation unconsciously. In relation to this Freeman, deMarrais, Preissle, Roulston and St. Pierre (2007) indicate that qualitative data consist of interpretations provided by the participants as they respond to questions and by researchers as they write down their observations. Therefore both participants and researcher bring their preconceived knowledge to the research context. So, as a researcher I had to be mindful of the factors that could compromise the trustworthiness of my study. I therefore chose to use the following strategies as proposed by Lincoln and Guba (1985); confirmability, credibility, transferability and dependability. These strategies will enable readers and people who were not part of the project to judge and evaluate the trustworthiness of my study (Graneheim & Lundman, 2003).

3.7.1 Confirmability

Confirmability refers to the strategy that verifies whether the data collected and the conclusions drawn can be confirmed by others investigating the same phenomenon (Ary et al., 2002). According to Zhang and Wildemuth (2009) confirmability is conducted by the consistency between the various components of the research product. These include the data, the findings, the interpretations and the recommendations. The main strategy that I employed to demonstrate confirmability is the audit trail. My decision to employ the audit trail is recommended by Cutcliffe and Mckenna (2004) who attest that a researcher can establish confirmability by using an audit trail as a principal technique. In a qualitative study an audit trail gives a detailed account of how data were collected, how categories were derived and how decisions were made during the course of the study (Merriam, 2009). Hence, throughout the research I kept a research journal in which I recorded the procedures that I followed and the decisions that I made during this study. I carried out an audit trail by giving a transparent description of the steps that I took from the start of the project, and throughout the research as well as reporting its findings. An audit trail will allow other researchers to arrive at the same or sometimes different conclusions by tracing what was done during an investigation. The audit trail includes raw data, data reduction, analysis product, and field notes. My intention of keeping an audit trail is an attempt to answer questions by external auditors relating to whether the findings were grounded in the data, to enable them to check the extent of
researcher bias, and to allow them to evaluate enquiry and methodological decisions (Creswell and Miller, 2000).

3.7.2 Credibility

Another procedure in establishing trustworthiness in a study is credibility. Ary et al. (2002) reveal that credibility in qualitative research has to do with the accuracy of the truthfulness of the findings. The integrity of qualitative research depends on whether it is believable or not. According to Lincoln and Guba (2007) credibility can be ensured by prolonged engagement in the field, peer debriefing, member checks and triangulation by using different methods, sources or researchers. Zhang and Wildemuth (2009) highlight that in order to advance credibility the researcher must check the interpretations against raw data. To ensure the credibility of my study, I shared data with the participants by emailing the raw transcripts and the interpretations thereof. In this regard the participants commented and I was able to make some adjustments. This helped me as a researcher to represent the views of the participants as accurately as possible. Creswell and Miller (2000) purport that when a researcher allows the participants to view and make comments on the accuracy of raw data and the interpretations, the credibility of the study is advanced. To further accomplish credibility I ensured a prolonged engagement in the field. In relation to prolonged engagement Creswell and Miller (2000:125) indicate that “being in the field over time solidifies evidence because researchers can check out the data and hunches and compare interview data with observation data”. Another strategy that I employed to ensure credibility is triangulation. I used various data collection strategies which included semistructured interviews, research journal, field notes and observations. I also chose a sample which included different racial groups and I further included management and student perspectives in my sample.

3.7.3 Transferability

Transferability refers to the degree to which findings can be generalised or transferred to similar research settings (Ary et al., 2002). Qualitative researchers are expected to make available data sets and descriptions that are detailed enough to enable other researchers to make informed judgements about the phenomena (Zhang & Wildemuth, 2009). In this study I did not intend to generalise the findings but to portray the unique features of the study site. Therefore I am not making a claim that the findings of this inquiry can be replicated in other contexts. However I do acknowledge that it is important for a researcher to provide a detailed, clear and in-depth account of the study so that others can decide on the extent to
which findings from one study are similar to another (Cohen et al., 2000). In this study I gave an overview of the research site in which I described the location and the context in which it occurred. I also gave a detailed description of the study participants and their background. In addition, I made use of multiple and comprehensive quotations to help the reader understand the context of the study. Finally I disclosed that this study was inspired by the method of portraiture which believes that there are examples of good practices out there that need to be explored. In essence I believe that there is some value in the phenomena I am investigating.

3.7.4 Dependability

Dependability is the fit between what is recorded and what actually happens in the research field (Cohen et al., 2000). Throughout the study my work was thoroughly checked by my research supervisors who gave detailed feedback. This helped enhance the dependability of my study. I also used an audit trail to establish dependability. The trail was in the form of verbatim transcripts and the reflections in the research journal. Furthermore I also recorded interviews using a voice recorder which helped me to keep accurate records of the field notes. I gave a detailed description of the sample under study and kept a record of all the procedures followed. In those records, I accounted for and described the changes that had occurred in the context of the study. In the section that follows, I present the ethical considerations that were taken into account throughout this study.

3.8 Ethical considerations

Researchers have the responsibility to preserve the dignity of the participants and to take into account the effects of the study on them (Cohen et al., 2000). Throughout the study I made sure that I abided by the ethical guidelines set out by the University of Pretoria’s Ethics Committee. Through completing the ethics application form I assured the ethics committee at the University of Pretoria that I would abide by the rules and ethical practices as prescribed by the university. I included in the application form issues concerning methodology and informed consent (Guillemin & Gillam, 2004). The benefit of professional code of ethics is advocated by Punch (1994) who indicates that as a guideline code of ethics make researchers aware of the ethical dimensions of their studies. Furthermore I took care of the following ethical considerations: securing access, informed consent and confidentiality.

3.8.1 Securing access

The study has been approved by the Director: Residence Affairs and Accommodation and Head of Residence at the University at which this study was conducted. A formal written
request in which I informed the university of the aims of the study, the design and the methods to be used, was made. I proposed the time schedules and highlighted the inconveniences that might occur throughout the study. I indicated that the study was part of a Master’s Degree program registered at the University of Pretoria. I assured the stakeholders that the data accumulated would not be used for any other purpose other than the degree intended for.

3.8.2 Informed consent
Qualitative researchers have an obligation to inform the research participants that they are being researched, why they are being researched and how they will be researched (Punch, 1994). “Informed consent entails informing the research participants about the overall purpose of the investigation and the main features of the design as well as any possible risks and benefits from participation in the research project” (Kvale, 1996:112). I ensured that I obtained written informed consent from the research participants. Before the participants could give me their consent, I gave them verbal and written information. During the process, I informed them of the purpose of the study and I also brought to their attention that the study was going to use interviews, observations of the site and document analysis. They were made aware that their participation was voluntary and that they had the right to withdraw from the study whenever they thought it necessary. In addition to that, I let them know that they were allowed to withdraw certain information if they felt that it should not be included as part of the data. They were also informed that the results of the study would be brought to their attention prior to the final submission of the dissertation. I further informed them that I intended to use a voice recorder during the study and moreover I indicated that they had the right to object to being recorded.

3.8.3 Confidentiality
The essence of confidentiality is that information provided by the participants should in no way reveal their identity. Cohen et al. (2000) argues that the standard protection of participants is the guarantee of confidentiality, withholding of names and other identifying characteristics. In this study I used the methodology of portraiture which starts by asking “What is good here?” which allowed me to intentionally choose a unit that was functional. Therefore, the sample I decided on was known and selected with the help of the Residence Management Committee. It was chosen because of certain qualities which qualified them as a unit that was exemplary and functioning well. Thereafter, I used pseudonyms to protect their identity. In the section that follows, I give the limitations of the study.
3.9 Limitations of the study

This study is focused on a very small sample which is restricted to female students only. I focus on a single case study which is one unit at one university residence. I have no intention of generalising the outcomes of this study.

3.10 Conclusions

In qualitative research researchers seek answers to questions by investigating relevant individuals and relevant settings (Berg, 2001). In this chapter I first discussed how I went about obtaining answers to my research question. Second, I described the meta-theoretical and the methodological paradigms that influenced the study, namely social constructivism and qualitative research approach. Third, I justified my choice of a case study research design and sampling of participants. Fourth, I described the data collection methods and how the data were analysed. Fifth, I also described how I took care of ethical issues. Sixth, and lastly, I described the strategies I used to augment the quality of the study. In Chapter 4 I present the findings of this study.
CHAPTER 4
FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

“So a core aspect of what is involved in the challenge of multiculturalism is a
callenge to the state’s cultural hegemony” (Tiryakian, 2003:21).

4.1 Introduction
In this chapter I start by portraying the diversity within the participants’ background. This is important as it allows me to introduce the participants, and by sketching their background I show the distinctiveness of their neighbourhoods, their families and the context of their previous schools. I also provide contextual information on the site where the study is taking place. This is necessary because it is the practices and the setup in the site that influence the nature of interactions occurring between diverse students. In the thematic analysis that I provide, I consolidate the views and the interpretations of the participants as they make sense of their environment.

4.2 Portraits of diversity within the participants’ backgrounds
In this section I present the portraits of diversity within the background of the participants. Since the study focused on interaction of students from different backgrounds, I found it relevant to portray their personal traits and previous settings which could have influenced their interactions.

4.2.1 Joy (white): “... as much as we have big differences, we are all technically the same thing. We all need the same thing.”
On my arrival at TuksVillage I knocked on the door of one of the units. A young woman opened the door and greeted me with an explicit smile. She introduced herself as Joy. What I can remember about Joy is that she looked upbeat, and her outgoing nature made me comfortable to be with her. As she invited me to her room, she coiled herself on her bed while she offered me a chair, which I gladly accepted. Joy was a Bachelor of Arts student at the University of Pretoria. She indicated that it was her third year living at TuksVillage.

As we continued with our conversation Joy informed me that she was from a predominantly white area. She could not recall having neighbours from other racial groups.

No! Not that I know of. I think that the area I live in is quite a white area. All my neighbours are white.
Joy spoke fondly of her family that consisted of her mother, father and sister. She described her family as not being pushy and that they encouraged her to be kind to everyone. I could see the sparkle in her eyes when she spoke about her mother.

My mom is one of the nicest people ever and she is very generous, and she always helps someone if they need it. So I think always from a young age whenever my mom will be helping someone, I always saw that which taught me to do that as well. So uhm... they have... ja between my mom and dad I have learned to be very accepting of other people.

As Joy reminisced about her family and perceptions on interracial relations she revealed that their opinions differed. As she was musing over their conversations, I could discern that her father was not always in alignment about the interracial relations with the rest of the family.

He fits in with the Afrikaans men. That’s what I always say. But with the rest of us we are completely... it’s not even an issue. It’s not. We often get into debate with my dad because he will say something which is not even racist but I just... it doesn’t sleep well with me and we all end up having this big fuss and stuff because of the comments he makes.

However Joy could not describe her father as a racist.

I think uhm... my dad, my dad, I wouldn’t say that my dad is a racist but my dad, because my dad is about 55 or 56 years old now so a lot of white men that are that age are racist but my dad is not completely racist but he still you know got a bit of I don’t agree with some of this.

As Joy looked at her school background, she portrayed her high school as a multiracial school with almost a 50/50 racial (black/white) quota. She affectionately recounted the diversity in the school choir which encompassed genres from jazz to Zulu traditional music. The formal desegregation of the school could be depicted in the classroom and other school activities. However, some learners still existed in different racial worlds in their informal settings. As our conversation continued I detected that Joy did not attribute the separation outside the classroom to racial barriers.

There were black and white girls in class together as well, and at breaks and stuff. It had lots of different races and things like that, but the one thing was like you would notice at breaks and stuff there was still a little bit of segregation in terms of you will always see that there was a group of black girls and a group of white girls but I don’t think... I don’t think that was to do with anyone being racist or anything. I just think it was just because they were friends.

For lack of interaction at her high school Joy cited culture as a barrier to interactions of diverse students.
Ja it wasn’t because the white girls did not like the black girls or the black girls did not like the white girls. I think it is because people that have similar backgrounds and a similar culture will be drawn to each other and they will become friends more easily than people from different cultures.

From Joy’s narratives it is evident that she was from a background of mixed perceptions towards interracial relations. Her family had different views on racial interactions. Her school was formally desegregated but students still segregated themselves outside the classroom. And what was also interesting for me was the fact that even in the democratic South Africa her neighbourhood was still predominantly white.

4.2.2 Mary (white): “I like that there is mutual respect between everyone, and I like that we are very diverse.”

Mary seemed to me like someone who was generous and eager to impress. I was touched by her apparent sense of compassion which made me feel more like a visitor than a researcher. I could feel her concern when she asked about my travelling arrangements and I later saw her contentment when I assured her of my safety. Whenever I arrived at TuksVillage for the interview sessions she would offer to help in one way or another. Mary introduced herself as a strict athlete, which to me did not come as a surprise as I could sense an aura of discipline coming from within her as we interacted. At the age of 20 Mary was a second year BSc degree student at the University of Pretoria.

I wanted to learn about Mary’s family background. So I asked her to describe her family for me. Apart from her parents whom she portrayed as not being young, Mary also had a brother. As our conversation continued she explained that her family taught her the right kind of morals which did not impose any boundaries in terms of her interactions. Her face beamed as she explained that she was taught to be open and listen to what makes other people different. Mary further described her family as non-racist.

My family is very non-racist. We were brought up that every one is the same. Just because your skin colour is different or you grew up in a different place makes you no different from anyone else.

She described her neighbourhood as a multiracial area.

It is pretty multiracial. Dam-side Ville in itself has got a wide variety of people. It’s not mainly white or mainly anything. It’s pretty diverse. Our neighbours for instance are a black family.
Mary attended a very small private high school which was based on specific religious values. The school catered for different race groups but the majority of the learners were white. As she looked back at her experiences Mary could not recall any incident of racial discrimination and described interactions of students as normal. She further explained that her high school celebrated cultural diversity,

During cultural days you can come dressed in a specific culture, like the way you will dress in your culture. Maybe... an African traditional dress, or maybe an Indian outfit or however. Sometimes you have like events where you can make a meal of your tradition and tell them a little bit about your meal or your history or maybe the religion within your culture.

Mary’s background placed her in a multiracial neighbourhood where she was exposed to people of different races from her early years. However, her school background was characterised by small numbers of students where the majority were white students.

4.2.3 Mercy (black): “So when I was able to drop that (inferiority complex) and just try and break through my comfort zone I found that it was all in my head.”

My first impression of Mercy was that she was a gracious and reserved young woman. As I was making myself comfortable in her room she offered me something to drink. The shyness in her eyes and the politeness of her voice could depict her in a typical black South African culture as a respectful person. Looking at the way she sat and the manner in which she communicated with me, I concluded that she carried herself with dignity and modesty. She described her parents as being of North African descent. Her parents relocated to South Africa in the mid 1980s. Mercy was one of the senior students pursuing a career in Business management at the University of Pretoria.

Mercy talked affectionately about her family. Apart from her mother and father, she had four siblings. As we acquainted ourselves with our dialogue Mercy revealed that she was born in one of the former homelands created during the apartheid era. She talked extensively about the different neighbourhoods that she settled in as she was growing up. Her family was initially from a predominantly black township and they later settled in a historically white suburb.

So when we were growing up we knew all our neighbours and we were interacting and stuff like that. In 2001 we relocated to a suburb so we are pretty much around like white people ... our neighbours. It was different. It was very different because in the suburb people kept to themselves. So we really don’t get to know our neighbours pretty much. It was just hi/bye situation, so ja, I felt the difference.
I was curious to know about the perceptions of Mercy’s family on race. What amazed me is that even after they moved from a predominantly black area to a predominantly white area Mercy could not associate her parents with any major racial stance. She explained that at primary school she was secluded because her family did not originate in South Africa. As she recounted one of the incidents when other black children attacked her and referred to her as a foreigner, I could detect a sense of gratitude because of the way her mother taught her to handle similar encounters.

People are going to say things to you. Rather take the approach of ignoring it and focusing on the positive. I learned from that lesson that you are not always going to have people who are going to like you and stuff like that and you should just focus on your goals and continue working towards them.

During our conversation Mercy talked passionately about her high school experiences. She described the school as mainly black which prompted her to interact mostly with black students. The school was still in its early years and as a result there were no well established traditions. She also elaborated on how the principal was trying to instil many rules. I admit that I was surprised by the way Mary beamed as she recalled how students were determined to break those rules.

4.2.4 Melisa (white): “So like I am happy, I don’t know what they were thinking making apartheid but now that’s over.”

Melisa was a considerably tall and well poised young lady. Her charismatic and extroverted nature accentuated her looks. My first impression of her was that she was witty and charming. As she was chatting with her unit mates, she projected herself as playful and as a friend that would always pick you up when you were down. When I interacted with Melisa I was fascinated by her outgoing personality and carefree spirit. She introduced herself as a third year student in her early twenties. She lived at TuksVillage for three years and she was eager to share her thoughts about her stay at the residence. As we continued with our conversation Melisa indicated that she still lived with both her mother and father. She also indicated that she had two brothers. Melisa was from a historically Afrikaans neighbourhood. While we were talking, I could sense some reluctance from her to the notion that her area was still maintaining its Afrikaans heritage.

Uhm our area... ok people see Mooi Berg as an Afrikaans town but it’s not really. Like inside Mooi Berg there are a lot of Afrikaans people. We live in Aqua Park, in our street there are actually quite a few blacks and coloureds. I think there is only... it’s my house that’s us. Then is my neighbour and my other neighbour across the road. Is like us... we are like the white people. We
have Indians, quite a lot of Indians. And there is a few black people, black families. Our area is like doubles you know, not a “lanie” white area.

Melisa also went into details of her family perceptions on race. She described it as a family that interacted across races. Their love for South Africa and its diverse people surpassed the racial challenges in the country.

Like they will never leave, and I think... we all think South Africa has got like very good possibilities and things are going to turn around, because apartheid. I really disagree with apartheid. I am very against apartheid. So like I am happy, I don’t know what they were thinking, making apartheid but now that’s over.

I found the manner in which Melisa reminisced about her high school experiences enchanting. She related her encounters through the lens of someone who embraced diversity and accordingly she appreciated the fact that she met one of her best friends who is a black South African while she was at high school. She described her school as an English medium institution which did not discriminate against anyone because of their skin colour or religion. However Melisa acknowledged that informal desegregation still occurred to a certain extent.

Everyone was tolerant you know. I don’t know, no one had conflict with other races. Like the races will have conflict between themselves basically. There will never be like Whites against Blacks or Blacks against Whites. And uhm when... people would... like black people will hang out by themselves in a group and white people and Coloureds but you would get one white person with the Coloureds or one Coloured with the Whites.

As Melisa spoke, I realised that she was from a school background that was not restricted by rules. She attended one of the former independent schools which were less dominated by racial paradoxes. However, her neighbourhood was historically Afrikaans and some people still viewed it as predominantly Afrikaans.

4.2.5 Kgadi (black): “It’s nice to be nice to people when you live with them but you must be able to go out in the world and still be able to be nice to those same people or people like them.”

Upon first meeting Kgadi I was impressed by her strong personality. To me, she displayed herself as someone who was very opinionated and comfortable with her independence. As a partner in dialogue I found her very easy to talk to while her youthfulness and the eloquence of her speech displayed her passion regarding the research problem. I found Kgadi to be charismatic and easy to listen to. She revealed that it was her second year staying at TuksVillage. As we began with our conversation Kgadi introduced herself as a very diverse
person who is attached to quite a number of South African ethnic groups. She was fascinated by the fact that her multiple ethnic background allowed her to fit in with different cultures as people did not know what identity to attach to her.

It was very interesting because I could never explain it. People always ask, “What are you, whatever?” And I’m like uhm ... I always thought I am Xhosa. I mean it’s challenging especially the coloured side because I don’t know how to speak Afrikaans and stuff like that. But it is always interesting to engage with so many cultures. I don’t feel like I am one thing. I don’t feel like I am Sotho or Zulu. I just feel like I am South African.

As we communicated Kgadi revealed that as a young child she had stayed in a predominantly black township but later moved to a predominantly white area. She eagerly shared her family’s perceptions on racial interactions in South Africa. The family moved to suburbs while she and her brothers were still at primary school. As she shared her thoughts I could detect that with young children race did not determine boundaries of contact for them.

So I’d say that race amongst kids really doesn’t matter. They just see you as a person. I also saw them that way. I didn’t go like; oh! I have a white friend. I just saw I had a friend. As I started to grow up and stuff, I saw that there are racial differences and my brothers even now don’t have white friends anymore.

Hearing her express her personal interpretation of how her family members were not eager for her to join a historically Afrikaans university made me wonder about the intensity of the damage inflicted by the legacy of apartheid on some South Africans. The paradox here is that she recalled her mother being amused by her befriending a white child while she was still at primary school.

Like I said in primary my first friend was white and from another country, and my mom was very open to me having a friend from like another country. I think she welcomed that a lot since she found it interesting, “Oh, you have a white friend.”

However, by the time Kgadi wanted to enrol at a historically Afrikaans university her mother changed her views. In this respect racism was a major concern. Her mother held strong negative perceptions about white people. Kgadi further indicated that her grandmother shared the same sentiments as her mother. She thought that her grandmother was still stuck in the past as she related everything that had to do with white people to what happened during the time of apartheid. From her narrative I learned that most of the people that were around her as she was growing up associated white people with discrimination and racism.

I mean like I said my mom was very anti-Afrikaans, as much as she loved University of Pretoria and stuff. I mean before I even got to Tukkies my mom had, and people around me already told me, “You know Tukkies is very
“...I need my own space to study, like not have people talking outside the room and stuff.”

My first impression of Malebo was that she was an introverted person. As we started conversing, I realised that I may have misplaced her diligence in academics as a trait of wanting to keep to herself. I came to know Malebo as a conscientious young woman who valued her studies. She took meticulous care in the way she presented herself as she was speaking. As she opened up to me, I became aware that she was a refined and sophisticated student who was well aware of her priorities and knew what she was about.

Malebo initially came from the rural areas of one of the former homelands. Her family later moved to a suburb, which she described as predominantly white. According to Malebo her neighbourhood was characterised by lack of interaction between neighbours.

I’ve been staying there for like about 10 years. Uhmm it’s like a... basically it’s a suburb. So you don’t really get to interact that much with your neighbours. Sometimes you don’t even know who... like you see each other, but you don’t really know who is who?

Malebo talked extensively about lack of interracial contact at her former high school. She went to a historically Afrikaans high school which after transformation decided to have one English class per grade. I asked Malebo to describe interracial interactions at her school.

Oh, not... when I was still there not exactly because we were like one English group in each grade. Like a very, very small number. So we didn’t really interact that much with the other Afrikaans kids. Like most of them couldn’t even speak English.

She continued her description of lack of cultural inclusivity in school cultural celebrations.

Well it’s an Afrikaans high school, so things hadn’t like developed that further, that they introduced black uhm... activities or whatever. I am thinking the matric dance was basically all Afrikaans. We danced to sokkie music. Uhm... Valentine’s dance was also that.
According to Malebo their contact with white learners was limited to some sporting activities and to a few English white students who shared classes with the black learners.

**4.2.7 Kate (black):** “In other residences you have to wear uniform, you have to stand in queues and they shout at you. I’ve seen it happen and I have experienced it. Here there is no such in first year.”

As I listened to Kate telling her story, I was impressed by the tone of voice from which I could sense her deep compassion and sincere spirit. The manner in which her speech was composed depicted her as a good natured and warm hearted young woman. I was in no way going to mistake her politeness for a woman who was restricted by her femininity. She presented herself as a solid person with a strong leadership disposition. Kate had been staying at TuksVillage for three years.

She described her family as a large family and a typical African clan that put more value on extended family members. As she elaborated on her family and she put more worth on the role played by uncles and aunts in her life. She attributed her strong personality to the fact that she grew up surrounded by a number of siblings and many cousins. As she went on describing her family I could discern that she was from a cultured and strict family.

I grew up in the North. It’s a township. It’s like our neighbourhood is very calm. It is your typical South African township neighbourhood, where you have people chilling at the corner or loud music on weekends and maybe month end people go out and drink and so on. That’s kind of how it is. But in my house we are very conservative. Ja, and so no one in my family drinks, no one smokes and so on.

She eagerly shared her interpretation of how her family perceived racial interaction in South Africa. She talked about how some members of her family still believed that the power relations of the apartheid era are still apparent and white people are still superior to black people.

Most of them grew up in those times when they were really segregated. They never went to school with white people and so on. For them I think white people are still the bosses, type of thing.

As our conversation continued she narrated her experiences at her former high school. She mentioned that she went to an Afrikaans medium school. Being a black girl she learned most of her subjects in Afrikaans. Irrespective of her family’s perceptions about white Afrikaans-speaking people her mother decided to let her daughter take advantage of better education offered by historically white Afrikaans schools which were better equipped in terms of
material and the quality of human resources. What intrigued me is how she valued the experience she obtained from the school even when learning took place in the language that her family regarded as of the dominant oppressive group.

They put great emphasis on academics which helped me in being what I am now and being able to cope with what is happening now at varsity level.

Students’ interactions were characterised by lack of contact between interracial students. There were little clans of black or white students who occupied certain spaces across the school. In that regard the students shared the classroom, learned in the same language but segregated themselves outside the classroom. All black people ended up forming their own minicommunity.

As we moved to higher grades, we would sit by the cafeteria side. There were these benches; we sit by the bench, the black bench, but then obviously you reserve your benches.

She expressed the view that the culture of the school catered mainly for the dominant group. Black learners were the minority hence they were expected to assimilate into the dominant culture. During cultural events they mostly played Afrikaans music, while music that related to the black culture was played minimally.

4.2.8 Elise (white): “Like I’ve never had anyone be like, aah it’s because you are white. I’ve never heard that here.”

Elise introduced herself as a person who valued her independence and did not like being tied down by rules and curfews. I was captivated by her native English accent which gave her speech a refined texture. Elise’s family came to South Africa while she was in her early teens and she had already done her primary schooling at her native country. Apart from her parents she stayed with her two brothers. She explained that she came from a close-knit family who did not impose any restrictions on her interactions.

As our conversation progressed Elise commented on her family’s perceptions towards other races. Unlike South Africa, in her country of origin the racial tensions are not attributed to the black and the white racial groups. She could not recall incidences where racial tension in terms of black and white was ever an issue in her family.

Well being in a Western world you don’t really see the black and white race. There is no like a background to black and white race. When I came here I struggled a lot with racism.
However it was at her former high school where she started experiencing some effects of the legacy of apartheid. Elise struggled to understand why racial comments were made against her since her family was never part of the apartheid system. She could not understand why people thought that just because she was white she benefited from the injustice of the past. Nevertheless, she indicated that learning history at school helped her to understand the background of South Africa’s racial tensions. Elise went to a dual medium high school and she described the culture of the school as inclusive.

We had a big culture in high school. We tried to incorporate. Like in our choir we had English songs and Afrikaans and like Zulu songs. And sometimes we mixed songs in English, Afrikaans and Zulu.

She explained further that there was interracial contact at her former high school. She had friends from different racial groups and they are still in touch with her through social networks.

4.2.9 Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to understand how students from different backgrounds interact with each other at university residences. I believe that in this section I have indicated the portraits of diversity within the sampled participants. Apart from them belonging to two different races there is diversity in their family, neighbourhood and school background. In the section that follows, I give the contextual portrait of the research site.

4.3 The contextual portrait

TuksVillage is situated on the eastern side of the city that was once a proud beacon of the Afrikaner nation. This city was named after a leader of the Voortrekkers and still boasts works of architecture and artefacts that provide testimony to the intensity to which the Afrikaner nation was favoured by the laws that ensured unequal development between the various races of South Africa. The area was a major habitat for the Afrikaner population and as such it developed schools and tertiary institutions specifically for their use. In the same vein the University of Pretoria was converted in 1930 to cater exclusively for the needs of white Afrikaans-speaking South Africans.

In the early 1990s South Africa’s political landscape started to be transformed. This led to the inauguration of Nelson Mandela as the country’s first black president. Consequently, this caused the city in which Tukkies is located to transform. As a result a decision was taken to enrol black students at Tukkies and the implication was that all students now had to be
provided with university accommodation which was previously a white preserve. A decision to integrate the student residences was made in the late 1990s. However, within most of those residences separate living arrangements were provided. As the situation unfolded in 2008 the university decided to establish a co-educational residence after it had conducted a study of the needs of students in relation to accommodation. TuksVillage was initiated and diverse students were accommodated without race being used as a factor to establish living boundaries.

4.3.1 Framing the institutional practice

The establishment of TuksVillage led to the appointment of Dr J Hendrikz¹ as the Head of Residence. This middle-aged man who was tasked with running a residence program which was different from the conventional setup was not new to residence management at Tukkies. During his career at the University of Pretoria he had managed some of the traditional residences. It was still in the morning at about 9:00 when I arrived in Dr Hendrikz’s office at University of Pretoria for our interview session. The office was very welcoming, cosy and comfortable. As I was waiting for Dr Hendrikz I was mesmerised by one of the posters on the wall. It was a two-faced black and white portrait which captured the complexity of a multicultural society. To a certain extent the sculptures that were neatly placed around the room bestowed an African feel to the interior of this modern environment. As Dr Hendrikz joined me for the interview his face beamed with authority and passion. In his introduction he declared that he had a wealth of knowledge about the background of the case I was studying.

I will tell you about TuksVillage and where it comes from. I will tell you what I have done, what we have done to identify the specific unit that you are going to research.

Dr Hendrikz began by recollecting the dynamics within the various residence programmes at Tukkies. He talked about residences found at different campuses of the university. Most of the residences could be referred to as traditional type of residences. The traditions in some of these residences were deeply rooted as some of them were almost 100 years old. They put more emphasis on competition between the various residences which focused on challenging each other in sport, culture and social activities and endeavoured to have one of the residences acknowledged as best among all. However the residences which were predominantly Afrikaans-orientated in their approach to culture and language had become more diverse as students from different backgrounds were absorbed. The change in student demographics

¹ Dr J. Hendrikz gave “full consent to my [his] identity being revealed”.

© University of Pretoria
caused dissonance in settings which were historically monocultural as it became evident that more and more students were not willing to participate in the structured traditional residence activities. This prompted the university to conduct a comprehensive study which led to the establishment of TuksVillage.

Our conversation then shifted to the dynamics edged in the establishment of TuksVillage which was aimed at creating a residence that functioned and was structured differently.

Modern students in general want to be more independent, they want be part of the residence environment that allows more independence and that may be less structured and it is more communal in nature and don’t have this excessive or this massive major focus on competitiveness.

As he compared TuksVillage to other residences of the university he indicated that it is a megaresidence with physical facilities which are different from those of its counterparts. Instead of the traditional dining halls and long corridors, students live in units which have communal areas where they are prompted to share facilities.

They are living as a mini-commune. So it is not like students living in a residence with long corridors, each have their own room and they go to the dining hall, it doesn’t work like that.

He fondly reminisced how he ventured together with other members of the residence management team to distinguish how they managed the new residence as opposed to the management in traditional residences. Since he was no stranger to residence management he employed his experience to create a residence that looked and operated differently.

So what we said right from the start is that we will clearly need to understand what is going to be an underpinning philosophy of the residence, what will drive the human part of the residence, because we can’t allow it to become like the traditional residences.

The managers made it their first priority to come up with the character of TuksVillage. Still working within the vision of the university in relation to the new residence they decided that it would be academically oriented. It would cater for students who are serious about their studies; the activities will be less structured and students will live in a communal type of environment. They solicited the services of the Department of Ethics at the university to come up with a code of conduct which emphasises respect for the environment, no sexism, no racism, no criminality, respect for rules and working towards becoming a well-rounded citizen in South Africa. The code of conduct became the sphere of influence which gave direction to how the students were to live. Hence, he indicated:
And what we then decided is we need to move from a very rule driven kind of residence to where the code of conduct should be what directs how we do things at TuksVillage. And not we do things because of the rules, but we do things because of the code that we live by.

Another measure was to come to the fore with the first student component of the residence management committee which they identified through interviews. The management composition at TuksVillage had to go beyond the standard patterns of power which are determined by the unequal quota system in some residences. The group that was chosen comprised multiracial male and female students who did not receive any privileges because of the colour of their skin. In this regard the students became part of formulating the vision, the slogan and the rules which were within the framework of the university. That implied that the developments were ‘bottom-up’ rather than ‘top-down’. So the residents started to introduce rules and practices which were aligned with the vision, the slogan and the code of conduct they had previously developed. As in any academic residence noise was to be minimised. All students were to be treated equally disregarding their years of enrolment. In developing the rules the principle of cosmopolitanism was enhanced. According to Pogge (1992) cosmopolitan principles afford the institutional ground rules to be of the first order as they apply to a person’s responsibility to refrain from violating other people’s human rights. Despite the rules that were developed Dr Hendrikz described TuksVillage as a place of freedom. But the tone of his voice also indicated that the freedom which is afforded to the students came with a lot of responsibility.

If you understand the freedom that we allow you in this place you will be amazed at how you can grow and become greater than you have ever thought. If you however can’t handle this freedom in a responsible way you are not welcome here.

The management developed an orientation programme that was aimed at creating an inclusive environment and empowering first year students. At TuksVillage every person’s voice prevails and seniority is not used as a commodity to suppress other people’s view points.

We also understood that we need to change the so-called orientation programme for first years, because in most residences, the traditional type of residences the focus is on intimidating the first years and into inducting them into a tradition of that residence.

In the orientation programme, the management committee came up with a workshop on understanding diversity and stereotyping, how to respect the environment, and also taught the students various life skills that would enable them to work with people of different colours,
different cultures and different languages. Dr Hendrikz and his team encouraged the students to live as a community and to acknowledge each other’s existence.

So we started to build and we became stronger and stronger in the establishment of our culture. For example, the fact that we need to greet one another is a conscious thing that we try to communicate constantly with people.

Ramanujan (1989) attests that modernity among other things resulted in cultures that are stratified yet interconnected, where the different communities communicate but do not commune. In some of the so-called mixed residences racially diverse students live in separate floors and wings. The manner in which students are allocated to their rooms at TuksVillage is aimed at promoting interracial contact. Dr Hendrikz explained that the university strives to mix students on a 50/50 basis in terms of their racial composition. However, he acknowledged that it is not always possible as some students might decide to leave the residence causing imbalances in racial numbers within some units. Being an academic residence TuksVillage placed students according to their academic performance and according to black and white racial composition.

4.3.2 The role of institutional practice on choosing a residence

As I was interacting with the students I was eager to find out why they chose to stay at TuksVillage. I discovered that their decisions to stay at the residence were triggered for different reasons. Most of them consciously came to TuksVillage because it was a residence of choice for them, whereas for some a decision was made by the institution.

Among the eight participants, six of them intentionally chose to stay at TuksVillage. For Mary, TuksVillage could be distinguished from other residences. She alluded to that when she said:

TuksVillage is very different from other residences. Like I said there is no barrier where you can’t be staying with a black person, or you can’t be staying with a white person.

As Mary shared her rationale for choosing TuksVillage she indicated that she liked the fact that the residents were very diverse. What further attracted Mary to the residence is that the students were not forced to participate in the traditional residence activities. She explained:

I didn’t have time for those kinds of things. So it’s nice to just come here, be relaxed with the people you are staying with and just get your studies done and just enjoy your time at varsity.
In Mercy’s view TuksVillage created a feeling of independence which she found appealing. She explained that in terms of interaction between students, she regarded the environment at TuksVillage to be conducive.

And uhm ... also the commune setup, I really love that because of the fact that you are forced to live with people you don’t know. You are forced to be in each other’s lives. With other residences you can see people walk in corridors but they just go into their rooms and then come out and go somewhere.

This new residence attracted some students because the environment was interpreted as relaxed. Melisa’s talk revealed how she cautiously considered her choice of residence when she arrived at TUKKIES.

So I just wanted a nice chilled environment where I am not obliged to go participate in something and not prepare for a test because I need to focus on my studies.

As a young woman Melisa did not want to be in a place where she would be tied down by rules. During our conversation she made her reasons for her repulsion of traditional residences explicit.

There are just too many rules, and coming from school rules, my parents’ rules, and you come to varsity and there are still rules. And then your boyfriend can’t visit in your room and you got to sit on the grass. It’s just awkward. I don’t know. It’s just strange to me.

What Joy liked about TuksVillage is that it was portrayed as a relaxed residence. In her case it was recommended by a friend who stayed at TuksVillage a couple of years before she arrived.

Elise’s recollection of what one of her family members had experienced became a conviction in her preference for a university residence. As we were conversing her head was reeling over what had happened to her brother when he joined one of the universities some years back.

My brother broke his vertebra during initiations. So my mom didn’t want me to go into any res which had any form of any initiation whatsoever.

According to Elise equality and freedom are two attributes that define TuksVillage. She found the fact that both senior students and first-years were on an equal status to be appealing and was a good way to deter racial confrontations.

I feel like with residences that have that if you are a third year you got higher status; people take it and their heads seem to be big about it. I think that’s sometimes where conflict comes in more because ... say for instance if I was third year and I say to a first year will you do this and this. Racial comments
could come out there, because one can say that, “why are you saying that to me. Is it because of the colour that I am whatever”?

I suppose Kgadi’s choice of residence had to do with an encounter she found peculiar when she was trying to find a room to stay. She did not want to be in a residence where cultural and linguistic capital reward power and status (Purnell, Ali, Begum & Carter, 2007).

I got into another res called Meisie Laan and I went to really check the room out. And when I got in, there were these black girls, these black girls are singing Afrikaans songs in a line and they had to dance and stuff before they got in. I was like No! No! No! No! No! I didn’t even go to the room.

For Kgadi, TuksVillage depicted a residence which offered true democracy and freedom. The fact that it did not assume an Afrikaans name like most of the residences at TUKKIES was an indication that it was ready to embrace diversity. As a young woman in a democratic country she did not want to be in a place where she would feel oppressed. She made it clear that she was against the quota system applied in some traditional residences.

And also that whole 60/40 thing. Like it’s been a rule apparently. It’s been a rule for sometimes. The quota is 60/40 obviously 60 for whites and I thought that it doesn’t make sense to me. It is not fair. I want to be like in a place. I just want to live at a res and have the packs of res, like food and stuff like that and like social interaction and I don’t want to do those Afrikaans things. So I chose a res that is truly democratic.

Malebo and Kate did not consciously choose to live at TuksVillage. They both found accommodation at other university residences and Kate was already in the process of learning residence culture at the residence she initially had applied for. However, because of the field of study they were pursuing they had to be accommodated at TuksVillage. Malebo recalled:

Uhm was it really...? It wasn’t really much of a choice or... I was supposed to stay at this other residence but then I joined this other programme and then they just allocated us to TuksVillage. So it wasn’t like oh! I like that res or I’m going to stay there. So ja I think I came here by chance basically.

In this section I highlighted the reasons for the participants in choosing to live at TuksVillage. Six of the participants made informed choices as they compared TuksVillage with other university residences. Meanwhile two of them were placed there because it is a residence which is particularly focused on academics. In the following section, I discuss students’ perception on leaving TuksVillage for other residences.
4.3.3 Students’ perceptions on leaving the residence

As I continued with the interviews I wanted to find out if the participants had ever considered moving out of TuksVillage. Mary explained that she was happy to stay until she completed her studies. According to Mary one of the most interesting things about staying in her present unit was that she shared a unit with two of the girls from the previous year’s unit.

There seemed to be a problem with the size of rooms for some participants. It is for this reason that most of them considered moving out of TuksVillage. Whereas others felt that they had stayed at TuksVillage for a long time. However, what is notable from their explanations is that none of them wanted to leave TuksVillage for a traditional residence. Mercy tried to recall what prompted her to think about leaving the residence.

Uhm last year, I guess it was basically because I felt like it was time to leave res. Ja that was my reason because we were here for a long time. Just wanted to move out and go to a private accommodation. To see how it was. It was... I didn’t leave because it was just convenient to live here. And plus it’s almost the same as private accommodation because uhm... we don’t have those rules where you have to do this and that.

Melisa felt that the space in her room was not enough for her. In her explanation she mentioned that:

You know I used to, ok! Like the thing is, it’s my third year now. I am not really enjoying it here this year. Like, I like my unit and everything. Like, I like it a lot, but the room is too small now.

There was a moment when Joy also considered moving out of TuksVillage. She indicated that:

Uhm .. I was thinking about moving into a flat next year, but that’s just because I’ve been staying here for three years now. My parents were talking about me getting a flat but I am not moving out. I am staying here next year. I just decided it is very nice staying here and I enjoy it so much that I might as well just ... I don’t need to move out.

Elise clearly stated that:

No reason that I would have to move out of here. Not to go to another res.

As Kgadi explained her intention to move I discovered that her movement was going to be limited to the different blocks within TuksVillage.

I am going to consider moving out. I won’t mind meeting new people. But having like, taking two of these girls, I wouldn’t mind staying with them. It’s what I am saying. Like if I had to say given a choice, they say you can move here and I don’t like the block or you can stay here. I’ll stay here.
Malebo was going to consider moving out of Tuks Village to a post-graduate residence. As a student who put more value on academics she felt that the communal setup at Tuks Village did not create an environment for her to concentrate on her studies without being disturbed by the other residents.

Yes, like... maybe this is my third year at the village. I think I might have overstayed my welcome. Like the rooms are so small and we are living like eight people and I am doing my third year, it is not like first year where I had a lot of time. I could chill in the kitchen and like talk all night and all of that. It’s kind of... I need my own space to study.

Despite Kate wanting to leave Tuks Village she fondly talked about how she loved the residence. However she was of the opinion that she stayed at the residence for a long time and after comparing it with post-graduate residences she contemplated leaving Tuks Village.

I love this place and I love the setting and moving out is not because I have bad blood in the unit or I hate living with white people. And it’s also that those first years are going to come in next year and we are so old. But it’s nothing bad if I don’t get into the other residences I am staying here. It’s not a train smash if I stay here.

In this section, I presented the opinion of the participants about leaving Tuks Village. Even though it is evident that most of them did consider leaving the residence at some stage they however after reassessing their options decided to stay. It was also clear that two of the participants were still going to consider going to postgraduate residences. In the next section, I discuss how the students interpreted the benefits of staying at Tuks Village.

4.3.4 Benefits of being in an interracial residence

During our conversations, I wanted to find out how the residents of Tuks Village benefited from their environment. Except for two participants, all others spoke at length about the benefits of staying in an interracial residence. They were aware of how staying at Tuks Village would influence their future. Most of them appreciated what they were learning from living with people from different cultures.

Mary adoringly spoke about what it means for her to stay at Tuks Village.

I must say that I enjoy it. It’s nice to have different people around you, do you understand? Not all white people, there are black people, there are Indians. Everyone is different and the feeling is pretty good.

As our dialogue continued Mary indicated that she had learned to adapt to different situations and to live with various people. As a young woman she was grateful for the morals that she
was learning at TuksVillage. When I was listening to her interpretation of how she experienced staying at TuksVillage, I realised that Mary had learned to value difference and accepted the racial others.

You learn to live with different other types of people. So you learn to respect how other people live because if you don’t respect it you are going to be very unhappy. So you learn to adapt to different situations and you learn to live with people, even though they may not live the same way as you. It doesn’t make them a worse person.

Listening to the manner in which Mercy interpreted how she had benefited from living at TuksVillage was an inspiring experience. The encounter helped her to break through the racial barriers that limited her interaction with the white race.

For me especially, I have learned to be much more comfortable around different races. I think it is definitely... in a small way without people even realising that being put together with different races, being forced to live with different races is going to... in the future we are going to just be able to interact with different races more easily.

For Mercy the gain of bringing people from diverse backgrounds together was going to be extended to the future generation. In her interpretation coming back to TuksVillage at the beginning of each academic year is like starting a new family which enabled students to help one another and also give one another moral support. Melisa was of the opinion that staying at TuksVillage will equip the residents with interpersonal skills that they will utilise in the future.

I mean one day in a work situation you won’t know how to interact. So is very good because it is forcing people to interact that wouldn’t usually interact and you find that you can be friends with everyone and you can live together and everyone is normal.

As a white girl Melisa acknowledged that the benefits would be even more for Afrikaans-speaking white students.

I know like some people, like the Afrikaans people aren’t used to interacting with black people. So if they don’t interact in TuksVillage where will they interact? And then they get to a work situation and their boss is a black guy and they feel awkward. You know what I mean?

According to Joy her stay at TuksVillage has taught her that irrespective of the different racial groups, people have similarities.

I think it kind of taught me that we are so similar. Like, as much as we have big differences, we are all technically the same thing. We all need the same thing.
As we continued with our conversation Joy explained that apart from the fact that living in a university residence you get the social interaction, TuksVillage offers its residents an opportunity to learn from different backgrounds. Her face lit up as she recalled an incident in which one of the white students had to do a project based on a black culture. What was fascinating about the occurrence is that they were able to obtain first-hand information from some of the black girls in their unit.

One girl couple of doors down, a white girl, she had a project to do. She had to base it on one of any of the African cultures that she wanted. She had to talk about the food and all that kind of thing, but, we were on the internet and stuff and we were no! Actually we went and spoke to a couple of the girls and we learned about the actual traditions which I found very interesting.

Elise also learned how to deal with people of different races and different backgrounds. She thought that the lessons would come in handy when she went to the work place. She also thought that being at TuksVillage helped her to interact with diverse people in a manner that was acceptable.

So it helps you to be able to understand and to communicate properly and in a way you get to socialise with different people of different backgrounds. Actually it helps for the future to ... when you have to work with different people from different backgrounds, you have experienced it. You know how to deal with it yourself.

Elise seemed to appreciate the fact that she had learnt much about the culture of black people from the girls she had lived with in the previous units. As she narrated what they taught her, I could discern that she valued the kind of knowledge she had accumulated from their interactions.

Kgadi came from a family that had intense negative perceptions of white people. As I listened to her as she was speaking, I was puzzled by the manner in which her initial perceptions were transformed by staying at an interracial residence.

They are really teaching me to be open-minded you know, not be judgemental and stuff like that. Just to be like friendly, there is no need of stereotypes or the way you think people are or a certain person is, doesn’t mean now you have to treat everyone like that.

As I spoke to Kgadi, I realised how much she valued the lessons she had learned at TuksVillage. She did not only attribute the benefits to how she related to white people, but also how she interacted with the human race in general.

I think I have benefited even like amongst... not only whites you know I have learned to be open minded and accept other people. Like people in general,
you can treat them the same because even amongst us as blacks there is like a lot of division.

In deciding whether she benefits from staying at TuksVillage, Malebo struggled to come up with details pertaining to the people she shared the unit with.

I really don’t know. I guess meeting... having had the opportunity to meet the people that I have met here at TuksVillage and those are basically going to be lifetime friends. Not just... and most of them, we are studying the same thing so we going to be in the same field.

The influence of the character of TuksVillage as an academic orientated residence was evident in how Malebo thought that putting black and white students in close proximity at TuksVillage did not allow them to learn about one another’s backgrounds. She felt that students spent more of their time concentrating on their studies than on getting to know each other.

The thing is... everyone does their own thing. Everyone is always so busy and we all have different schedules so we don’t really get into that position of connecting and taking things from each other, like learning from each other’s background and so on. Maybe in the first year you would have had a chance but now, no.

In this section, I showed how students interpret their benefit from staying at an interracial residence. Students described how they learned to live and interact with racial others. They saw it as an opportunity to learn about other people’s background and about various cultures. However, there were students who felt that they had to spend more time on their academic work and this limited their interaction with other students. In the next section, I present the perceptions of the participants on student socials.

### 4.3.5 Students socials

The influence of Dr Hendrikz also had an effect on how students conducted social events at TuksVillage. He promotes cultural activities that advocate racial inclusivity and put measures to curb racial or cultural bias in any function. Students were given opportunities to initiate and advertise the cultural events of other residents. However, to limit the possibility of monopolising social events by racial groups, Dr Hendrikz ensured that the list of people associated with the events was balanced in terms of black and white people attending the event. He recounts his reaction to a list of participants which was racially uneven:

Change your advertisement. If it is not an inclusive function it is not going to happen. Because we will not perpetuate stereotypes in that we will have a
white function and a black function. It doesn’t work that way. If we don’t have an inclusive function we don’t have a function.

The duplication of cultural hegemony was deterred at TuksVillage. It was important for all racial groups to be accommodated during social and cultural events, starting with the music play list which catered for various genres popular among South African university students. Dr Hendrikz insisted that the list should include among others kwaito, boeremusiek, English pop music, rock music and R ’n B. Mercy lived at TuksVillage from its very beginning. She describes how the students’ socials evolved over the years.

In the beginning... the first year, it was separated. Racially the music was separated. Like there was one play list, I mean there was like a few seconds for all white and the rest of the night for black music. I saw it for example if they play the Afrikaans sokkie sokkie people will just stand back, like me, just say let’s wait for them to finish. But then from the second year onwards they tried to incorporate play lists that included both so that it’s mixed.

Mercy fondly talked about how the intervention by Dr Hendrikz to incorporate the play list improved the students’ approach to the socials.

But last year... the last event I’ve been to was... you can see people were gelling in. Ja they were gellying in so it worked out. I think we have learned from the past. Like especially Dr Hendrikz was trying to... this was what he was trying to instil. He was trying to... like uhm target the socials especially because he has noticed the differences. It has, it has worked out.

The same sentiment is expressed by Kgadi:

In our socials... actually Dr Hendrikz tells us that “Guys you should find ways to accommodate everyone”. So the social that we had we opened... we started off playing white music it was so nice, the vibe was so nice when we started playing house music even the white people were dancing to house music because it was so integrated. There was no segregation, just all of us dancing together.

Student socials did not only serve to entertain the students but also helped them to appreciate other people’s cultures. At the beginning of the year students participated in the dance and play list competition. They taught each other how to dance to different kinds of music. An ordinary moment like teaching each other moves on the dance floor enabled some students to cross the bridge that separated them in terms of their music preferences. Mercy recalled her exposure to Afrikaans music and how she had learned to dance to the sokkie sokkie.

Like when my friend and I went and they started playing sokkie sokkie, so we were like let’s try it and see and then one of the guys came and said “let me show you how to do it. It was fun, it was really fun.
Despite the inclusivity of the student socials, Melisa is of the opinion that it is mostly black students who like to socialise. In some events white students gradually leave and eventually black people will be left to continue with the event.

So there will be some black and white people and they will always end up with all black people there and then it turns to them playing their music because there are no white people... but TuksVillage is always very like trying to be racially diverse. They will never say anything to offend anyone. They wouldn’t purposefully play only Afrikaans music or purposefully play black music. It’s just how it happens.

According to Banks (2007) for people to experience cultural democracy and freedom, there must be cohesion around a set of democratic values such as justice and equality that provide stability in terms of unity and diversity and protect the rights of diverse groups. Instead of promoting traditional events that encompass the previous hegemonic images and practices that are seen to perpetuate the dominant culture, TuksVillage started to create its own traditions. As an academic residence, it holds annual academic awards which are found to be culturally relevant by most of the participants. The main categories of the event are best performer in the unit, best performer in the block, best performer in the residence and so forth. Kgadi was overwhelmed with excitement as she visualised the distinctiveness of the anticipated academic awards day.

We are going to have those torches; we are going to have drums and stuff. In our socials... like most of the time from these other residences’ socials they just play Afrikaans and you know these beats that are just for whites.

TuksVillage is not focused on structured activities. However the students admired and appreciated the moments they spend in sport and other socials. The activities are initiated and managed by the students themselves. Despite the fact that residents attend the socials on their own free will they are also seen as an opportunity to make friendships and have fun. This makes the students cherish being part of the socials as they are voluntary and not imposed on anyone. Kate indicated that:

The fact is that when the people do plan something and you participate, it’s really fun. So in TuksVillage if you want to do something or if you want to have fun, if you want to meet people and if you want to socially interact with people you have to come out by yourself... Instead of in other places where they tell you do this and do that and you kind of resist because you are being forced sometimes.

This section reveals that the student socials were initially separated. When the management realised that there was segregation, they intervened by incorporating play lists because music is an integral part of student socials. The intervention was successful and saw students...
exploring new frontiers as they tried to learn about each other’s music. Moreover in the case of TuksVillage, the student socials taught the students to appreciate each other’s difference. In the next section, I frame the interpersonal relations of the participants.

4.4 Framing the interpersonal relations

The nature of the setup at TuksVillage allows social interaction between diverse students to develop. It is important to note that the students came to this interracial residence with varying preconceived perceptions. In this section I discuss how they interpret their views on social interactions, sharing of facilities, challenges, conflict management and efforts to create positive environments.

4.4.1 Social interactions

At TuksVillage, students live as mini communities. They find themselves having to relate and depend on each other to a certain extent. The manner in which the students approach social interactions is determined by their level of exposure to racial others prior to coming to the university.

Mercy did not know how to handle her new association with white people during her initial arrival at TuksVillage. She grew up around black people and that made her more comfortable around people of her own race. In the beginning of her stay at the university residence she preferred to interact with the black girls. Being at TuksVillage offered Mercy a mirror through which she reflected on her perceptions and at the same time offered her a window to view and understand the racial others.

... growing up I was never really around other races except black. Where we lived in Nokaneng there are many black people. So then when you are walking around you see one white person it’s like okay, I don’t really know how to approach this person, even though they are just human beings. So when I was able to drop that and just try and break through my comfort zone I found that it was all in my head.

The extension of mirrors and windows was also evident in how other participants interpreted their perceptions. Kgadi spoke strongly about how her discernment of white people had changed.

They have influenced me but I’d say at first it was in a negative way. I won’t lie. Last year, even before I came to res I was just negative. Each time I saw a white person on campus I just passed them and just thought in a certain way because of the mentality that I had from my parents and stuff like that... So all of sudden I have all these white people around me, but like being in
TuksVillage had changed that perception. I saw that white people are not all like that.

Staying at TuksVillage helped Kgadi to work on her stereotypes. She acknowledged that being in close proximity with white people caused her to begin thinking about her own prejudices.

I thought that they were all the same. They were racist. They all think that they are better but engaging with them they have changed my perception I don’t think that they are better. They are just normal people and I used to think they all looked at black people as one thing. They actually see you as an individual. Like these girls notice when I change my hair, they always notice. I thought they just see... she braided.

For some of the participants, TuksVillage did not have much influence on their perceptions. They were exposed to diverse races in their early years at primary and high school, therefore being in the midst of racial others was not a new thing for them. Mary mentions:

But I think because of my background of always having black people around me and other kinds of people around me. Like in school I had black friends, so I never had that prejudice.

According to Melisa, she did not have issues with cross racial interactions. Her encounters with black people in high school helped her to be comfortable when exposed to people from different cultures at TuksVillage.

It really doesn’t bother me because I was in a choir, for uhm... for five years there were some blacks and Indians as well. So I am used to like being in a bus, sharing a bathroom or chilling together and it really doesn’t bother me at all.

Kate was never threatened by interacting with other races,

I didn’t have that thing as a child growing up that okay these people are better than I am or these people are supposed to control or so on... I’ll see ja you are white but so what? Throughout high school I’ve been with white people. Black people were the minority but then, so what? Now here I treat any black person the same way I would treat a white person.

As the interviews continued I wanted to understand how students interpret their interaction with others at TuksVillage. Since most of the participants went to multiracial schools their previous interracial contacts were limited to public arenas. Coming to TuksVillage made them interact within their personal spaces which I think is more intimate.
Mercy went down memory lane of her early contact with the racial others. She recounted that by breaking through her comfort shell she learned much about the white girls in her unit. She became aware of the difference between the two races in terms of social interactions. She broke through her own isolation and began to go across the bridge by interacting with the people she previously regarded as the out-group.

On the black side we don’t really talk that much. When you see the white girls, you find them in their rooms, all together, talking and getting to know each other. I tried to also just join them and see how it is. It was one night we were talking about everything, talking about their lives. I found that interesting because with the black girls ... we don’t really ... it’s more like, how is your day? They are just talking about everything you know, not really reserved.

From the above excerpt it is evident that interactions at TuksVillage are not restricted by racial boundaries. I was intrigued by the fact that within the unit that I studied, black students attested to lack of interactions with girls of their own race. In fact there was more interracial association than same race association as far as the black girls were concerned. When I asked Kgadi if she had ever felt left out when she was around the white girls, her revelation was forthcoming and seemingly unrestricted. She blatantly indicated that:

No! Actually I don’t. I’d even say I feel more left out around these girls, the two black girls, they keep to themselves. These ones (white girls) are so friendly, like if I had to choose, I’d rather stay with them next year than these two. It is not even about you know, race anymore because I’d feel more excluded if I had to chill with these ones (two black girls).

The kitchen area provided a favourable platform for social interaction. The students have to prepare their meals or wash their dishes particularly in the evening. There is a big rectangular table with eight chairs in which residents could become somewhat more comfortable having a meal around it than sitting in their rooms. It is at moments like this when they will be sharing what happened throughout the day. They usually talk about their frustrations and challenges. They also get the opportunity to learn about each other’s cultures in terms of food and so forth. Mercy recounts one of her memories of what happened in the kitchen area.

She was beginning to cook so I was just looking at what she was cooking because it was different. It was like “Oh tell me about this. And there was another girl who was baking. I was like oh you baking chocolate cake. Then she is like “Yes, would you like a piece?” So, ja we just got to exchange.

Joy also cherished the time she spent in the kitchen.

Uhm ... I know the thing that I enjoy most is just when ... I know it happen most in the kitchen, when everyone is around in the kitchen and that kind of
thing. We are all talking and laughing and all joking around. I really enjoy that. It’s fun. That’s my favourite part of it.

For Elise the moments spent in the kitchen provided a homely atmosphere. She described how she valued the opportunity of interacting with her unit mates. Listening to her describe her personal apprehension as caused by having left the nest made me realise that for students like Elise TuksVillage is more like ‘home away from home’.

I do struggle because I don’t get to see my parents a lot because I live far. But we interact quite a bit in the kitchen when we are all cooking supper and stuff. I enjoy that. You don’t feel like sitting in a room staring at four walls. Like... you have people of different experiences and stuff. It’s nice to speak to everyone at the end of the day, because none of us is studying the same thing. So it’s like at home you are not doing the same thing as everyone during the day. When you come home you all have different things to talk about. It’s nice; it’s like family that way.

Kgadi detailed what she discovered about the white girls she lived with.

And like you know sitting with them, they are so interested in even learning about us. And they will ask you, where are you staying? Like you know we have a lot of similarities. Like now we all stay in the suburbs whatever, but they are interested in like where I used to stay. They even ask us to plait their hair, how much does that cost, they are very interested.

Students at TuksVillage have learned to recognise and appreciate their differences.

...like we always joke about the hair thing. “You guys are lucky you don’t have to plait your hair.” They go like “But I wish I had black hair so that I can do something else. I am always doing the same thing. The race thing only comes up as a joke or something.

This section reveals that the physical setup in the units allows students to have sufficient social interaction. The participants interpret the environment to be conducive enough to promote a sense of belonging. Most of them indicated that being able to interact with the others made their unit feel like home. Moreover, the section also reveals that some of the participants were able to deal with their prejudices and stereotypes. In the next section I show how the participants view their efforts of creating a positive environment in the unit.

4.4.2 Effort to create positive environment

At TuksVillage the students have to create an environment in which they can all get along. Their contributions and reactions in any given situation can either build or harm how they interact. As our conversations progressed, I asked participants to describe how they contributed to creating a positive environment in the unit. The common sentiment shared by
participants was the necessity to communicate with everyone. Mary further expressed the need to accept every person and be concerned about their wellbeing.

I am very accepting of everyone. I’ll make an effort to speak to everyone. I see them in the kitchen I’ll greet them. I’ll chat to them and ask them how their day was.

Joy also shared the same sentiment.

I think like everyone here, we are all very friendly with each other and we are genuinely interested in everyone else’s wellbeing and that kind of thing. So you will see if someone comes in, someone who lives here, we all greet each other, we all often sit around and talk and joke around, and if someone has written a test and they come back, everyone want to know how the test went and that kind of thing. It’s very nice coming back here. It’s like you are coming home to a group of friends.

Melisa also talked extensively about the need to talk to everyone.

No one feels... I don’t think anyone feels alienated like they are not friends and like if all of us white girls are in the kitchen cooking and washing dishes, like Malebo or someone come or Kgadi we will talk to her. We won’t be like, can’t talk to that person because she is not part of our friend group, like we are all friends. So we always chat and ask her how you doing and how is exam going.

Melisa described an incident that occurred the previous year. In her talk, the message of talking to one another and giving each other moral support was clear.

... so that people don’t feel alienated because last year there was a girl in my unit, it was a white girl, our unit last year was like five white girls and three black girls. The one girl she battled a lot with like depression and stuff and she like would never come out of her room. And every time she came out of her room we all tried to interact with her and like come sit with us for dinner and she was like no, no, no. So I don’t ever want anyone to feel like they are not welcome or they are on their own.

Kgadi shared her memories of what usually happens when she comes back to the unit. As she was talking, I realised that there was evidence of cross-group and extended friendships.

What happens is like, every time when I come they are always together, these four girls (white girls) because they are friends. And they are friend with my other friend who is staying in another block. Every time we come in we talk and we talk by the door or like we sit down. And there is not enough space. It’s like we talk for long and we laugh and stuff. And we were just thinking we must have like... whatever, we must have like a cocktail. We are going to have a cocktail day. Just sit and chill properly, not like by the door or standing up or in someone’s room or you know squashed and stuff. But they are really cool. They actually came up with that.

Kgadi recounted with a sense of gratitude the support they give to each other.
Like well done, don’t forget to do this, if I like to go to a social or whatever I’ll tell them to come. I remember like we had an auction night were we auctioned each other off, the money went to charity. So they came and they were supporting me because I told them to raise the bid high. We were raising it high, so it was high. We do support each other like that. Even for residence management, when I was running, they were like telling people to vote for me and stuff. So a lot of their friends voted for me.

Mercy expressed her appreciation for how tolerant her unit mates can be. She elaborated on how the girls accommodate her noise-making when she plays her musical instruments. Beyond that Mercy recounted how one of the girls saw the need to acknowledge each other’s birthdays.

There was one particular girl who asked “Should we put our birthdays up on the notice board. So we can just get to know when each other’s birthday is... Like one time we waited until 12 O’clock, midnight, one of the girls... and I think she was fallen asleep already. So by the time midnight came we just came knocking on the door and like “Oh happy birthday” and I just gave her a hug. It’s like we just building a little family every time.

As far as Malebo is concerned she was not contributing in creating a homely environment in the unit. It became apparent then that her personal interests did not revolve on social interaction with her unit mates. From our conversation, I detected that Malebo valued her personal space as that provided to her the opportunity to concentrate on her studies and personal hobbies.

Oh, uhm... I think most of the time I am in my room trying to work or watch a movie or something. I don’t think I contribute much to that one because I hardly see most of them. I just hear them talking.

Kate believes that at the forefront of creating a homely environment, students must be able to accommodate each other. She explained what she meant by accommodation in painstaking detail.

I try to leave the place the way I find it. Like if I have dishes I leave them in my room because I don’t want to leave them out there for days and other people suffer through seeing my dirty things. I try to accommodate others. I don’t play loud music and leave my door open and come back from wherever I come from and make a noise.

As part of the residence management Kate thought that it was critical for her to make sure that the people are living in harmony together. In addition to that if they have problems, with facilities that are really urgent and they aren’t being sorted out she refers the problem to the relevant people.
This section reveals that most of the participants consider their resident unit to be like home. It is critical to make the effort to speak to other residents by approaching them and greeting them. Some of the participants indicated that acceptance of everyone and communicating with the others is vital for their interactions to be positive. Taking interest in others is very important as it enables them to detect if they are going through personal challenges and in turn gives moral support. However, one participant confessed that she did not socialise with the others.

4.4.3 Friendship

As the interviews continued, I wanted to understand the nature of friendships that were developing among the participants. In my opinion TuksVillage offers an environment which is conducive to both cross-race and same-race friendships to develop. In Mary’s opinion, good friendships are developing in their unit and that is what she cherishes most about her unit. Kgadi shares the same sentiment:

I think... I think like making units friends, like those girls (white girls) they really, really nice, and Kate, she is also very nice. Like I know if I have a problem because I am secretary and she is also secretary. Whenever I have to have a problem, I can always talk to her. It really does feel like a home. You know at home when you have a problem you talk to your mom or something. So like here if I got a problem I tell her. These girls always notice when I am writing and stuff and always “say good luck”. Last time I had to go to the library, they offered to take me. The kindness, the friendliness, that’s why I wouldn’t mind staying with them again. I think that’s the best experience.

Elise emphasised that she did not choose friends based on skin colour.

If we are friends we are going to be friends. I will not be friends with someone because of their skin or whatever. Like in the other unit I interacted a lot more with them (black girls) because in the unit I was staying I was the only white and the rest were black.

Conversely, Kate had a different opinion on friendship within the unit. She did not consider the girls she stayed with as her friends but her unit mates. She expressed that because of their different schedules she did not connect well enough with the girls for their relationship to qualify as friendship. She also thinks that because of their age and the fact that they already had friends from previous years development of new friendships is limited. In describing their relationship she said:

I wouldn’t say friends per se. Right now they are just my unit mates. I talk to them about maybe the series I watched. I ask some things from them and so on. It is not really a situation of we will sit for long hours and talk.
Nevertheless, Kate indicated that she does not rule out the possibility of new friendships emerging with the girls she shared the unit with.

Definitely, because... like I believe that the people you meet, everyone you meet can be something in your life. So if it were possible if the time comes where maybe we connect and we start interacting more, I am very open to that.

As we conversed, I wanted to know if the participants would consider having prolonged cross race relationships with some of their unit mates. From the tone of Mercy’s voice, I discerned that by breaking through her isolation she was able to develop meaningful relationships with the racial others.

Yes, I would, definitely. And I had with the other girls from other years, ja. I have continued the relationship. That’s why I find it exciting staying here every year because I know that after we done living together we built some friendships. There is always friendship.

Kgadi explained further the importance of prolonged relationships. She wanted to see beyond what happened at TuksVillage. It became apparent for Kgadi to track if they could apply what they learned at TuksVillage to the world outside their residence.

I think that’s very important. I’d really like that. So you can see how we have done and stuff and how like just interacting with each other has affected us and if they actually carried through. I mean is nice for them to be nice. It’s nice to be nice to people when you live with them but you must be able to go out in the world and still be able to be nice to those same people or people like.

Cross-race friendships were not a new phenomenon for Elise. Accordingly, she valued prolonged relationships with her unit mates.

Ja, few friends from school that I had I see them when I go home and it’s nice to see them. And also lot of my brother’s friends are also of different ... my brother befriended lot of people more than I am with close relationships with other races. So when they are at my house I interact with them.

Malebo doubted if she would have a prolonged relationship with her unit mates. She declared that she was not in contact with the friends she made after she arrived at the university.

Uhm... friends from first year... first year ja, I had in my unit but I haven’t seen any of them... No, is that when we see each other we stop and then we catch up and stuff but other than that we don’t call each other and stuff.

Even though the participants did not attest to self-segregation in their unit there is an indication that intimate friendships developed among same race people. As Melisa indicated:

Like my friends, basically it’s like us four white girls in a row we are like very good friends. And it’s like Kate and Malebo are friends and then Mercy has a
friend from another unit and then Kgadi has another friend. So like we all got our little groups and stuff.

This section reveals that some of the participants valued friendships that were developing within the unit. However, their accounts differed in terms of what friendship entails. For most, staying together and being able to interact was equivalent to friendship and they valued that kind of association. While for some friendship is more than talking and general cohabiting. The sentiment shared by most of the participants is that it is significant for them to have prolonged relationships. However, one participant indicated that she did not consider having a prolonged relationship with any of her unit mates. There was also an indication that the four white students were close friends with the rest of the girls being friends to people outside the unit.

4.4.4 Confessions of attitudes towards sharing facilities and personal space

At TuksVillage residents occupying each unit share a bathroom, self-catering kitchen, laundry, lounge and dining room. It seems as if cleanliness caused most apprehension as far as the sharing of facilities was concerned. Though the participants were divided on the issue of sharing facilities none of them attributed their encounters to racial differences.

Mercy expressed some of her frustrations caused by different values with regard to cleanliness. And she is of the opinion that it has nothing to do with race.

With that I have mixed emotions because I think it depends with who you are living with. Like I don’t... with regards to that I don’t blame it on the cultural background, I blame it on the person’s character, because like uhm... well, I can see the difference between this unit and my friend’s unit. The kitchen is always clean. Here it is always like full of dishes and ja.... So at times it’s a bit frustrating but I can understand because you can’t really expect someone else to view it the way you view it, because I like a place that is always clean and no dishes. But someone who grew up in a situation like I wash my dishes in five days... and stuff like that. Somehow I have learned to compromise with that but that has also brought a little tension to the unit because of different backgrounds of how people keep their stuff.

According to Elise, she did not have any serious problems with sharing of facilities. She is of the opinion that the small problems that they had were not interracial.

I don’t think so because we didn’t actually know whose they were. So it could have been anyone’s dishes. I never thought ... dishes are dishes. I think it has to do with how you are brought up. I don’t think it has to do with what colour you are.
Malebo felt that people should put the dirty things in their rooms so that they don’t affect everyone. As she compared the present unit with previous ones, she concluded that it was not about race.

I wouldn’t because you don’t know who? You just find things dirty. You don’t really know who has done it. But even though last year I stayed with mostly black people and like two white girls it was like... I think I enjoyed... out of the three years that I have been here I think last year’s unit I enjoyed it more because we never had any noise problem. We never had any cleanliness problem, every room was clean.

As far as Kate is concerned, she does not mind sharing facilities with racial others. She believes that people should consider others.

If you know that there are other people who have dishes to be washed or if you know that there are other people who will use the same toilet, you won’t leave it in an unimaginable state. You will at least try to make an effort to know that there is someone else who is going to want to use this, so let me just leave it clean.

As I listened to Kgadi reminiscing on her views concerning sharing of facilities, I could sense the paradox in how she perceived the lack of cleanliness. Even though she did not explicitly blame that on race her articulation was with mixed sentiments.

Uhm, I don’t mind. But sometimes it’s quite annoying because I mean you can tell... most of the time their hair (white girls) blocks the shower because their hair is too long and stuff. So that’s a bit irritating, like I don’t like sharing the shower in terms of that. And like eish! Some of the girls here are not that neat. I mean I don’t know who it is. I am not going to put it on race. But in terms of sharing they are respectful like if someone is showering they won’t get in. They are different, like if they wash their dishes or whatever they will move your dishes and put somewhere properly. They won’t just wash over your dishes like “other people”. So sharing with them is really not bad. They are very respectful and stuff like that.

Although most of the participants acknowledged that there were problems in their unit, none of them could describe the problems as racially motivated. When I enquired from Mercy whether she could attribute any of the challenges to racial differences, her response showed that she had not done so.

No haven’t, actually haven’t. I’ve been fortunate not to experience that.

Melisa amused me to no end as she talked about how she too played a part in causing problems within the unit.

I don’t have race wise problems, but there are problems in our unit. Not that many problems like ok, I... don’t really wash my dishes, I try to but I am so busy and then they built up and I feel bad ok. But I’ll try to wash and then it is
a problem because I don’t wash my dishes and someone else doesn’t wash their dishes, everyone’s dishes build up.

Melisa’s confession alluded to the alleged mishaps occurring in the kitchen. For me it was interesting how her unit mates kept on saying that they were not aware of the people who neglected washing their dishes. As the participants interpreted their experiences with sharing facilities, I detected that inasmuch as most of them acknowledged that they had experienced problems, some of them also avoided confronting the people whom they suspected as responsible for them. The same could be said from the response given by Kgadi.

...sometimes there is just inconsideration. I think that needs to be addressed. There might be like a lot of noise or something like that. And I know I am very close with these girls. It is a bit hard for me to just be like “guys let’s keep quite”. My neighbour is also, always like playing music very loud. That needs to be addressed. And like being clean, did you see our kitchen? That also needs to be addressed. Like seriously we don’t really know who is doing it, but you need to point fingers because you see certain people in the kitchen. And that’s bad because I think now we are treating the people that we are thinking that are making the mess different, we treat them a bit different.

I think it is important to note how interracial relations are playing out in this setting. Kgadi considered her interaction with the white girls in her unit to be healthier than her interaction with one of the black girls. In this regard the tension is not between out-groups, but is evident within the black girls in the unit.

She (black girl) plays loud music but they (white girls) also like talk loudly among themselves. I don’t see it as a race thing. But like I would say if I tell them they are more considerate because when I ask them ‘guys keep quiet’ they will say sorry and they will keep quiet. But I ask her to keep quiet she will give me attitude at first, and then think about it, maybe after five minutes she will keep the radio down.

The same revelation was also echoed by Kate when she indicated:

There was a situation where uhm... one of the girls wanted to move out because she wasn’t clicking with the other girls... with one of the girls because they were from the same school and they had a beef. So she wanted to move out because of that. I felt like why don’t you guys just get past whatever is going on and that people still have those grudges for no reason (black girls)?

As the interviews continued, the participants revealed that noise and cleanliness were major problems in their unit. However, as they drew from their experiences from previous units most of them concluded that the challenges in their unit could not be attributed to a particular race group. Kate attests to this when she indicated that:
No because I haven’t heard... no I can’t, because last year, was it last year when I lived in another block... yes, it was last year, I stayed with white people. They played their music very loudly and this year in this unit there are some black people who play their music and sing very loudly. No it’s not a racial thing.

However, as much as Malebo did not want to attribute all the challenges in the unit to a particular racial group she is of the opinion that in relation to noise, white girls contributed more to the problem than the black girls.

Well... the noise... I’d say maybe because the white girls do stay there at the corner all of them, like all of them stay there, so they all know each other and they are all basically friends and talk in the kitchen and whatever. The noise I’ll say it is mostly them because other people don’t have friends over a lot and stuff.

This section reveals that sharing personal space and facilities posed some challenges for the participants. However, none of the participants could unequivocally put the blame on one particular racial group.

4.4.5 Conflict resolution

As the conversations continued I wanted to understand how the students resolved conflicts within their unit. Furthermore I wanted to understand how they made sense of the ways through which they communicated with each other as they attempted to handle their differences. Mary tried to give a thorough explanation of how their endeavours of resolving their challenges evolved.

Well in the beginning we used to write lot of notes on the board saying please wash your dishes, but it’s gotten better now. People understood that some people don’t like the dishes to be full in the basin otherwise you can’t wash dishes. So we pretty much just adapted through talking about it. You can’t just avoid the problem and complain. You’ve got to actually approach the people and say listen I’ve got a problem with this and how are we going to compromise.

It was evident that the mode of writing messages on the notice board as a means of communication was widely used by the participants in this study. In as far as Mary is concerned the significance of communication cannot be overrated. She advocates that it is necessary for diverse people to communicate in order to avoid misunderstandings.

...communication is so important. People may go back to racial prejudice and say ja because you are black this and this when it is not actually so. You need to just speak to the people. Communication is so vital otherwise people make their own assumptions and I think that’s were a lot of the problems come in. People just don’t communicate with each other.
The significance of communication is also emphasised by Mercy:

It has to be open because I realise that without interaction there is a lot of miscommunication. So you start thinking oh this person is like this. They are doing this because they want to hurt me and stuff like that. You don’t even know that... maybe is a cultural thing or something.

The messages that are written on the notice board are usually generalised and never directed specifically to individuals. One of the popular messages reads as follows, “Girls please wash your dishes”. I was particularly captivated by how Melisa thinks that people write on the notice-board because they avoid confrontations. She further revealed the racial confinements that come with avoidance of confrontation in their unit. As she reminisced about her encounters, I sensed her disapproval of the dearth of face-to-face conflict resolution across races.

Ja, well my... people might like... ok, we started... ok this is what happens, ok. Like my friends, basically it’s like us four white girls in a row we are like very good friends. And it’s like Kate and Malebo are friends and then Mercy and her cousin and then Kgadi has another friend. So like all got our little groups and stuff. So like my white friends will like joke and like say you must go clean your dishes but I know and I try but it just doesn’t work but like none of the other like the black girls ever come to me and say wash your dishes. But people put up psalms saying ‘come girls lets all wash our dishes and look after our unit’.

Melisa continued expressing her discontent about lack of verbal discussions within the unit.

We never have a unit meeting where they say ‘Melisa we want you to wash your dishes or something’. We all just make little notes and pretend it wasn’t us who made the notes. I think we will benefit if we maybe had a weekly unit meeting or monthly just among us where we can just discuss things that are boring us, what people are doing, playing the music loud, if they are dirty and they are not clean whatever.

As Melisa recounted her experiences, it was evident that even in cases where people approached each other they were able to avoid misunderstandings.

Is like if someone is playing their music loud, I go knock at their door and be like can you turn it down, they will. It will not be a fuss and no one is like ‘no I will not turn my music down’. And I think is very good.

In relation to this Kgadi mentioned that:

There has never been racial attacks or like comments. And every time there is a problem we are so open we can talk to each other.

An instance when approaching each other yielded positive result was highlighted by Kate.
At times there would be someone who sings very loud. I’ve been told that sometimes when I am in the shower (laughs) and stuff I sing out loud. And I’m like oh, sorry and I’ve stopped.

Elise is of the opinion that as a unit they never had major issues where they had to call someone and confront her face-to-face. She mentioned that people responded well to written messages and their misunderstandings were resolved quickly through that channel. Kgadi attributes the speedy resolution of conflicts to the institutional practice that encourages responsibility rather than instilling fear among the residents.

I actually think the more rules you give people the more they want to break them. So we don’t really have rules, we have code of ethics that every one abides by. When that person... there is always that person who just doesn’t abide by them. And that person will stand out because everyone else is abiding by them, because of that I think that is solved really easily whether they give you a fine or something like that.

Then again in this regard Malebo showed lack of interest in further attempts at resolving misunderstandings with her unit mates.

I think in the beginning I used to go over and ask, “Guys could you please keep it down and stuff but now I just sort of given up and want the year to be kind of over so that I can basically get my own place. Because it doesn’t... it doesn’t really seem to work.

This section reveals that the participants avoided speaking about their challenges to a certain extent. They rather preferred to write on the notice-board instead of voicing out their problems. It is also evident that some participants think that talking could yield more positive results as individuals would be approached for the inconvenience they caused.

4.5 Conclusion
In this chapter I portrayed the diversity within the participants’ background. This helped reveal differences in family, neighbourhood and school backgrounds of the participants. First, some participants were from predominantly white areas. Second, some participants were from predominantly black areas. Third, some participants were from racially mixed urban areas. The various backgrounds influenced the preconceived perceptions of some of the participants. I furthermore indicated the contextual information of the site within which the study took place. I discussed the role played by institutional practice in student interaction. Findings of this study reveal that certain practices and traditions were considered to be important when choosing a residence. The findings also reveal that most of the participants benefited from
living in a multiracial residence. Even so one participant highlighted the fact that she did not benefit much from being part of the multiracial residence under study.

I also consolidated the views and the interpretations of the participants as they made sense of their environment. The findings reveal that there were challenges like cleanliness and noise experienced by the participants as they interacted. However, the majority of the participants mentioned that these challenges could not be attributed to racial differences. In the next chapter I discuss and analyse the findings of the study which I further compare with the findings from the literature review and the theoretical frameworks of the study.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

“The future belongs to those who are able to work with and walk beside people of many different perspectives, cultures and lifestyles”
(Howard, 2003:6).

5.1 Introduction
In this chapter I present the discussion and the analysis of the findings of the study. I compare and contrast the findings with the literature in chapter two. I further analyse the findings using the two theoretical frameworks that underpinned the study namely contact theory and critical race theory, which I also presented in chapter two. Finally, I present new knowledge that has emerged from this study.

5.2 Echoing the literature
In this section I discuss the similarities between the findings of this study and the findings reported in the literature. Similarities were found in terms of institutional practice, benefits of being in an interracial residence, friendship, confessions of attitudes towards sharing facilities and personal space, and conflict resolution.

5.2.1 Institutional practice
What an institution does in order to provide conditions that promote the interactions of diverse students will determine the extent to which students will actualize their interactions. The manner in which the institution structures its resources and policies have to create opportunities that will help students experience genuine racial integration which will encourage students to interact in meaningful ways (Gurin et al., 2004). The findings of this study showed that because of the influx of non-whites, the University of Pretoria took cognisance of the change in its student demographics and conducted research in order to understand how best to deal with the new situation. This move by the university to examine its existing structures concurs with critical race theory research which shows that institutions must understand that historically they were tainted by deficit theorising (Yosso, 2002). Therefore, by listening to the voices of the current student demographics, the university was able to gauge the success of its transformation policies, and whether both black and white students experience their environment as equitable, integrated and non-discriminatory (Durheim et al., 2004). This also echoes the argument forwarded by Gurin et al. (2004) when they indicate that it is important that institutions go beyond increasing enrolment of
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previously disadvantaged groups because numerical diversity does not guarantee interaction between diverse groups on campus.

It was found in this study that TuksVillage offered facilities and practices that were different from the mainstream residences of the university. Physical facilities were structured in such a way that they encouraged integration of diverse students. Instead of long corridors that detached the students from each other TuksVillage boasted a communal arrangement that encouraged students to interact. The eight mates in the unit shared a communal area where they could cook. It had a refrigerator, a micro-wave, a stove, cupboards for their groceries and a dining area. Each unit also had a balcony where students could sit and socialise. This kind of setting is in accordance with a recommendation made by Braxton and McClendon (2002) when they suggested that campus dining facilities must be arranged in such a way that they promote social interactions among diverse students which can be done by creating lounges or open plan seating with chairs arranged in a way that allows students to interact. This resonates with the point made by Bleiberg (2003) that students who seek accommodation at university residences are from different racial, ethnic or religious backgrounds and it is the responsibility of the university to encourage them to form relationships and learn from each other.

Residence managers can constitute placement policies that influence the racial and ethnic compositions that ensure contact between diverse students (Stearns et al., 2009). In the same vein it was found in this study that the placement policy determining room allocation at TuksVillage was aimed at coming up with racially mixed units where in an ideal situation each unit would comprise four black students and four white students. This equation in the student body at TuksVillage eliminated what CRT refers to as ‘subordinated position of minority’ (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995). The placement policy allowed students to select rooms on the basis of their academic performance but they had to remain within the basic requirement of four/four mix with regard to race. I think by implementing policies that are non-discriminatory TuksVillage has the potential to reduce racial discrimination and promote intergroup contact. Research on critical race theory has indicated that service providers who are working towards creating inclusive programmes should start by acknowledging that race and racism should be challenged in order to avoid any form of subordination (Villapando, 2004). By explicitly indicating that student placement was to be confined within the four/four mix in terms of black and white races the institution deterred the possibility of self-segregation at TuksVillage. This act of putting race as a determiner of room allocation was an
indication of deviation from what CRT refers to as the colour-blind ideology which proclaims all students as the same (Evans, 2007).

The findings of this study appear to support the notion brought forward by Braxton and McCledon (2002) that managers should apply methods or approaches that guarantee efficient communication of rules and regulations, and also enforce them in a fair manner. The contact theory research indicates that it is the responsibility of the authority to establish norms of acceptance to be observed by racially diverse students (Pettigrew, 1998). More specifically the findings of this study revealed that TuksVillage shifted from a very rule-driven system to a participatory structure. First, the university developed a code of conduct which was aimed at guiding the students into becoming well-rounded citizens. Second, together with some of the students, the residence management decided on the vision of the residence and then the students developed the slogan. Third, they tailored the rules that were within the framework of the university residence rules but were also aligned with the code of conduct, the slogan and the vision of TuksVillage. This initiative concurs with contact theory research that indicates that racist attitudes of the past cannot be eradicated by legislation only but also by consciously changing the human relations within the institutions (Durrheim, 2005).

Critical race theory research recognizes multiple layers of oppression and discrimination (Solorzano & Bernal, 2001). CRT further allows managers at universities to admit that their initiatives are motivated by the desire to eliminate all forms of subordination including racism, classism and sexism in higher education (Villalpando, 2004). Voices of the participants in this study revealed that both the first-year students and the seniors had equal status. Among others this is attributed to the orientation programme that did not focus on intimidating first years or discriminating against them. In fact the orientation programme was aimed at empowering young people who were from diverse communities to be able to interact with racial others. The programme included a workshop on understanding diversity and stereotypes and that served towards fulfilling the vision and the code of conduct informing the activities at TuksVillage. A similar position is emphasised by Braxton and McCledon (2002) who argue that orientation programmes should make available opportunities for new students to socially interact with their peers. At TuksVillage such initiatives were strengthened by the constant emphasis of equality and social justice.

This discussion proves that as an institution TuksVillage fulfilled some of the conditions highlighted by the contact theory as put forward by Allport (1954). First, the support of
authority promoted prolonged contact between diverse students and furthermore the institutional policies were structured around interventions that promoted and ensured that positive intergroup contact was sustained (Pearson et al., 2008). Second, the residents met on equal status and that minimises battling for power which might lead to conflict between members of the entire desegregated group (Pettigrew, 1998).

5.2.2 Benefits of being in an interracial residence

International literature reports that if students meet and deliberate as equals they will develop constructive racial and ethnic attitudes that will enable them to survive in a multicultural society (Antonio, 2001; Banks, 2008; Halualani, 2010). A similar position was developed in this study and five out of the eight participants reported that they had benefited from staying at TuksVillage. They seemed to identify the need and the importance of a mixed race residence. More specifically the participants expressed their awareness of how staying at TuksVillage would positively influence their future. According to Melisa and Elise, the living arrangement at Equity unit forced its residents to interact with one another and in turn that would help them to communicate with people from different backgrounds. This finding seems to concur with an earlier study by Antonio (2001) which found that interacting across races helped the students to gain cultural knowledge about the out-group. According to research on CRT such cross-race interactions are vital because without access to diverse people, students will not have an opportunity to reflect on race, racial identity and race privilege (Chaisson, 2004).

Another important issue that was raised by the participants in this study is that they learnt to live with different people. Mary a white participant appreciated the morals she was learning at TuksVillage. Seemingly she learnt to respect how other people lived and to value the differences between various cultures. The same sentiment was shared by a participant in the study by Malfatti-Rachell (2009) who reported that mixed race residence helped her to be more aware and expanded her views on other things as she got to know her peers. Such perceptions are supported by the findings of the study by Boisjoly et al. (2006) which showed that mixing with out-group members enabled some students to interact more comfortably and have compassion on the social groups to which their roommates belonged. This explanation connects with the arguments by Gurin et al. (2002) that positive interaction between diverse students should include getting to know one another’s backgrounds, beliefs and also to know one another as individuals. In this study Joy, a white participant, explained how constructive cross-racial interaction enabled some of the participants to help each other during a study
project. In this regard the white participants might have applied CRT by acknowledging their black unit mates as ‘holders of knowledge’. In accordance with CRT they were able to recognise the legitimacy and the relevancy of the black participants’ personal histories, experiences and cultures (Bernal, 2002; Dixson & Rousseau, 2005; Teranishi et al., 2009). This acknowledgement responded directly to the concern of those who advocate for CRT that the knowledge of black students has been undermined in the formal learning environment (Bernal, 2002). In this study the findings revealed that the experiences of the black participants were viewed as strength rather than deficit.

Findings of this study appear to support the contact theory by Allport (1954) which indicates that intergroup contact has the potential to produce more tolerant attitudes when members of different groups interact within certain conditions. The views that the participants expressed and articulated echoed that being at TuksVillage taught them to take cognisance of the differences and similarities between the two racial groups. Kgadi a black participant was of the opinion that she had learnt to be open-minded and accept other people. Her prejudices towards the white race were reduced as she acknowledged that there was no need for her to treat people in the same way. For Kgadi, TuksVillage provided her with an environment which concurs with aspirations of CRT in which deconstruction of oppressive structures and discourses were observed.

5.2.3 Friendship

Research on contact theory has indicated that friendship formation may be one of the prerequisites for positive intergroup contact hence it involves cooperation, common goals and friends usually meet on equal status (Pettigrew et al., 2011). Different arguments have been developed around formation of cross-race friendships in university residences. Rinn (2004) suggests that once people with common interests are brought together friendships usually advance. It was also found that students who share their rooms with students from different racial groups proved to have a higher number of cross-race friendships (Stearns et al., 2009). In this study two of the white participants reported to have black friends from high school. Melisa was still in touch with a black friend she had met at school. And Elise indicated that her brother had more black friends than she did. This statement highlights that Elise’s contact with black people was extended to her home by her brother’s circle of friends. According to contact theory research by being close to an in-group member who has an out-group friend improves one’s attitudes and reduces prejudices towards out-group members (Pettigrew et al., 2007).
From the current study it would seem that strong friendship ties were established with the in-group members. The four white participants described themselves as good friends and were also described by some of the black participants as close friends. Likewise studies by Antonio (2001) and Stearns et al. (2009) seemed to point to the tendency of people developing friendships with people who are of the same race or ethnicity. However the students at Equity unit did not rule out the development of cross-race friendships and some of them were evidently forming out-group friendships within the unit. This was consistent with the findings of the study by Hargie et al. (1999) which found that students just wanted to make friends without being tied down by political or cultural differences. Similarly the study by Hargie et al. (1999) revealed that even with positive perceptions on cross race friendships close friends remained in-group members. All but one of the participants in this study indicated that they would love to maintain prolonged relationships with their unit mates after they had completed their studies. Kgadi explained:

So you can see how we have done and stuff and how like just interacting with each other has affected us and if they actually carried through. I mean is nice for them to be nice. It’s nice to be nice to people when you live with them but you must be able to go out in the world and still be able to be nice to those same people or people like them.

At Equity unit most of the residents showed that they embraced the possibility of cross-group friendship formation. Their contact was prolonged enough to allow close relationships to develop.

5.2.4 Confessions of attitudes towards sharing facilities and personal space

Desegregation of diverse people may take different shapes or have different meanings in different contexts (Southern, 2008). In the case of TuksVillage it also meant that the integrated students had to share facilities and their personal spaces. Schrieff et al. (2005) observed that the apartheid policies did not only serve to segregate people of different races but those policies had also marked racial connotations and identities to the reality of how social spaces are controlled. Given that the use of amenities was clearly demarcated by race during apartheid South Africa I wanted to understand how the participants in this study interpreted lived experiences of their everyday use of facilities and of spaces around them. As I have already mentioned the diverse students in each unit shared a kitchen equipped with microwave oven, stove, fridge a table with eight chairs and grocery cabinets, a bathroom and a shower. At TuksVillage there was a challenge to dominant ideology which prevailed in most university residences where desegregation was limited to providing equal but separate
facilities. According to critical race theory equal but separate provision is an indication of a colour-blind approach to race and it attempts to deny material and experiential consequences of racism in favour of an “equal but different” system of meritocracy that assumes that students are afforded equal opportunities while ignoring discrimination that may exist among the students (McDowell & Jeris, 2004). In accordance with CRT TuksVillage has worked against the colour-blind approach hence it has displayed disruption of status quo in order to make way for integration and remarkable equality of diverse students (McDowell & Jeris, 2004).

To a certain extent data from this study echoed the findings in the literature even though race was not expressed as the main cause of the challenges experienced by the participants at Equity unit. Literature revealed challenges associated with the sharing of facilities by racially diverse students (Durrheim et al., 2004; Jansen, 2009; McCorkle & Mason, 2009; Southern, 2008). Television viewing raised major problems in some university residences (Goga, 2008; Jansen, 2009; Southern, 2008). And black students were labelled as ‘foot draggers’ who did nothing for the residence (Jansen, 2009). In the excerpt that follows a white participant in Durrheim et al. (2004) explain white students’ attitude towards sharing facilities with black students and further explain their own experience.

We seem to think; I mean whites seem to think that blacks live you know, they will make it dirty and they will break things and you know, you don't want to live there because, you don't want to live in a res that ’s all been flooded and toilets will be disgusting and this and that at the end of the day, in my first year where I lived in a whites only tower, basically umm ... the toilets got flooded and the toilets were disgusting (giggles) and it was dirty, and I hated living there and I was with white people. Umm, so ... I think the facilities are the same, we seem to think they might be different because of the people living there but it is just students.

The first part of this extract concurs with what Bonilla-Silva et al. (2006) refers to as ‘categorization that creates in-group and out-group dichotomies’ which in this case ‘All blacks are dirty’ ends up leading to a tendency of prejudicing against individual members of the black racial group (Bonilla-Silva et al., 2006). The personal experience of the participant in this example concurs with the voices of the participants in this study. Cleanliness caused most of the apprehensions among the participants. Even so they asserted that the different values in relation to cleanliness cannot be classified as racial traits. Consistent with the excerpt above previous knowledge of the participants served as a frame of reference to make sense of their attitudes. When the participants compared their present unit with their previous
units they all agreed that the phenomenon could not be confined to a specific racial group. In relation to noise Kate affirmed that,

...yes, it was last year, I stayed with white people. They played their music very loudly and this year in this unit there are some black people who play their music and sing very loudly. No it’s not a racial thing.

However, Malebo a black participant felt that her white unit mates contributed more to noise than the black girls. In this regard the friendship between the white girls and the closeness of their rooms are alleged to be factors that drive their noise making.

Well... the noise... I’d say maybe because the white girls do stay there at the corner all of them, like all of them stay there, so they all know each other and they are all basically friends and talk in the kitchen and whatever. The noise I’ll say it is mostly them because other people don’t have friends over a lot and stuff.

The same issue of noise is interpreted differently by Kgadi, another black participant who indicated that both races contributed to noise making. However what is worth noting is how she considered the white girls more respectful and considerate when she approached them as compared with one of her black unit mates. Research on contact theory highlighted that direct contact under desirable conditions can produce ‘stereotype disconfirming information (Brown & Hewstone, 2005). It appears from this study that prolonged and direct intergroup contact helped to improve intergroup attitudes since members have observed that there was no need to characterise members of a group according to certain attributes.

One of the key findings reported in this study is that as many as all the participants were frustrated by cleanliness they avoided approaching the people who were suspected to be causing the problem. Opinions like, people should put the dirty things in their rooms so that they don’t affect everyone or people should consider others do not reach the relevant people or end up being ignored by the people concerned. Melisa’s confession made her as one of the people who contributed to the alleged mishaps occurring in the kitchen. For me it was interesting how all her unit mates kept on saying that they were not aware of the people who neglected washing their dishes even though she acknowledged that her white unit mates did at some instances tell her that she should wash her dishes. Melisa did not take the manner in which her friends approached her as serious and the fact that those who were outside her friendship circle turned a blind eye enabled her to continue with her habit. According to contact theory research anxiety can cause intergroup members to be sensitive to partners and context which led to members avoiding to raise negative issues (Harwood, 2010). I think that
this avoidance of confrontation can be one of the negative mediators of intergroup contact which might lead to the situation being interpreted as inconsideration by others and therefore it could lead to negative attitudes towards sharing facilities.

Prolonged contact between the participants and racial others at Equity unit enabled them to reduce prejudice in terms of sharing facilities. The experiences they acquired when staying with people of different races in the various units over the years enabled them to make informed decisions as far as their attitudes towards sharing facilities with the racial others were concerned. All their voices echoed that it had nothing to do with race but with how an individual was raised.

5.2.5 Conflict resolution

The findings of this study revealed that there were challenges triggered by unacceptable noise level and cleanliness. Accordingly the participants had to find ways of resolving their conflicts or to deal with envisaged challenges. In this study the participants made use of different methods to try and resolve their challenges. Some of them opted to keep quiet and act as if nothing was happening whereas some thought that communication was very important. This discrepancy in conflict resolution was also identified by Lee (2006) who outlined how similar problems caused by an unclean kitchen were dealt with differently by two students in one residence. One student chose to tidy up the mess caused by others and avoided confrontations. This made the student unhappy. The other chose to call a meeting that produced ground rules. The results showed that when diverse students communicated they did not associate their conflicts with negative connotations. However they enhanced an exchange of information and interactions (Lee, 2006).

According to Moraka (2001) when people communicate, they create an opportunity for peaceful co-existence, harmony and interaction. The majority of the participants in this study emphasised the significance of communication. Mary, a white participant, was of the conviction that it was necessary for diverse people to communicate in order to avoid misunderstandings. A similar point was made by Moraka (2001) who argues that communication will secure knowledge and understanding about others. More generally communication provided a bridge that allowed the participants to curb misunderstandings.

A method of communication which was widely used by the participants in this study was to write messages on the notice board. This mode of communication comes to a point and takes
a specific view that it is usually generalised and that it leads to avoidance of direct communication during conflict resolution. Considering that dish washing was considered to be a key challenge for the participants one would have expected them to have called a unit meeting to address the issue. However the recurrent message on the notice board continued to be, “Girls please wash your dishes”. Melisa, a white participant, was of the opinion that people write on the notice board to avoid confrontations. She further revealed that there was a lack of face-to-face approach in terms of resolving challenges across the two racial groups. More specifically Melisa argued that they could benefit more by having a unit meeting where they could discuss things that bothered them. This argument is in line with research on contact theory which noted that

...providing people with constructive strategies for getting groups “on the table” might be quite effective in overcoming such concerns and adjusting the valence–salience connection. Put differently, even a clumsy attempt to raise group issues might be appreciated as addressing the elephant in the room and might result in more positive outcomes than the most graceful avoidance of the topic (Harwood, 2010:166-167).

Seven out of the eight participants seemed to agree that their unit mates were thoughtful and showed respect whenever they approached them. Elise was of the opinion that as a unit they never had major issues which required them to call for external intervention. Most of the participants agreed that people responded well to written messages and none of them retaliated when asked to alter certain practices. According to contact theory research, when prejudiced members engage in positive relations with out-group members there is a possibility of positive change in attitude towards the out-group (Harwood, 2010). At Equity unit extended contact with the out-group mediated sympathy and tolerance and that improved intergroup contact.

The voices of the participants revealed that they never had racial connotations attached to any attempt of resolving conflict in the unit. Fundamental to their conduct was the fact that the participant respected the code of conduct which they equally valued and promised to live by.

5.2.6 Social interaction

The findings of the study by Gill (2007) showed that interacting with people of diverse backgrounds offered an opportunity for the out-group members to change their bias and prejudices. In this study there is substantial evidence that TuksVillage created a positive environment for social interactions among diverse students. The voices of all the participants echoed that their social interaction was not restricted by racial diversity between them.
However two of the black participants acknowledged that they came to TuksVillage with negative preconceived perceptions about white people. They explained how the negative beliefs and perceptions they held about white people influenced them to avoid interracial contact when they initially arrived at the University Pretoria. Contact theory research revealed that people’s conduct is influenced by their thoughts or experience of anxiety (Finchilescu, 2005). In this case the negative thoughts of black students emanated from preconceived attitudes and knowledge about the racial others. Consistent with the contact theory perceptions of black students changed as they continued to live with white people in Equity unit. Mercy acknowledged that continuous contact with the out-group helped her to transgress her racial barriers and to get rid of her fear of interracial contact. Similarly studies embedded on contact theory highlighted that people who previously had had little contact with the out-group had demonstrated that more contact led to change of attitude and they treated one another as individuals rather than categories (Koehler & Skoveretz, 2010; Tredoux et al., 2005).

In this section I discussed the similarities between the findings of this study and the findings reported in the literature. Similarities were found in terms of institutional practice, benefits of being in an interracial residence, friendship, confessions of attitudes towards sharing facilities and personal space, and conflict resolution. I also analysed the similarities through the lenses of critical race theory and contact theory. In the next section I present the differences between the findings that emerged from the literature and the findings of the present study.

5.3 Differences

In this section I will discuss the differences between the findings of this study and the findings of the reviewed literature. The following themes emerged in this study and also in the literature, but they showed some differences. The themes are the role of institutional practice on choosing a residence, students’ perceptions about leaving the residence, student socials, effort to create positive environment and friendships.

5.3.1 The role of institutional practice on choosing a residence

It has been reported in the literature that it is common for Afrikaans-speaking university students to choose an institution because of the traditions and cultural experiences that their parents had at residences during their days as students (Jansen, 2004; Barnard, 2010). Some studies have found that the very same traditions and residence experiences at some
historically Afrikaans university residences were hostile, alienating, and racist especially in relation to non-Afrikaans-speaking students (Jansen, 2009). As for black students university residences are just a place to stay (Jansen, 2004). In contrast to the literature six out of the eight students who participated in this study chose to stay at TuksVillage because of its character. Their voices echoed that TuksVillage was a place of democracy, equality and freedom. This revelation seems to concur with CRT which questions the idea of traditional values and norms, and favours equity and social justice (Evans, 2007).

It also emerged in this study that most of the participants chose to stay at TuksVillage because it demonstrated defiance to the dominant ideology which placed limits to racial contact. TuksVillage distinctively contested the construct of race which was used to allocate enduring hierarchy of racial supremacy and advantage. Such a challenge draws from the proponents of critical race theory who seek to critique and question how societal barriers of access to opportunities are constructed specifically in relation to race (Warmington, 2009). Mary, a white participant, dissociated TuksVillage from residences that limited proximity between blacks and whites by using race as a commodity that determined room allocation. Together with the other participants Mary acknowledged that unlike other residences of the University of Pretoria TuksVillage provided an environment for positive intergroup contact. Such perception consent to the contact theory which indicates that positive intergroup contact entails the demonstration of awareness of group-based prejudices (Brown & Hewstone, 2005).

Some of the participants mentioned that TuksVillage represented the epitome of independence. Unlike in some residences they were never obliged to take part in residence traditions which at some point were seen to be promoting the Afrikaans culture. Kgadi, a black female student, demonstrated her resentment of using the Afrikaans language to exclude non-Afrikaans students in residence traditions most eloquently through her critique.

All the songs they sing are in Afrikaans. In some traditions they try and put in a few Sothonyana. But if you look at it as a whole is like mostly Afrikaans. All the stuffs are written in Afrikaans. Like it doesn’t include all the cultures as it should. And you just don’t have white Afrikaans people. We have white English people. We have Indian people but the majority then is just Afrikaans.

A similar position was put forward by Kate, also a black female student.

There... there is still that thing, that black, white thing. And they are still very Afrikaans in those residences. You still get people who come up to you and talk to you in Afrikaans not knowing whether you know it or not. Sometimes they gossip about someone in Afrikaans thinking they don’t know.
The extracts above demonstrate how anticipated consequences can determine the nature of intergroup contact. Contact theory research indicated that anxiety can lead to avoidance of intergroup contact (Brown & Hewstone, 2005). Findings of this study showed that other residences of the University of Pretoria were avoided by some participants because of their emphasis of the Afrikaans character which posed what Stephan, Renfro, Esses, Stephan and Martin (2005) call a symbolic threat, which entails that people may avoid intergroup contact because they are concerned about group differences in values, beliefs, morals and attitudes. As a proponent of contact theory Finchilescu (2005) revealed that people might avoid intergroup contact or develop negative attitudes when they feel that they are being de-individualised or their experiences with the out-group lowers their self-esteem.

The hiccups caused by upholding of residence culture and traditions in historically Afrikaans universities were reported in various studies (Barnard, 2010; Jansen, 2004; Walker, 2005b; Moguerane, 2007; Pillay, 2010; Soudien et al., 2008). Expressions forwarded by Kgadi and Kate above are similar to the findings of the study conducted by Jansen (2009:130) at some residences of the University of Pretoria. He reported:

The boys on the floor were ordered to stand to attention, answer questions in unison, and from time to time be blatantly insulted by the pack of leaders... this part-orientation and part-intimidation was how boys in this koshuis (residence) had been inducted into the culture for many decades.

In the study conducted by Moguerane (2007) black participants also indicated that activities in the formal university residences were part of a distinct Afrikaner culture that filtered through their daily activities. They argued that these encounters were a form of Afrikaner culture which they were forced to assimilate. The findings of this study revealed that both black and white participants shunned traditional residences because they preferred a more relaxed residence where they were not tied down by rules and traditions. Elise, a white participant, was of the conviction that coming into a residence you become part of the family, and a family builds on each other’s confidence. She argued that in other residences, during initiation some people are broken to the extent that they feel worthless. Kate, a black participant, explained that:

I think there is still that divide type of thing. And only a select black people would be in a clan you know with those ones. Like in high school where a certain group of black people would be recognised like if you are doing well in academics, you now have proved yourself or whatever.
The voices of the participant in this study confront the legacy of apartheid which created inequality among South Africa’s people. In accordance with CRT the participants in this study questioned the manner in which property interests rationalised the marginalisation of non-Afrikaans speaking students (Evans, 2007), especially the use of the Afrikaans language as a property to oppress racial others and to enforce assimilation was challenged. In the case of TuksVillage the participants demonstrated their alignment to CRT since they chose a residence which was aimed at eliminating stereotypes, along with the eradication of derogatory images and words regarding marginalised people (Delgado, 2003).

5.3.2 Students’ perceptions about leaving the residence

It has been reported in the literature that after black students were integrated with some university residences, the number of white students declined significantly (Austin, 2001; Durrheim et al., 2004; King, 2001; Morrow, 2008; Woods, 2001). The contact theory literature also identified that ‘white flight’ is prevalent when there is an influx of black people in former exclusive white spaces. However TuksVillage offers spaces that are new for both black and white students. Thus in discussing perceptions on leaving the residence I will not depart from the concept of former exclusive white spaces. However, if the links are to be made, the university itself was previously reserved for white Afrikaans-speaking-students which I think can still determine the extent to which students are willing to share their spaces with racial others.

It was discovered in this study that none of the participants would leave TuksVillage because of racial issues or even opt for a traditional residence. It is important to note that all the participants in this study were senior residents at TuksVillage. Mary a white participant revealed that she was happy to stay until she had completed her studies. What excited her more during the time of this study is that she stayed with two of the girls from the previous year, Elise a white girl and Mercy a black girl. This explanation shows that there has been prolonged contact across race between some of the participants which according to contact theory has the potential to reduce prejudices. Mercy a black participant indicated that at some point she contemplated leaving TuksVillage. However, after pondering upon it she concluded that TuksVillage offered facilities similar to private residences and there were no watertight rules that restricted her daily conduct. The same sentiment was shared by Joy, a white girl, who indicated that she had also decided that it was best to stay at TuksVillage. The willingness to stay at TuksVillage by the white participants in this study seem to confirm the findings by contact theory research that intergroup contact had the capacity to change the
attitudes of whites’ positional threats and injustice thereby increasing their readiness to comply with equality at structural level (Dixon et al., 2010).

In the study based on contact theory conducted by Durrheim et al. (2004) at a South African university a contrasting situation to that of TuksVillage was reported. There was an indication that some of the parents did not want their children to live in a mixed race residence. One of the participants in the study by Durrheim et al. (2004) explained:

...there was some white parent saying that put my kid in a white res and whatever whatever, and Elizabeth was like no we’re more than willing to change the res for your child so she would be more comfortable with white people in Denison and the parents was like no I want a white res, I can’t have my child living in that res, and they just put them like that.

The reason I include this example from Durrheim et al. (2004) is to highlight how the social construction of race has situated the discourse of race as an indicator of social interaction. The kind of perspective forwarded by the parent in the given scenario brought to light how whiteness as illustrated by CRT was used as a commodity to determine residential preference at a particular university. More specifically it was racial issues that determined movement from one residence to another which was in contrast with reasons for choosing to stay at or to leave TuksVillage.

Three out of the eight participants in this study were still going to consider moving out. Melisa a white participant was of the opinion that the rooms were too small and she felt that she needed a bigger room. The size of the rooms was raised as an area of concern by all participants in this study. However, Malebo a black participant, argued that the commune layout was unfavourable for studies. She wanted to leave TuksVillage for a post-graduate residence so that she could concentrate on her studies without any interruptions. Kate, a black participant, argued that she had been at the Kraal for a long time and she felt that she needed a change. However, if she could not go to a post-graduate residence, she would not leave TuksVillage for its counterparts.

5.3.3 Student socials

Both the international and the South African literature reported deficiencies in student socials (Cross & Johnson, 2008; Crozier and Davies, 2008; Goga, 2008; Gumprecht, 2006; Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Hughey, 2007; King, 2000; Lorenz, 2009; Luescher, 2009; McCabe, 2011; Pillay, 2010; The University of Alabama, 2001). In the study conducted by Pillay (2010) at a South African university revealed that language, religion and culture differences were used as
justification to alienate and marginalise the out-group members. The extract below is an argument put forward by one of the participants in Pillay (2010).

If you speak Afrikaans and you are a Christian you are more than welcome in my organisation. And that is the thing that we do... [We have] practices which are unique to the Afrikaner culture. Certain traditions that we have. And that is something that I treasure. I would say we have got a get-together on campus, we sing Afrikaans songs. We talk in Afrikaans, we speak in Afrikaans, we socialise in Afrikaans. And I don’t think that is being racist. No. Or anything like that expressing your culture. But a lot of other students don’t understand the concept of Afrikaner culture. That’s not... that is something that we do, but we are a solid people of language. We want to retain our language.

The picture that emerges here is that language, religion and culture were used as the masquerades of racial discrimination and intolerance. Moreover, in accordance with CRT in this scenario, institutionalisation of whiteness as property was used as a right to exclude other students from student socials by establishing a system of exclusivity in which access and rights were based on race (DeCuir-Gunby, 2006; Evans, 2007) or rather on language, religion and culture as the participant in Pillay (2010) argued. Ladson-Billings (1998) who argues for CRT indicates that white people enjoyed the franchise that black people lacked. In relation to this literature showed that the salience of language was used by both whites and non-whites to exclude members of a different ethnic group or to unite members from similar ethnic groups (Flusk, 2008; Walker, 2005b). Unlike the findings in the literature I was intrigued by how Malebo a black participant in this study could not categorise the white students at Equity unit in terms of language.

It’s fine, because most of them are not even Afrikaans. They are actually... or maybe it’s because they are always speaking... but I doubt if any of them are Afrikaans because they are always speaking English.

In contrast to literature it was discovered in this study that at TuksVillage student socials were aimed at promoting racial inclusivity and appreciation of diversity. Moreover interventions by the residence management were reported as a vital component of encouraging inclusivity of student socials. This emphasis on racial inclusivity was in line with CRT which advises against a colour-blind approach that seeks to preserve dominant hegemonies and social hierarchies by turning a blind eye on discriminatory factors (Hylton, 2008). The findings of this study show that the residence management spoke explicitly against racially separate social functions and deterred their occurrence. Residence management at TuksVillage supported the creation of activities that enabled students to experience genuine racial integration which helped them interact in meaningful ways (Gurin
et al., 2004). The culture that was being created at TuksVillage was that social events should be reasonably inclusive and make provision for different races and preferences.

All participants in this study seemed to convey a similar message that student socials showed remarkable improvement in terms of inclusivity. Moreover the findings revealed how student socials fully attended to the reduction of stereotypes and prejudices between diverse students at TuksVillage. At the beginning there was disconnection in terms of the music play list. The hiccups caused by music preferences were also discovered in the study conducted by Jansen (2009) where in one residence there were two club houses, one for kwaito, black music and one for rock, white music. However the students at TuksVillage created bridges which enabled them to cross over to one another’s worlds and they started to appreciate one another’s cultures. According to CRT research equality will be certain when the interest of black people converge with the interests of whites. At TuksVillage music preferences of the students were merged and that improved the students’ eagerness to take part in intercultural activities.

This interest in student socials is in contrast with the findings of the study conducted by Moguerane (2007) which showed that black women were not interested in the various social activities that took place at their residence. Findings related to that of Moguerane (2007) were revealed in the study conducted by Crozier and Davies (2008) in which Muslim students were alleged to be keeping away from student socials. On the other hand Muslim students in the same study reported that they were harassed by their white counterparts.

Consistent with the contact theory the intergroup contact during student socials at TuksVillage helped to reduce prejudices between diverse students. They taught each other to dance to various music genres. More importantly in alignment with the contact theory the support of the authority was seen as a unifying factor which promoted culture sharing rather than a channel of promoting the dominant culture. Such intervention seemed to consider racial divergence that characterised the student demographics at TuksVillage. What is also fundamental is that the intervention by the residence management created an awareness that the concepts of ‘race neutrality’ and ‘colour blindness’ as highlighted by CRT had to be exposed so that other races and cultures are not dealt with as unimportant or worthless (Lewis et al., 2000).
5.3.4 Social interaction

The findings of the study by Walker (2005b) showed that even though diverse students lived in close proximity there was little interaction between them. Nevertheless some participants in this study reported that they were never troubled by being around racial others in social spaces because of their multiracial school backgrounds. According to Contact theory research prior attitudes and experiences determine the extent to which people will desire or avoid intergroup contact (Pettigrew, 1998). Some of them indicated that they already had out-group friends from their high schools. However being at Equity unit was more than just being together in a lecture room. They had to negotiate their personal spaces on daily bases. And all participants in this study seem to agree that the kitchen area offered them an opportunity to interact socially. Joy, a white participant, explained that:

Uhm ... I know the thing that I enjoy most is just when ... I know it happen most in the kitchen, when everyone is around in the kitchen and that kind of thing. We are all talking and laughing and all joking around. I really enjoy that. It’s fun. That’s my favourite part of it.

Her explanation was supported by Elise, another white participant.

But we interact quite a bit in the kitchen when we are all cooking supper and stuff. I enjoy that. You don’t feel like sitting in a room staring at four walls. Like... you have people of different experiences and stuff.

These findings are in contrast with the findings of the study conducted by Eubanks (2004) which reported points of tension between diverse students at university residences which included racially diverse roommates not talking to each other, avoidance of being in the room at the same time, and detrimental disputes. Most of the participants in this study indicated that being able to interact with their unit mates helped them to understand each other better and to appreciate their differences. Contact theory research discovered that when diverse students lived together as equals, with support from the authority they had a chance to expand their knowledge of the racial others (Saenz et al., 2007).

This study created an opportunity for me to view the dynamics of interactions between diverse students in a different light. Suffice it to say given the findings of this study the lack of contact in South African university residences can no longer be attributed solely to the differences in race or culture. In this study lack of interaction was reported between the black participants with more interaction reported across races. These findings are in contrast to literature from both the international and South African landscape. Some studies have revealed that many black students did not desire more interracial contact and they separated themselves to form predominantly black groups (Douglas, 1998; Fisher & Hartmann, 1999;
Johnston et al., 2004; Lewis, 2000; Moguerane, 2007). Contrary to this some of the participants in this study did not feel content when they were around people of their own race. Findings revealed evidence of culture sharing during cross-race interactions which is aided by the amount and quality of time the participants spend in the kitchen. This allowed some of them to appreciate the differences in their food and so on. Moments in the kitchen gave diverse students the opportunity to bond as they shared their, challenges, frustrations or even their success. Like most of them said:

The time we spend in the kitchen feels like home.

TuksVillage introduced a setting where proximity between people was not determined by race given that the facilities promoted social interaction across races.

5.3.5 Effort to create positive environment

The environment at some university residences was reported to be characterised by hostility and unfriendliness. Literature revealed the following: racial insults written in elevators (Harwood et al., 2009), white students treated badly by other white students for interacting with black students (Lorenz, 2009), graffiti that expressed racism and flags hanging from a residence window written ‘Niggers go home’ (Davis, Dias-Bowie & Geenberg, 2004), a group of male students assaulted a black student in one of the campus residences (Walker, 2005b) and during a study conducted by Jansen (2009) a black student commented:

It keeps getting worse. When they’re in a group, you feel it, and you know the message is ‘You’re black, you’re not supposed to be here, and this is not your place.

A study conducted by Gonzalez (2002) revealed that a student had to go home every weekend because he did not consider the university residence to be friendly. In a similar tone literature highlighted that black students were made conscious of their race by the manner in which white students stared at them (Douglas, 1998). However, it emerged in this study that seven out of the eight participants considered TuksVillage to be ‘home away from home’. Kgadi a black participant explained:

It really does feel like a home. You know at home when you have a problem you talk to your mom or something. So like here if I got a problem I tell her (Kate a black girl). These girls (white) always notice when I am writing and stuff and always “say good luck”. Last time I had to go to the library, they offered to take me. The kindness, the friendliness, that’s why I wouldn’t mind staying with them again. I think that’s the best experience.

This explanation was supported by Joy, a white participant.
We all greet each other, we all often sit around and talk and joke around, and if someone has written a test and they come back, everyone wants to know how the test went and that kind of thing. It’s very nice coming back here. It’s like you are coming home to a group of friends.

Critical race theory research has depicted race as a measure of social distance between people (Pascale, 2008). Participants in this study seemed to realise the need to communicate with each other in order to build bridges. It was more important for them to constantly talk to each other, even to those who belonged to different friendship circles. Gestures like greeting each other and asking about each other’s wellbeing were constant among the participants in this study. Melisa, a white participant, was of the opinion that talking to everyone within the unit would help to minimise stress and alienation among the unit members. She shared an experience from her previous unit where a white girl was depressed because she isolated herself and as result Melisa felt that unit mates should try to make one another feel welcome.

According to most of the participants one should make an effort to accept everyone, approach them and to speak to them. Voices of the participants revealed how their relationship went from simple greetings to celebrating each other’s birthdays. It was also revealed that some of them saw the need to formalise their social encounters by having a unit cocktail day. This was in accordance with contact theory research which indicated that when different people were put in the same environment they could appreciate various group opportunities and build commitments to collaborate (Finchilescu & Tredoux, 2008; Nagda et al., 2009). In accordance with the contact theory Equity unit provided diverse students with an environment of contact which was close enough to lead to the development of common interests (Pettigrew, 1998; Pettigrew, 2008b; Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005).

The positive relationship that prevailed between the participants in this study was also evident outside their unit. First, this was demonstrated when one of the black participants was standing for elections for residence management. And second, it was demonstrated at a competition during one of the socials. These findings seem to concur with contact theory research which showed that aspects that changed out-group members to one group could increase cooperation between the members (Dovidio et al., 2003; Gurin & Nagda, 2006). The election and the auction provided the participants with common goals which encouraged them to cooperate in order to win, and intergroup cooperation is one of the optimum conditions stated in the contact theory. Findings of this study highlight how most of the participants were happy about their stay at Equity unit. I found this to resonate with the slogan of their residence which is “Here we LIVE!”
5.3.6 Friendship

Some studies found that some of the interracial friendships developed were confined to residences as students in those friendships did not hang out together in dining halls and other social spaces (Douglas, 1998). This is in contrast with the findings in this study as one of the participants attested to cross-race friends accompanying her to the library. They also created a united front during student socials by supporting each other in order to win. Seven of the eight participants in this study were positive about interracial friendships. This was inconsistent with the literature from both the international and South African landscape that reports that black students did not promote interracial friendship as it was seen as a way of disconnecting themselves from their own race and also a betrayal of the black community (Douglas, 1998; Finchilescu et al., 2007; S. S. Smith & Moore, 2000).

In this study friendship patterns were not used to establish boundaries of contact between black and white participants. The four white participants described their relationship as that of close friends. Meanwhile the black participants had their various friends from outside the unit. Melisa a white participant explained:

No one feels... I don’t think anyone feels alienated like they are not friends and like if all of us white girls are in the kitchen cooking and washing dishes, like Malebo or someone come or Kgadi we will talk to her. We won’t be like, can’t talk to that person because she is not part of our friend group, like we are all friends.

Proponents of contact theory Schrieff et al. (2005:441) argue that “the spatial identity of groups is defined in terms of the spatial zones within which they operate comfortably; it involves knowing one’s place and having a sense of who belongs there with us”. In my study participants did not avoid penetrating the spaces occupied by racial others as observed by Schrieff et al. (2005) and they were not considered to be trespassing as reported in Alexander (2007). Mercy, a black participant, explained:

When you see the white girls, you find them in their rooms, all together, talking and getting to know each other. I tried to also just join them and see how it is.

This thinning out of racial boundaries is also corroborated by what Mary, a white participant, reported:

Yes, definitely, last week for example the girl (white girl) in the first room and I went and sat outside in the sun on a blanket, and then as everyone came by we chatted and they sat with us a little bit. It is so nice. Everyone is just ... everyone is open to each other and friendly. It is very nice.
These findings are in contrast with the findings of a study based on contact theory conducted by Tredoux et al. (2005) that proved students separated themselves from the racial others even when the space was accessible to everyone. And I found the findings to be also in contrast with the hypothesis put forward by Shrieff et al. (2005) that friendship patterns may be the cause of self-segregation.

The interracial students in the study by (Douglas, 1998) attributed their limited interactions to the fact that they did not relate to the same challenges and to the differences in cultures. In this study common interest were not confined to differences in culture and racial challenges but to a common study programme. According to contact theory research there is a possibility for a person to have contact with out-group members where the conditions are conducive but still fail to make friend with out-group members (Harwood, 2010). Findings revealed that Malebo a black participant reported to have only one friend, Kate, who was also black because they studied the same thing and Malebo believed that it was only Kate who understood her challenges. Most of the participants in this study indicated that throughout their stay at TuksVillage they have made both same race and interracial friendships.

In this section I discussed and analysed the differences between the findings of this study and the findings from the reviewed literature with regard to the following themes: the role of institutional practice on choosing a residence, students’ perceptions about leaving the residence, student socials, effort to create positive environment and make friends. In the next section I present the areas of silence in my study.

5.4 Areas of silence in my study
In this section I will discuss themes that were reported in the literature but did not arise in my study. Themes such as white flight, self-segregation and the salience of culture were never discussed by the diverse students who participated in this study.

5.4.1 White flight
In the literature it was revealed that desegregation of student residences has led to white flight (Austin, 2001; Durrheim et al., 2004; Hill, 2009; Hunter & Danahoo, 2004; King, 2001; Morrow, 2008; Woods, 2001). The implication of white flight in these studies is that the number of whites students declined as black students were continuously absorbed at some university residences. Not only did the literature agree that white students prefer to seek
private accommodation off campus, some literature shows that Indian students prefer to live at home or with relatives.

The phenomenon of white flight further invigorated the restrictions of integration which according to some respondents came as a result of some of the white people who perceived desegregation of residences as destabilizing the established status quo which positioned whites as a privileged and superior race (Bobo & Zubrinsky, 1996). The study by Woods (2001) showed that after black students were integrated at residences at Wits University, the number of white students declined significantly. Similar attitudes are observed at the University of Kwa-Zulu Natal where campus residences accommodate mostly black students, while the majority of white students prefer to seek accommodation off campus. Most Indian students are accommodated at their homes (Durrheim et al., 2004). A trend of white flight, where black students are increasingly filling the university residences while white students are steadily departing was also experienced at the University of Port Elizabeth which is now Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University (Austin, 2001). The trend of white flight was never reported by the participants in this study.

5.4.2 Self-segregation

Previous South African studies showed that self-segregation is prevalent among diverse students (Alexander & Tredoux, 2010; Durrheim et al., 2004; Koen & Durrheim, 2007). It was also noted in the international literature that by the time most universities authorized all students to access university accommodation and other facilities self-segregation started to emerge (Antonio, 2001; Buttny, 1999; Douglas, 1998; Fisher & Hartmann, 1995; Koehler & Skvoret, 2010; Lewis et al., 2000; Li, 2008; S. S. Smith & Moore, 2000; Stearns et al., 2009; Villalpando, 2003). It was reported in the literature that where policies to desegregate were put in place self-segregation or informal segregation started to be evident in the manner in which the students used the space around them (Antonio, 2001; Li, 2008; Villalpando, 2003), for example in dining halls, residences and other social settings. These studies reported that university students were desegregated in the lecture rooms but displayed a lack of intergroup contact in public spaces. Some of the researchers noted that in some instances segregation was attributed to culture difference, common interests and preferences of students (Douglas, 1998).

The study by Woods (2001) described how the few white students who lived in the residences disassociated themselves from black students and demarcated their own terrains. Evidence
from research showed that even in integrated residences people preferred to live with people of their own races and it was rare to find black students mixed with white students in double rooms (Moguerane, 2007; Pillay, 2010; Walker, 2005b). At some predominantly white universities blacks avoided interracial contact and formed their own enclaves of predominantly black groups (Fisher & Hartmann, 1995). Some researchers established that minority groups create their own social spaces for support and have a sense of belonging (Douglas, 1998; Fisher & Hartmann, 1995; S. S. Smith & Moore, 2000).

The development of cultural and ethnic theme residences at some universities was found to encourage self-segregation (Afsher-Mohajer & Sung, 2002; Harwood et al., 2009; Pouncey, 1993). It is also noted in the literature that these kinds of residences were found to promote informal segregation as they categorise students according to their different cultures and ethnicities. The literature reveals that the use of stereotypical features to promote such residences fuelled discrimination (Afsher-Mohajer & Sung, 2002) therefore; theme-based residences promoted re-segregation and reduced interaction of diverse students.

5.4.3 Salience of culture

Literature advanced culture as a dividing factor for diverse students and a unifying factor for in-group members. The discord caused by culture difference was evident in how students displayed their traditions and preferences. The problem that arose because of culture difference was that people feared to make contact with out-group members and by doing so they detached themselves from the cultural others (Finchilescu, 2005). The literature revealed that those who campaigned for the dominant culture emphasised the need to preserve their culture, traditions and heritage and that further promoted segregation between diverse students (Cohodas, 1997; Eubanks, 2004; Gumprecht, 2006; Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Hughey, 2007; Lorenz, 2009; McCabe, 2011).

The rigidity of the dominant culture led to assimilation of the incoming community members in some instances. The study by Lewis et al. (2000) revealed the phenomenon of assimilation of black students into white territories at a predominantly white university. In student residences, black students indicated that they were compelled to adapt and seek likeness with their white peers who in turn expected black students to demonstrate explicit racial or ethnic stereotypes (Lewis et al., 2000). Typical of this kind of situation black students who assimilated and behaved like white students were applauded for fitting in with their white counterparts. On the other hand black students who resisted conforming to the dominant
culture felt that assimilation contributed to their lack of knowledge with regard to their
culture, history and traditions (Lewis et al., 2000). In contradiction white students had some
difficulty in understanding why black students emphasised the need to appreciate diverse
cultures and why they would not just blend in.

South African literature revealed that most of the historically Afrikaans university residences
were still upholding residence cultures and traditions that excluded students that did not
conform to their specific practices (Barnard, 2010; Jansen, 2004; Moguerane, 2007; Pillay,
2010; Soudien et al., 2008; Walker, 2005b). The study by Pillay (2010) also reported culture
as a hindrance to integration. The participant in the study by Pillay (2010) emphasised the
need for “Preservation of white Afrikaner culture”. Lack of acceptance of diverse cultures led
to black students segregating themselves to form support groups within some university
residences. This dissociation caused by conflicting cultures was also reported by black
participants in the study by Moguerane (2007). He indicated that black students in residences
mobilized each other into upholding township culture. The study revealed that students
brought into cognisant their ‘blackness’ and emphasised the need to appreciate their common
identity (Moguerane, 2007). The findings by Jansen (2004) revealed that some black students
in residences retreated when they felt that residence culture was being inflicted on them. They
chose to socialise with people from their own communities as a way of sustaining their
culture and that put constraints to intergroup contact. The fact that at TuksVillage residence
traditions were not promoted seemed to eliminate the possibility of assimilation and tensions
caused by cultural differences. In this section I presented the areas of silence in my study. In
the next section I present new knowledge which was generated during the current study.

5.5 Generation of new knowledge

New knowledge appeared to have emerged from this study which was based on interactions
of diverse students in a South African university residence because of the unearthing of new
information not previously documented in the literature. Most of the studies conducted on
interaction of diverse students at university residences showed that there was tension and lack
of interaction between the out-group members. Findings revealed that it was essential for
members of different groups to stick with people of their own groups (Clack et al., 2005;
Kurian, 2008; Mabokela, 2001; Walker, 2005b). There was a claim that every student felt
content around people they were familiar with (Douglas 1998).
In this study it was discovered that the participants did not specifically attribute lack of interaction to the salient of race. What is exceptional is that evidence pointed to lack of interaction between black unit mates. There was an indication that some of the black participants preferred cross-group interaction as compared to making the effort to bond with their fellow black unit mates. Mercy a black student explained her observation.

On the black side we don’t really talk that much. When you see the white girls, you find them in their rooms, all together, talking and getting to know each other. I tried to also just join them and see how it is. It was one night we were talking about everything, talking about their lives. I found that interesting because with the black girls ... we don’t really ... it’s more like, how is your day? They are just talking about everything you know, not really reserved.

The detachment between the black unit mates was also revealed by how little they knew about each other. Kgadi struggled to recall information about her fellow black unit mates.

I don’t know hey, like it’s so funny I hardly talk to them. I’m very close with Kate. We are very much alike actually, like we are the same. Obviously she is not like me. She is Sotho and stuff. Mercy is, I don’t remember which African country Mercy is from... But ja, I don’t know about Malebo, I really hardly talk to her. She really keeps to herself.

Kgadi revealed that she would even feel more anxious if she was to spend time with two of the black participants. In her case fear of contact was not determined by race or ethnicity. In fact negative attitude was mostly directed to the in-group members.

No! Actually I don’t. I’d even say I feel more left out around these girls, the two black girls, they keep to themselves. These ones (white girls) are so friendly, like if I had to choose, I’d rather stay with them next year than these two. Is not even about you know, race anymore because I’d feel more excluded if I had to chill with these ones (two black girls).

Studies revealed that desegregation does not always lead to integration (Barnard, 2010). It was noted that there was still a persistent desire for students to associate with people belonging to their own racial groups in residences (Barnard, 2010). However, two of the black participants in this study preferred interracial contact rather than in-group contact within their unit. It appears from this study that boundaries of separateness emerged between some of the black participants. Does this seem to suggest that new patterns of discrimination are emerging in South African society? In this section I have presented the knowledge that was unearthed during this study.
5.6 Conclusion

In this chapter I have discussed the similarities and the differences between the findings of this study and the findings in the literature from both the international and the South African landscape. I have analysed the findings using the two theoretical frameworks that underpinned the study namely Contact theory and Critical race theory which I also presented in Chapter 2. I further discussed the areas of silence which were revealed in the literature and were not mentioned by the participants in this study. I concluded the chapter by presenting new knowledge that emerged from this study. In the next chapter I present the summary of emergent themes, limitations of the study and significance of the study. I will also revisit the research assumptions and conclude by making recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER 6
RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

“One interesting caveat is that individuals might not always be aware of how exactly their activities contribute to the world”
(Stetsenko & Arievitch, 2004:495).

6.1 Introduction

In this chapter I present the summary of the findings of the study I conducted on interactions of diverse students at a South African university residence. I also present the limitations and significance of the study. I proceed by revisiting the research assumptions that I highlighted in Chapter 1. I also present recommendations for future research.

6.2 Summary of emergent themes and findings

This study set out to understand how diverse students interact at a South African university residence. The findings revealed that institutional practice forms part of the integral elements that promote contact between diverse students. What makes the case of TuksVillage exceptional is the type of leadership that embraced diversity. Even though the university initiated the need for a different residence it was Dr Hendrikz and his colleagues who came up with structures and policies that drove the integrative and inclusive atmosphere that prevailed at TuksVillage. Their approach to student accommodation made the residence different from mainstream residences. That included refraining from residence culture and traditions that catered for white-Afrikaans speaking students and were seen as a means of oppression by most non-Afrikaans speaking students. The management collaborated with students to create the statutes that guided their existence at TuksVillage. The students became active participants in creating and shaping their community. Dr Hendrikz’s distinctive knowledge of student’s residences and dispositions empowered the residents of TuksVillage to embrace diversity and to promote human rights. Findings seemed to indicate that physical facilities of the residence were structured in such a way that they promoted continuous contact between the unit mates.

The findings of the current study revealed that the available systemic support at the institutional level helped to motivate the students to consider prolonged stay at TuksVillage. Participants in this study therefore believed that TuksVillage offered them an environment characterised by equality and freedom for all residents. Some of them indicated that they were going to stay at TuksVillage until they completed their studies while others contemplated leaving the residence when they applied for postgraduate courses.
participants in this study apparently felt that there was a need for racially integrated student residences. Most of them appreciated what they learnt from staying with racial others. A call was therefore made that residences should be established in such a way that they enabled diverse students to be part of one another’s lives. While some of the participants valued the benefits of being in a racially mixed residence, there were two participants who expressed the views that the character of TuksVillage which put more emphasis on academics, did not allow them time to learn from racial and cultural others.

The study revealed that social interactions are significant in reducing prejudices and stereotypes. Continuous interaction with students from other races helped some of the participants to cross the racial barriers and eliminate their fear of intergroup contact. There seemed to be culture sharing during student socials and during their interpersonal interactions. Participants in this study therefore believed that informal communication across races allowed them to understand each other and to appreciate the differences between them. Student socials were seen by participants in this study to be inclusive and accommodated various cultures and preferences.

The findings of the current study suggest that a student’s willingness to communicate across race minimised misunderstandings between diverse students. This positive attribute between multiracial and multicultural students allowed them to form their own community which provided moral support and enhanced the spirit of collegiality between them. Participants apparently understood the need to interact beyond their friendship circles within their unit. Therefore friendship patterns were not used to limit interaction between diverse students in this study. There seemed to be a desire by most participants to have prolonged relationships with their unit mates to see how they progressed in life and whether staying at TuksVillage had influenced how they interacted with the racial others in the real world.

On the one hand this study revealed that lack of interaction occurred between students of similar race at Equity unit and on the other hand the study revealed that students showed a willingness to interact across races. Some of the black girls indicated that they found it difficult to communicate with other black girls at Equity unit. Findings seemed to indicate that both the white girls and the black girls made efforts to promote interracial contact. This study also revealed that in some cases students do not always feel comfortable around people of their own race.
6.3 Limitations of the study

I conducted a case study which involved one university residence. Within that particular residence I chose to include one unit which comprised a small sample of eight participants, four black and four white students. Considering that 640 racially and culturally diverse students resided at the residence, participants based at one unit could not represent the entire student body. Therefore the findings of this study cannot be generalised to the whole population. As it has already been observed in this study I used the method of portraiture which was coined by Sarah Lawrence-Lightfoot. Portraiture provides the opportunity for the researcher to intentionally choose to explore the strength of the phenomenon under inquiry and the way in which it is approached and managed (Vandeyar & Jansen, 2008). For that reason I approached the case on the assumption that there was goodness in the way it is run and managed. As a result the findings cannot be generalised to other residences. As I was searching for a distinct case I purposively selected a unit which comprised senior students as I considered them to possess the kind of insight that I was looking for and this means that junior residents were excluded in this study of interaction of diverse students at a university residence. It is also important to note that at the time I collected the data the residence was in its fourth year and therefore it could not provide enough documents to be analysed. The ones that were available lacked historical depth.

6.4 Significance of the study

Student demographics in South African universities have changed significantly. Most university residences that were predominantly white during the apartheid era are now accommodating multiracial and multicultural students. Research shows that desegregation of South African university residences resulted in challenges for the institutions and for the involved students (King, 2001; McLean, 2000; van der Merwe, 2009). This study adds a new dimension to the study of interaction and contact of diverse students in university residences. It could help in the understanding of interpretations put forward by diverse students as they help us to identify and critique the separation that still persists among South Africa’s racially and culturally diverse people. This study revealed that contacts of students in university residences are not always limited by racial boundaries, which I found to be in contrast with Finchilescu et al. (2007) who argue that despite the fact that South Africa has made some progress in terms of democratic practices, there are still many challenges in terms of desegregation, and contact between different races is still shallow. The understanding produced in this study is that when an inclusive environment is created for diverse people their desire to interact across race and culture is enhanced.
Adequate knowledge of interaction of diverse students in university residences may help institutions of higher learning to make informed decisions when they formulate policies in relation to student accommodation. As university residences are a microcosm of the society community leaders can be informed and able to prepare for transformation through studies like this. In this study I analysed the findings using contact theory and critical race theory and therefore the study adds to research that explores these two theories.

### 6.5 Revisiting research assumptions

In Chapter 1 of this study I put together a number of assumptions which were derived from the literature I gathered from both the international landscape and the South African landscape. In this section I revisit those assumptions and evaluate them if they have been confirmed or disconfirmed by the findings of this study.

**Assumption 1:** The influx of black people into historically white spaces including historically white university residence resulted in white flight (Austin, 2001; Durrheim, 2005; Hill, 2009; Hunter & Danahoo, 2004; Mclean, 2000; Nkuna, 2000; Woods, 2001).

Contrary to literature, the findings of this research did not reveal the phenomena of white flight at the university residence under study. All the white participants in this study were senior residence at TuksVillage and three out of the four white participants clearly indicated that they would stay at TuksVillage until they completed their studies.

**Assumption 2:** People choose to interact effectively with people with whom they share culture and common interests and they further avoid infiltrating spaces that are occupied by racial others (Alexander & Tredoux, 2010; Boisjoly et al., 2006; Bobo & Zubrinsky, 1996; Douglas, 1998; Kurian, 2008; Mabokela, 2001; Moguerane, 2007, Pillay, 2010; Stearns et al., 2009).

The participants in this study reported that there was little intergroup contact during student socials in the early years of TuksVillage. However with the intervention of the residence management contact between diverse students improved. Student socials were seen as an opportunity to make friends and interact with in-group and out-group members. Intergroup contact was not restricted by racial boundaries between the participants of this study. Black and white participant felt comfortable with one another and culture and language were not used to restrict contact between intergroup members. Contrary to this, lack of contact was reported between girls of the same race in this study. The findings of this study disconfirm the assumption I made in this regard.
Assumption 3: In South African university residences transformation policies are seen as a threat to white Afrikaans-speaking students who desire to preserve their culture and residence traditions (Barnard, 2010; Durrheim et al., 2011; Southern, 2008).

Findings of this study revealed that the culture of TuksVillage was not characterised by residence traditions which are part of many historically white university residences in South Africa. Therefore the participants in this study focused more on their academic careers rather than perpetuating the dominant culture.

Assumption 4: Black students retaliate when they feel that they are forced to conform to the dominant culture (Jansen, 2004; Moguerane, 2007).

The participants of this study reported that TuksVillage was not a traditional residence therefore there was no need for them to conform to an established culture.

Assumption 5: More contact of diverse people which is supported by conducive conditions lead to lower prejudice (Allport, 1954; Antonio et al., 2004; Pettigrew, 2008b; Tredoux & Finchelescu, 2010)

In the current study the participants reported how their prejudices and stereotypes were reduced by staying with diverse people at TuksVillage. It was evident that students from diverse backgrounds who were part of this study learnt to transgress their stereotypes and started to see people as individuals. They came to university with prior knowledge about the racial others which could have restrained intergroup contact. The participants apparently started to notice their similarities and learnt to appreciate and value their differences. The findings of the current study confirm the assumption above.

6.6 Recommendations for future research

The purpose of this study was to understand how a group of diverse students interact with each other and negotiate their personal space with individuals that were previously seen as the out-group. I wanted to understand how they defied the legacy of apartheid and the history of stereotypes which did not allow people of different races to share their personal spaces. Findings of the current study suggested that tensions at racially integrated student residences cannot be attributed to the salient of race. None of the participants cited race as trigger for the challenges they experienced at the residence. These findings hold important implications for future research and I therefore recommend the following topics for further research:

- Interaction of same-race students in a South African university residence.
• Conduct a quantitative survey based on interaction of diverse students at TuksVillage. The questionnaire of the suggested survey should be administered to all the residents.
• Conduct a longitudinal study to determine what effect living at TuksVillage had on the participants in this study even after they had left the university.

6.7 Chapter summary and conclusion
In this chapter I presented a summary of the themes that emerged from the findings of this study. I also presented the limitations and the significance of the study. I also revisited the research assumptions that I put forward in Chapter 1. I concluded by presenting recommendations for future research. This study discovered that South Africa’s history of stereotypes and separateness between people of different races and cultures did not determine how participants in this study interacted. Institutional support was commended for advocating equality and human rights. Language, culture and colour were not used as commodities to award advantage. In a world that aspires to eradicate segregation that transpired for many years, it is distinctive institutions like TuksVillage that make common humanity an aspiration to hope for.

“Change will not come if we wait for some other person or if we wait for some other time. We are the ones we’ve been waiting for. We are the change that we seek” (Barack Obama).
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