

## Repositório ISCTE-IUL

---

Deposited in *Repositório ISCTE-IUL*:

2019-03-21

Deposited version:

Post-print

Peer-review status of attached file:

Peer-reviewed

Citation for published item:

Dumont, K. & Waldzus, S. (2017). Reparation demands and collective guilt assignment of black South Africans. *Journal of Black Psychology*. 43 (1), 27-49

Further information on publisher's website:

[10.1177/0095798415617057](https://doi.org/10.1177/0095798415617057)

Publisher's copyright statement:

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Dumont, K. & Waldzus, S. (2017). Reparation demands and collective guilt assignment of black South Africans. *Journal of Black Psychology*. 43 (1), 27-49, which has been published in final form at <https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0095798415617057>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with the Publisher's Terms and Conditions for self-archiving.

---

### Use policy

Creative Commons CC BY 4.0

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a link is made to the metadata record in the Repository
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

---

**Reparation demands and collective guilt assignment of  
black South Africans**

Kitty Dumont

University of South Africa (UNISA)

Sven Waldzus

Instituto Universitário de Lisboa (ISCTE-IUL)/CIS-IUL

Paper accepted for publication in Journal of Black Psychology

## **Abstract**

The present research studied reparation demands of born-free black South African adolescents as members of a former victimised group from a social psychological perspective. Two cross-sectional studies tested whether identification indirectly predicts reparation demands via assignment of collective guilt to white South Africans; and whether this indirect relation is moderated by cross-group friendship. The results support both hypotheses and show a stronger link between identification with the victimised group and collective guilt assignment in a segregated rather than a desegregated context (Study 1: N = 222) and for participants reporting lower levels of cross-group friendship (Study 2: N = 145). Reparation demands are important for strongly identified members of a victimised group in a post-conflict situation. Their mediation by collective guilt assignment, mitigated by cross-group friendship, indicates that one major function is to insure recognition of the victims' past suffering and to repair the relationship rather than ostracising the transgressor group or gaining access to resources.

## Introduction

Archbishop Emeritus Desmond Tutu called in 2011 for a “wealth tax” to be imposed on all white South Africans because they did (and most of them still do) benefit from the apartheid system (Lefko-Everett, 2011). He referred to the final report of the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission which proposed that reconciliation between black and white South Africans after the end of the apartheid system was not possible without reparation (TRC, 1998, p. 170). This reparation demand was particularly rejected by the FW de Klerk Foundation which described it as unfair because not all white South Africans supported apartheid and as unconstitutional because it would introduce laws that are aimed at one racial group within the non-racial new South Africa (FW de Klerk Foundation, 2011). This debate illustrates how important the issue of reparations is in post-conflict reconciliation processes even if the atrocities committed by one group toward another group have ended decades ago.

So far, reparations as part of the reconciliation process in a post-conflict context have mainly been studied from the perspective of transgressor groups. Numerous studies focussed either on predictors such as guilt (e.g., Brown, Gonzales, Zagefka, Manzi & Čehajić, 2008) or on situational conditions such as changes in the status position of the transgressor group (Dumont & Waldzus, 2014) that make reparation offers more or less likely. Yet, history tells us that reconciliation processes in post-conflict contexts are less likely to be initiated by spontaneous reparation offers of transgressor groups but rather by reparation demands of victimised groups and their supporters. Reparation demands as legal action serve not only the purpose of monetary compensation but also to achieve acknowledgement of the violations and acceptance for the wrongdoing by the transgressors (Minow, 1998, pp. 93-94). The following two examples illustrate the latter. The first example refers to a UK High Court ruling which granted three elderly Kenyans, who as Mau-Mau members were tortured during

the final days of the British Empire in the 1950s, the right to sue the British government for reparation despite the time that has lapsed (BBC, 2012a). The British government responded by apologetically declaring itself guilty although not liable (UK at the UN, 2012). The second example refers to the response of the French President, Francois Hollande, to the initiatives of various Algerian Members of Parliament and civil society organisations to criminalize French colonialism and to demand compensation for the Algerian people. While addressing the Algerian Parliament he described France's colonial rule in Algeria as brutal and unjust; and he "recognised the suffering that colonialism inflicted on the Algerian people" (BBC, 2012b).

As important as it is to understand the predictors and conditions that are associated with reparation offers of transgressor groups it seems equally important to extend our knowledge about relevant influences on reparation demands of victimised groups and their supporters. The present research aims to address the latter by studying three potentially important factors influencing reparation demands within post-apartheid interracial relations in South Africa: (1) identification with black South Africans as one of the victimised groups during apartheid, (2) the assignment of collective guilt toward white South Africans, and (3) intergroup contact between black and white South Africans in post-apartheid South Africa.

### **Identification with the victimised group**

Although reparation demands have rarely been studied, one can build on previous research addressing closely related topics. The abstaining from reparation demands, for instance, has been considered to be one component of the more general concept of forgiveness (Wohl & Branscombe, 2005). The granting of forgiveness as "a choice, held at the discretion of one who was harmed" (Minow, 2014), is highly influenced by the degree to which individuals identify with the victimised group. Brown, Wohl and Exline (2008, Study 1), for instance, demonstrated experimentally that an official apology was more effective among those individuals who identified less with the victimised group. In a similar line,

Philpot and Hornsey (2011) found that only identification with the victimised group reliably predicted awareness of apologies, in that high identifiers were less likely to remember apologies expressed by transgressor groups than those who identified less with the victimised group.

Victimised groups and their members are, however, not only influenced by social identity processes in their choice to forgive but also in their choice to demand reparations. The latter is suggested by research conducted by Pennekamp, Doosje, Zebel and Fischer (2007) who explored the antecedents and consequences of group-based anger and found a positive relationship between identification with the victimised group and reparation demands. In their studies this relation was mediated by group-based anger. The link between identification with the victimised group and reparation demands is not only consistent with general social psychological theories on intergroup relations such as social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986) but also with specific models developed particularly for post-conflict situations insofar as they assume that people are concerned with their group's interests and needs. For instance, based on Shnabel and Nadler's (2008) needs-based model of reconciliation one could argue that reparation demands related to emotions such as group-based anger serve the victimised groups' need to restore their sense of power in that resources are transferred from the transgressor to the victimised group (i.e., distributive justice).

However, empowerment is not only achieved by (re-)gaining control over relevant resources (e.g., Keltner, Gruenfeld, & Anderson, 2003) but also by (re-)gaining the ability to recruit human agency in the service of one's agenda (Simon & Oakes, 2006). The latter refers to social influence processes within a larger moral community in which both the transgressor and the victimised group and in many cases third parties are included (see also Turner, 2005). The question arises, how do victimised groups exert social influence by demanding reparations? Reparation demands, particularly as legal action, not only offer victimised

groups and their supporters “a chance to speak and tell their story” publicly (Minow, 1998, p. 93) but also force transgressor groups to face and engage with their transgressions which, as outlined elsewhere, might result in the acknowledgment and in taking responsibility for the wrongdoing.

Legal pressure is an important yet not the only way in influencing the former transgressor group. Intergroup relations like any other social relations are also regulated by moral considerations and moral emotions such as guilt and shame (Rai & Fiske, 2011). For instance previous research has demonstrated that the experience of guilt and shame motivate members of transgressor groups to repair and adjust their relationships with the victim groups after transgressions (for instance, Doosje, Branscombe, Spears, & Manstead, 1998; Lewis, 2011; Wohl, Branscombe, & Klar, 2006, Dumont & Waldzus, 2014). Therefore eliciting such moral emotions in the transgressor group is a form of social influence the victimised group can exercise, a form that might be of particular importance as it is compatible with the overall process of reconciliation. Although guilt and shame are both relevant moral emotions we think that collective guilt assignment might be particularly relevant for reparation demands in a context in which the victimised group intends to continue and repair the relationship with the transgressor group; because guilt refers to the act of transgression committed in the past and not to the devaluation of the transgressor group as shame would imply.

### **Collective guilt assignment**

Collective guilt assignment was introduced as a construct by Wohl and Branscombe (2005; see also Wohl et al., 2006) who studied its implications for the willingness to forgive members of a social group for its past transgressions. The authors reasoned that when people perceive another group to have violated moral standards, collective guilt might be assigned to members of that group irrespective of whether those outgroup members were personally responsible for the transgression or not. Collective guilt assignment means that members of

the victimised group expect members of the transgressor group to feel remorse for their group's transgressions (Wohl & Branscombe, 2005, p. 289). Guilt assignment is different from outgroup blame. Outgroup blame focuses on the outgroup's responsibility for past wrongdoing (e.g., outgroup people can be held accountable for what their group did) and represents an important appraisal in provoking group-based anger (see Pennekamp et al., 2007). In contrast, collective guilt assignment refers to the attribution of the feelings members of the transgressor group should have in response to what they or their people have done (e.g., they should feel remorse). By assigning secondary emotions to members of the transgressor group, that is emotions that are unique for humans as compared to animals (Leyens et al, 2000), the victimised group re-humanises the former which is among others considered to be essential for initiating the forgiveness granting process (Minow, 1998). Thus, while group-based guilt assignment has been found – just like outgroup blame – to reduce the willingness to forgive in the short run (Wohl & Branscombe, 2005) because it makes salient the moral transgression committed by the transgressor group and the moral necessity for some form of compensation toward the victimised group, it might paradoxically be a necessary precondition of forgiveness in the long run. Moreover, by assigning collective guilt to members of the transgressor group, the victimised group exerts social influence on both the transgressor groups and the larger moral community in that moral emotions serve to regulate social relations. Recognition of the wrongdoing and the victims' suffering are crucial for the victimised group to fully participate in further relations within the moral community. Following this logic, collective guilt assignment might be more important and more closely related to identification with the victimised group than reparation demands as such. This reasoning is in line with research of Wohl and Branscombe (2005) who found that salience of identity as a victimised group within a post-conflict context increased collective guilt-assignment and reduced the willingness to forgive.



Applying the above outlined reasoning, which is supported by previous research, the present research tested the hypothesis that there should be an indirect statistical relationship between identification with the victimised group and reparation demands via collective guilt assignment (H1).

Whilst the first part of the present research places attention on the relationship between identification with the victimised group, collective guilt assignment, and reparation demands, the second part will focus on situational conditions that determine these relationships. Social psychological research focusing on intergroup forgiveness and reconciliation has repeatedly shown the importance of contact to overcome tensions that emanate from intergroup conflicts. For instance, Hewstone, Cairns, Voci, Hamberger and Niens (2006) in their study conducted in Northern Ireland, show that intergroup contact is positively associated with forgiveness. Similar results are reported by Čehajić, Brown and Castano (2008) who demonstrated the positive relationship between intergroup contact and intergroup forgiveness using a sample population of Bosnian Muslims. Taking these contact effects into account, we aimed to explore intergroup contact as factor that determines the relationship among identification with the victimised group, collective guilt assignment, and reparation demands as proposed in hypothesis 1.

### **Intergroup Contact as Moderator**

Pettigrew and Tropp (2006), who conducted an extensive meta-analysis of 713 independent samples from 515 studies, demonstrate that the positive effect of contact on intergroup relations was larger when Allport's optimal conditions (equal status within the contact situation, intergroup cooperation, common goals and support by authorities) were present. In addition to Allport's conditions moderating the relationship between contact and improving intergroup relations, recent research has also pointed toward the role of cross-group friendship (e.g., McGlynn, Niens, Cairns, & Hewstone 2004; Page-Gould, Mendoza-

Denton, Alegre, & Siy, 2010) and imagined (or indirect) contact (e.g., Stathi, Crisp, & Hogg, 2011).

McGlynn et al. (2004), who addressed the impact of cross-group friendship in their study on integrated education within a Northern Ireland context (i.e., pupils with different religious background attending the same school), conclude that integrated education increases not only the quantity, but also the quality of contact, which impacts positively on intergroup forgiveness. Indeed, cross-group friendship has been demonstrated to increase the perceived variability among outgroup members (e.g., Islam & Hewstone, 1993), and to improve intergroup attitudes (e.g., Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Page-Gould et al. (2010) provided a social-cognitive explanation for the positive intergroup experience as a function of cross-group friendship. They demonstrated that self-extension processes of interpersonal closeness (i.e., the association of close others with the concept of self) extend to collective characteristics; in that these self-extension processes impact on the way social information is accessed and applied to “novel” outgroup members. Given these results, there are reasons to assume that cross-group friendship might have the potential to fulfil the needs of members of victimized groups for justice and empowerment, as well as to facilitate forgiveness. Moreover, other research has shown that cross-group friendship can have a positive impact on intergroup relations by facilitating the recategorization of outgroup members (e.g., whites) as members of a more inclusive common ingroup (e.g., South Africans, see Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000). Such recategorization might lessen the salience of a victimized group identity and consequently the relative predictive power of identification with that group (Wohl & Branscombe, 2005). In the present research, we therefore propose that cross-group friendship moderates the indirect relationship between identification with the victimised group and reparation demands via the assignment of guilt. More precisely, we hypothesise that the moderation effect of cross-group friendship should occur between identification with

the victimised group and guilt assignment (H2), that is, the relationship between identification with the victimised group and guilt assignment would decrease as the opportunities for cross-group friendship between members of a victimised group and a transgressor group increase.

(insert Figure 1 about here)

### **The Present Studies**

We report here on two studies that tested, first, the hypothesis (H1) that identification with the victimised group indirectly increases demands for reparation via collective guilt assignment; and secondly, the hypothesis (H2) that this indirect relation should be reduced by cross-group friendship, which is predicted to diminish the link between identification with the victimised group and collective guilt assignment (see Figure 1). The second hypothesis was tested both indirectly via the degree of educational integration as either segregated or desegregated (Study 1), and directly via the assessment of cross-group friendship (Study 2).

The two studies were conducted in post-apartheid South Africa where a restorative justice model was applied after 1994 by establishing a Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC). The South African TRC is one of the best known of the more than 30 truth commissions that have been established worldwide since the 1980s, and it has been the model that subsequent truth commissions aimed to emulate (Chapman, 2007, p. 52). What might be less known is the fact that the TRC concluded in its final report that reconciliation was not possible without reparation (TRC, 1998). The TRC, which differed from most other commissions in that it was authorised to grant amnesty for transgressions motivated by political objectives, reasoned that “reparation is essential to counterbalance amnesty” because the granting of amnesty denied victims the opportunity to institute civil claims against transgressors (TRC, 1998, p. 170). The TRC’s recommendations on reparations were not only opposed by businesses, but also by the South African government. Nevertheless, the public

discourse on reparation demands for apartheid victims continued and is likely to do so for a long time to come given the increasing activities of social movements such as the Khulumani Support Group and the prominence of its reparation case against international multinationals accused of having colluded with the apartheid government (Khulumani, 2014). Thus the persistence of reparation discourse in South Africa led us to assume that the concept of reparation demands toward white South Africans is meaningful to and even salient among the “born-free generation” of black South Africans (i.e. the generation born after 1994) and those black South Africans who were young children at the end of apartheid.

## **Study 1**

### **Method**

#### *Sample*

There were 222 participants, who categorized themselves as black South Africans. Assuming that the opportunity for cross-group friendship is institutionally supported in desegregated rather than segregated educational contexts (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006), we recruited two different samples from the Eastern Cape Province in South Africa. The first sample consisted of 107 participants (42 males, 65 females) with an average age of 15.1 years ranging from 13 to 25 who attended a school located in the low socio-economic community of the township of Mdantsane. These participants were classified as pupils from a segregated context because the school only hosts black students. The second sample consisted of 115 pupils (66 males, 49 females) with an average age of 16.6 years ranging from 15 to 20 who were from a school in East London which according to its fee structure is mainly attended by pupils from middle class families. This sample was classified as pupils from a desegregated context because this school hosts students from different racial groups. Ethical clearance for this research was obtained from the local university, University of Fort

Hare, and permission to conduct the study was granted by the headmasters of the respective schools.

### *Procedure*

Participants were informed (verbally and on the front page of the questionnaire) that the questions formed part of a project that addressed learners' ideas on whether history is important for people's current lives. Participants completed the questionnaire in their classrooms after class and in the presence of a teacher and one research assistant. They were asked to respond to every question or statement as honestly as possible, even if they found it difficult to form an exact opinion. On completion of the questionnaire, all participants were debriefed.

### *Measures*

The items for all measures were anchored at 1 (*totally disagree*) to 5 (*totally agree*).

*Identification with the victimised group* was measured by five items selected and adapted from the 10-item self-investment scale proposed by Leach, van Zomeren, Zebel, Vliek, Pennekamp, Doosje, Ouwerkerk and Spears (2008). These items were: "I feel a bond with black South Africans", "I am glad to be a black South African", "I think that black South Africans have a lot to be proud of", "Being a black South African is an important part of how I see myself", and "I often think about the fact that I am a black South African" (segregated context:  $\alpha = .90$ ; desegregated context:  $\alpha = .75$ ).

*Collective guilt assignment* was assessed by a reformulated version of the group-based guilt scale proposed by Brown et al. (2008) and Brown and Čehajić (2008) and consisted of the following four items: "I think that white South Africans should feel guilty for what they did to black South Africans during the apartheid years", "Thinking about some things that the white South Africans have done in the apartheid years, should make whites occasionally feel guilty", "I think white South Africans should feel guilty for the human

rights violations committed by them during the apartheid years”, and “When thinking about how white South Africans took away homes from black South Africans, whites should feel guilty” (segregated context:  $\alpha = .86$ , desegregated context:  $\alpha = .83$ ).

*Reparation demands* were assessed with two items adapted from Brown et al. (2008) and reformulated for the South African context: “I think that black South Africans deserve some form of compensation from white South Africans for what happened to them during the apartheid years” and “I think white South Africans owe something to black South Africans because of the things they have done to them” (segregated context:  $r = .29$ ,  $n = 90$ ,  $p < .01$ , desegregated context:  $r = .60$ ,  $n = 114$ ,  $p < .001$ ). The lower correlation between these two items in the segregated context might be due to the fact that both items focussed on different groups, that is to say, the first item focusses on black South Africans’ deserving while the second item focusses on white South Africans’ owing. These two aspects might be more intertwined for contexts with more intensive intergroup contact (desegregated context). Nevertheless, we decided to average both items to cover these different aspects of reparation demands.

## **Results and Discussion**

### *Preliminary analysis*

Table 1 depicts the means, standard deviations and correlations between the principal variables. Participants from the segregated and the desegregated context identified equally strong with the victimised group and assigned equally strong guilt toward white South Africans. Although both samples demanded reparations from the white South Africans, the demands of participants from the segregated context was significantly stronger compared to the demands of participants from the desegregated context,  $t(210)^1 = 5.55$ ,  $p < .001$ .

---

<sup>1</sup> Variations in participant numbers and degrees of freedom between different analyses are due to the exclusion of data from participants with missing values.

(insert Table 1 about here)

### *Hypotheses testing*

The first hypothesis (H1), which stated that identification with the victimised group has an indirect positive effect on reparation demands via guilt assignment, was tested for the two samples separately. The procedure applied followed the guidelines of Preacher and Hayes (2008) and used the bootstrapping method with 2000 iterations. Table 2 summarizes the results for both samples. As predicted, the results revealed a significant indirect positive effect of identification with the victimised group on reparation demands, statistically mediated by collective guilt assignment for participants from the segregated and the desegregated contexts.<sup>2</sup> However, the results suggest a stronger indirect positive effect of identification with the victimised group for the segregated context ( $B = 0.50$ ,  $SE = 0.15$ , 95% CI [0.2179, 0.7991] compared to the desegregated context ( $B = 0.14$ ,  $SE = 0.07$ ), 95% CI [0.0229, 0.3283]. In order to conclude that the indirect positive effect of identification with the victimised group on reparation demands via guilt assignment is conditional upon cross-group friendship as predicted by hypothesis 2, we tested for moderated mediation following the procedure as proposed by Preacher, Rucker and Hayes (2007).

(insert Table 2 about here)

The test of the conditional indirect effect of identification with the victimised group was conducted by combining both samples and creating a dummy variable distinguishing segregated (0) and desegregated context (1). As in the previous analysis, identification with

---

<sup>2</sup> It is important to note that this statistical mediation model does not imply a causal chain from identification on reparation demands via collective guilt assignment. Instead, it reflects a conditional relation. If the demand for reparation is not a need in itself but only meaningful because of its function to provide credibility for collective guilt assignment, the relation between identification and reparation demands should be mediated by such guilt assignment. In contrast, the demand for reparation that is motivated by the need to gain control over resources (and independent of their moral function) should manifest itself in a direct effect of identification on reparation demands when guilt assignment is statistically controlled.

the victimised group was entered as an independent variable, reparation demands as a dependent variable, and guilt assignment as the mediator variable. The dummy variable was included as moderator variable, which was assumed to moderate the relationship between identification with the victimised group and guilt assignment. Guilt assignment as the mediator variable was significantly predicted by identification with the victimised group ( $B = 0.81$ ,  $SE = 0.07$ ,  $p < .001$ ), the dummy variable ( $B = 1.67$ ,  $SE = 0.56$ ,  $p < .01$ ), and the interaction between identification with the victimised group and dummy variable ( $B = -0.44$ ,  $SE = 0.13$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Reparation demands as the dependent variable was only significantly predicted by guilt assignment ( $B = 0.46$ ,  $SE = 0.07$ ,  $p < .001$ ). The Sobel test revealed that the indirect effect of the interaction on reparation demands via guilt assignment was significant,  $t(212) = 3.01$ ,  $p = .002$  (one-tailed). Consistent with the separate analyses for the two contexts, in this combined model the strength of the indirect effect of identification with the victimised group on reparation demand via assigned guilt was stronger in the segregated context ( $B = 0.38$ ,  $SE = 0.08$ ,  $p < .001$ ) than in the desegregated context ( $B = 0.15$ ,  $SE = 0.09$ ,  $p < .05$ ).

The results of Study 1 replicated Pennekamp et al.'s (2007) findings of the positive relationship between identification with the victimised group and reparation demands. The results further support our first hypothesis (H1) that the relationship between identification with the victimised group and reparation demands is an indirect one, which is statistically mediated by collective guilt assignment for both the segregated and desegregated samples. However, the actual indices suggested a stronger indirect effect for the segregated context when compared to the desegregated context. In order to conclude that this difference could be attributed to the moderator function of cross-group friendship, the second hypothesis (H2) needed to be tested. The results supported the conditional indirect effect of identification with the victimised group on reparation demands via assigned guilt, in that it was significantly



stronger in the segregated context than in the desegregated context. Thus, the results support our argument that reparation demands are important for the victimised group mainly because of their link to collective guilt assignment. Interestingly, the mediation was complete in both samples, that is, there was no significant direct link between identification with the victimised group and reparation demands when guilt assignment was statistically controlled. In other words, there was no evidence of the victimised group's concern with reparation as a way to gain merely control over resources.

Given that this is, to our knowledge, the first study that tested the conditional indirect effect of identification with the victimised group on reparation demands via collective guilt assignment we decided to replicate the study. Moreover, the indirect variation of cross-group friendship by the degree of segregation on school level has several disadvantages, as it leaves the door open for various alternative explanations of the moderator effect such as local school politics, different subcultures, discourses on apartheid in the different schools, or differences in socio-economic status of participants' families. In addition, the level of desegregation seems to be an indicator for the opportunity for cross-group friendship rather than for the actual cross-group friendship. Particularly in the South African context it has been shown that desegregation does not necessarily mean that members of different groups engage in interpersonal contacts (e.g., Durrheim & Dixon, 2001; Tredoux & Dixon, 2009). Even if they do engage in contact with outgroup members (i.e., number of outgroup friends) the question remains whether these interpersonal contacts create closeness which is assumed to be characteristic for high quality cross-group friendship (see McGlynn et al., 2004). Therefore, and in contrast to the previous study, Study 2 was conducted only with participants from a desegregated education context and cross-group friendship was directly assessed in terms of interpersonal closeness.

## Study 2

### Method

#### *Sample*

Study 2 was conducted in a lower-class multi-racial school (desegregated context) in the small town of Gonubie outside East London, South Africa. As in Study 1, only those participants were included who categorized themselves as black South Africans. In total, 145 pupils (55 males and 90 females) participated with an average age of 14.1 ranging from 12 to 16 years. Ethical clearance for this research was obtained from the local university, University of Fort Hare, and permission for this study was granted by the headmaster of the school.

#### *Procedure*

The procedure and the questionnaire were identical to Study 1 with the exception of the cross-group friendship assessment. On completion of the questionnaire, all participants were debriefed.

#### *Measures*

As in Study 1, all items were anchored at 1 (*totally disagree*) to 5 (*totally agree*). *Identification with the victimised group* ( $\alpha = .79$ ), *collective guilt assignment* ( $\alpha = .77$ ), and *reparation demands* ( $r = .58$ ,  $n = 132$ ,  $p < .001$ ) were assessed as in Study 1.

*Cross-group friendship* was measured by two items: “My white friends are very similar to me” and “I feel close to my white friends” ( $r = .40$ ,  $n = 122$ ,  $p < .001$ ).<sup>3</sup>

### Results and Discussion

---

<sup>3</sup> We also asked the participants to indicate how many white friends they have. While most participants had no problems indicating closeness to their white friends, a large proportion of the participants refused to report an exact number ( $n = 51$ ). When using the number of outgroup friends ( $n = 94$ ,  $M = 6.86$ ,  $SD = 7.86$ , ranging from 0 to 30) instead of the measure for cross-group friendship reported in this paper, the results were similar but did not reach statistical significance.

### *Preliminary analysis*

Table 1 depicts the means, standard deviations and correlations between the principal variables of Study 2. Participants identified equally strong with the victimised group and assigned equally strong guilt toward white South Africans when compared to the two samples of Study 1. As in Study 1, participants demanded reparation from white South Africans. They did not differ in their reparation demands from participants in the desegregated context in Study 1 (Bonferroni:  $p = 1.000$ ). However, they were significantly less demanding when compared to the participants from the segregated context in Study 1 (Bonferroni:  $p < .001$ ).

### *Hypotheses testing*

As in Study 1, we first tested the hypothesis (H1) that identification with the victimised group has an indirect positive effect on reparation demands via collective guilt assignment following Preacher and Hayes (2008) and using the bootstrapping method with 2000 iterations. Table 2 reports the results. As predicted, the positive effect of identification with the victimised group on reparation demands was again statistically mediated by collective guilt assignment indicated by a significant indirect effect ( $B = 0.25$ ,  $SE = 0.07$ ), 95% CI [0.1265, 0.4115]. Note that in contrast to Study 1, the mediation was only partial, as there was still a direct effect of identification with the victimised group on reparation demands (Table 2), indicating some group interest in reparation that is unrelated to the assignment of collective guilt.

Finally, we tested the second hypothesis (H2) that the indirect effect of identification with the victimised group on reparation demands via guilt assignment is conditional upon cross-group friendship, which was directly measured in Study 2. The results replicated the findings of Study 1 in that guilt assignment as mediator variable was significantly predicted by identification with the victimised group ( $B = 1.10$ ,  $SE = 0.29$ ,  $p < .001$ ), and the interaction between identification with the victimised group and cross-group friendship ( $B = -0.15$ ,  $SE =$

0.08,  $p = .05$ ). Reparation demands were only significantly predicted by guilt assignment ( $B = 0.48$ ,  $SE = 0.11$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Again, the Sobel test showed a significant indirect effect of the interaction between identification with the victimised group and cross-group friendship,  $t(126) = 1.73$ ,  $p = .04$  (one-tailed).

The conditional indirect effect of identification with the victimised group on reparation demands via assigned guilt was strongest for low levels of cross-group friendship ( $B = 0.34$ ,  $SE = 0.10$ ,  $p < .01$  at 1  $SD$  below the Mean level), weaker for medium levels of cross-group friendship ( $B = 0.26$ ,  $SD = 0.07$ ,  $p < .01$  at Mean level) and again weaker for high levels of cross-group friendship ( $B = 0.19$ ,  $SE = 0.07$ ,  $p < .05$  at 1  $SD$  above Mean level). Thus, although there was a significant indirect effect of identification even at high levels of cross-group friendship it was much weaker than at lower level, confirming the assumption that the indirect effect of identification with the victimised group on reparation demands via collective guilt assignment is conditional upon cross-group friendship.

### **General Discussion**

The present research addressed reparation demands of black South Africans within post-apartheid South Africa. We tested two hypotheses: first that identification with black South Africans as a former victimised group is indirectly related to reparation demands via collective guilt assignment; and secondly, that this indirect relationship is conditional upon cross-group friendship with white South Africans. The results of the two studies support both hypotheses. The conditional indirect effect of identification with the victimised group could be demonstrated using an indirect assessment (i.e., segregated versus desegregated education context), and a direct assessment of cross-group friendship, in that the effect of identification with the victimised group on reparation demands via assigned guilt decreased with an increase of cross-group friendship.

The results tangentially support our argument that after transgressions, victimised groups may have a particular need for empowerment by re-integration into the larger moral community, which is more prominent than the need to gain control over relevant resources: in both samples of Study 1, identification with the victimised group was only related to reparation demands insofar as they were predicted by collective guilt assignment. Study 2 also supported our argument as the relation between identification with the victimised group and reparation demands was again reduced when guilt assignment was statistically controlled. However, Study 2 showed evidence of a weak, yet significant direct link between identification with the victimised group and reparation demands that was unrelated to guilt assignment. This direct link was not unexpected but nevertheless requires some interpretation for the present research context. One interpretation would be that such a direct link indicates some desire for empowerment by gaining control over relevant resources at expense of the transgressor group. While such interpretation is still speculation, one could explain the difference between the two studies with regard to this direct effect by the particularity of the sample in Study 2: it was both desegregated and composed of participants from families with lower socio-economic status. Such a combination might carry the potential for beliefs in negative interdependence between black and white South Africans in terms of economic resources, rendering the instrumental function of reparation more relevant. Additionally, it is also possible that the disadvantaged position of the families of participants in Study 2 made them more prone to anger toward the transgressor group (Pennekamp et al., 2007).

The present results contribute to at least four research domains that are relevant not only for post-apartheid South Africa but also for post-conflict intergroup settings in general. First, while previous research studied several antecedences and consequences of ingroup identification, collective guilt assignment and reparation demands, the present research is the first which addresses the interrelatedness of these concepts and how this interrelatedness is

conditional upon cross-group friendship. Secondly, the present results complement the research on intergroup forgiveness. More specifically, they shed light on the complexity and dynamics underlying the process of intergroup reconciliation. Most social psychological research on reconciliation has focused on intergroup forgiveness, for instance, by elaborating on involved social identity processes (e.g., Leach, Baker & Zeigler-Hill, 2011); by testing the impact of seeking forgiveness by members of the transgressor group (e.g., apologies and reparation offers; see for instance, Philpot & Hornsey, 2008; Wohl, Hornsey & Bennett, 2012); or by assessing the effects of the granting of forgiveness on members of victim groups (e.g., Wenzel & Okimoto, 2010). With its focus on forgiveness, however, this research has not directly addressed the expectations and needs of members of the victimised group in such reconciliation processes. Reparation can be considered as one of those expectations because it is tied to our moral understanding of repairing relationships (Ekiyor, 2007). This argument is supported by the fact that most of truth and reconciliation commissions established worldwide over the recent decades included in their final reports recommendations with regard to reparation to victims (Darcy, 2011).

Thirdly, the present research implies that the assignment of emotions to the transgressor group might be as essential as self- and other-related emotions in the process of forgiveness and reconciliation (e.g., Iyer, Leach, & Pedersen, 2004). The results of the present study suggest that the role of collective guilt assignment cannot be reduced to its mere instrumentality in legitimising, for instance, reparation demands. In contrast, the found relationship between identification with the victimised group and collective guilt assignment toward the transgressor group supports our reasoning that moral emotions held by the transgressor group may also be functional for the victimised group's reconciliation needs for reintegration and recognition in a larger moral community. Furthermore, attributing the capacity for such secondary emotions to the transgressor group in association with a

particular behaviour such as reparation may as well point toward the re-humanising of members of the transgressor group. Re-humanising members of the transgressor group might be considered as welcoming of the violator into the circle of humanity (Minow, 1998) and subsequently as an intention to forgive. Future research needs to address this conclusion.

Fourthly, the present research underlines the significance of cross-group friendship in post-conflict intergroup relations. Cross-group friendship has been shown to impact positively on intergroup forgiveness (e.g., Čehajić et al., 2008). The present results are in line with these findings by demonstrating the conditional effect of cross-group friendship on the proposed model. The effect was found for both the indirect and direct assessment of cross-group friendship. The results of the two studies indicated, however, that cross-group friendship does not have an effect on whether collective guilt is assigned or not nor how much the participants identified with the victimised group. Furthermore, the results of cross-group friendship effects on reparation demands were rather ambivalent. Although the demand for reparation was lower in the desegregated context than in the segregated context, the interindividual differences in cross-group friendship within the desegregated context in Study 2 were unrelated to those demands. However, our results were consistent in that cross-group friendship reduced the indirect effect of identification with the victimised group on reparation demands via assignment of collective guilt. Thus, for members of the victimised group with higher quality friendships with members of the transgressor group the assignment of collective guilt might be motivated by other aspects of their identity, for instance by their sense of intragroup justice as members of a shared common ingroup (e.g., South Africans or humans in general). Again, although in line with previous research and theorizing, this conclusion needs to be addressed by future research.

Other limitations of our research, which should be addressed in future, is first, that the current correlational data do not allow for conclusions on causal processes involved. The

replication of the findings using a more controlled methodological approach is pending. However, as the three constructs that we studied in this research are part of a complex belief system, we would hesitate to propose simple causal predictions. As in other social identity contexts, we would consider the possibility of bi-directional causal processes as part of longitudinal change processes or experimentally induced variations (see Kessler & Mummendey, 2002). Secondly, the present studies assessed reparation in rather general terms. The question that arises is whether the proposed model applies in the same way for different reparation forms (e.g., demands for symbolic versus materialistic reparation). It might be plausible to assume that the model applies less to materialistic reparation demands particularly for members of victimised groups who experience their group as low status within the current intergroup relations (Dumont & Waldzus, 2014). Lastly, given that cross-group friendship did not reduce collective guilt assignment in our studies, future research should examine under which conditions a shift of categorisation toward an inclusive category reduces collective guilt assignment (Wohl & Branscombe, 2005) and reparation demands. It is questionable; however, that reduction of collective guilt assignment and reparation demands as mere attitudinal change is sufficient for reconciliation. Wohl and Branscombe (2005) argue that intergroup forgiveness is not merely a result of attitudinal changes but of changes in the structural relations between members of the victimised group and members of the transgressor group (see also Dixon, Levine, Reicher, & Durrheim, 2012).

As reparation offers by transgressor groups are widely accepted as facilitating intergroup reconciliation, we would like to argue that the assignment of collective guilt together with reparation demands by victimised groups are not necessarily an obstacle in this process. On the contrary, they seem to be a means in the process of granting forgiveness, because they not only offer victimised groups the opportunity to express their experiences publicly but also force transgressor groups to acknowledge and take responsibility for their



wrongdoing which might eventually lead to the feelings of collective guilt and actual reparation offers. The assignment of collective guilt together with reparation demands promote thereby a kind of justice that is more adjusted to the needs of victimized groups which are not necessarily aiming at making the transgressor group suffer but rather restoring the victimised group's dignity. Taking such a perspective allows for a better understanding of the continuing discourses about reparations in interracial relations within the South Africa context (but also in other societies) whether informed by recommendations of truth and reconciliation commissions, by prominent figure's persisting appeals (e.g., Archbishop Emeritus Desmond Tutu's call for the "wealth tax") or by collective actions of social movements (e.g., Khulumani Support Group).

## REFERENCES

- Allport, G. (1954/1979). *The nature of prejudice*. Perseus Books: Cambridge, MA.
- BBC (2012a). Mau Mau uprising: Kenyans win UK torture ruling. *BBC News UK*. Retrieved January 22, 2013 from <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-19843719>.
- BBC (2012b). President Hollande accepts French injustice in Algeria. *BBC News Europe*. Retrieved January 28, 2013 from <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-20795750>.
- Brown, R.P., & Cehajic, S. (2008). Dealing with the past and facing the future: Mediators of the effects of collective guilt and shame in Bosnia and Herzegovina. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 38, 669-684.
- Brown, R., Gonzalez, R., Zagefka, H, Manzi, J., & Cehajic, S. (2008). Nuestra Culpa: Collective guilt and shame as predictors of reparation for historical wrongdoings. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94, 75-90.
- Brown, R.P., Wohl, M.J. & Exline, J.J. (2008). Taking up offenses: secondhand forgiveness and group identification. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 34 (10), 1406-1419.
- Čehajić, S., Brown, R. & Castano, E. (2008). Forgive and Forget? Antecedents and consequences of intergroup forgiveness in Bosnia and Herzegovina. *Political Psychology*, 29 (3), 351-367.
- Chapman, A.R. (2007). Truth commission and intergroup conflict: the case of the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 13 (1), 51-69.
- Darcy, S. (2011). Truth commissions, the European Union and reparation from business. In F. Medjoubia (Ed.), *Building peace in post-conflict situations* (pp. 43-60). London: British Institute of International and Comparative Law.

- Dixon, J, Levine, M., Reicher, S. & Durrheim, K. (2012). Beyond prejudice: Are negative evaluations the problem and is getting us to like one another more the solution? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 35 (6), 411-425.
- Doosje, B., Branscombe, N.R., Spears, R., & Manstead, A.S.R. (1998). Guilty by association: When one's group has a negative history. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75(4), 872-886.
- Dumont, K. B. & Waldzus, S. (2014). Group-based guilt and reparation in the context of social change. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 44, 331-341.
- Durrheim, K., & Dixon, J. (2001). The role of place and metaphor in racial exclusion: South Africa's beaches as sites of shifting racialization. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 24(3), 433-450.
- Ekiyor, H. A. (2007). Making a case for reparation. *Journal of Pan African Studies*, 1 (9), 103-116.
- FW de Klerk Foundation (2011). Tutu's race tax proposal: A response. Retrieved November 10, 2014 from <http://www.politicsweb.co.za/politicsweb/view/politicsweb/en/page71654?oid=250570&sn=Detail&pid=71616>
- Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (2000). *Reducing Intergroup Bias: The common ingroup identity model*. Philadelphia: Psychology Press.
- Hewstone, M., Cairns, E., Voci, A., Hamberger, J. & Niens, U. (2006). Intergroup contact, forgiveness, and experience of "The Trouble" in Northern Ireland. *Journal of Social Issues*, 62 (1), 99-120.
- Islam, M. R. & Hewstone, M. (1993). Dimensions of contact as predictors of intergroup anxiety, perceived outgroup variability, and outgroup attitude: an integrative model. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 19 (6), 700-710.

- Iyer, A., Leach, C. W., & Petersen, A. (2004). Racial wrongs and restitutions. The role of guilt and other group-based emotions. In N. R. Branscombe & B. Doosje (Eds.), *Collective guilt: International perspectives* (pp. 262-283). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Keltner, D., Gruenfeld, D. H., & Anderson, C. (2003). Power, approach, and inhibition. *Psychological Review*, 110 (2), 265-284.
- Kessler, T., & Mummendey, A. (2002). Sequential or parallel processes? A longitudinal field study concerning determinants of identity-management strategies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82 (1), 75-88.
- Khulumani (2013). Khulumani Support Group. Retrieved 02 January, 2014 from <http://www.khulumani.net>.
- Leach, C. W., van Zomeren, M., Zebel, S., Vliek, M. L. W., Pennekamp, S. F., Doosje, B., Ouwerkerk, J. W., & Spears, R. (2008). Group-level self-definition and self-investment: A hierarchical (multi-component) model of in-group identification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95, 144-165.
- Leach, M. M., Baker, A., & Zeigler-Hill, V. (2011). The influence of black racial identity on the forgiveness of whites. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 37 (2), 185-209.
- Lefko-Everett, K. (2011). New Wealth Tax? *SA Reconciliation Barometer Blog*. Retrieved November 11, 2014 from <http://reconciliationbarometer.org/2011/08/new-wealth-tax/>
- Leyens, J.-P., Paladino, P. M., Rodriguez-Torres, R., Vaes, J., Demoulin, S., Rodriguez-Perez, A. & Gaunt, R. (2000). The emotional side of prejudice: The attribution of secondary emotions to ingroups and outgroups. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 4 (2), 186-197.

- McGlynn, C., Niens, U., Cairns, E., & Hewstone, M. (2004). Moving out of conflict: the contribution of integrated schools in Northern Ireland to identity, attitudes, forgiveness and reconciliation. *Journal of Peace Education*, 1 (2), 147-163.
- Minow, M. (1998). *Between Vengeance and Forgiveness. Facing History after genocide and Mass Violence*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Minow, M. (2014). *Forgiveness, Law and Justice. Third Annual Lecture at the University of the Free State, South Africa*. Retrieved October 22, 2014 from <http://cncr.rutgers.edu/harvards-martha-minow-forgiveness-law-and-justice/>
- Page-Gould, E., Mendoza-Denton, R., Alegre, J. M., & Siy, J. O. (2010). Understanding the impact of cross-group friendship on interactions with novel outgroup members. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98 (5), 775-793.
- Pennekamp, S. F., Doosje, B., Zebel, S. & Fischer, A. H. (2007). The past and the pending: the antecedents and consequences of group-based anger in historically and currently disadvantaged groups. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 10 (1), 41-55.
- Pettigrew, T. F. & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analysis of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95 (5), 751-783.
- Philpot, C. R. & Hornsey, M. J. (2008). What happens when groups say sorry: the effect of intergroup apologies on their recipients. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 34 (4), 474-487.
- Philpot, C. R. & Hornsey, M. J. (2011). Memory for intergroup apologies and its relationship with forgiveness. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 41, 96-106.
- Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2008). Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models. *Behavior Research Methods*, 40, 879-891.

- Preacher, K. J., Rucker, D. D., & Hayes, A. F. (2007). Addressing moderated mediation hypotheses: Theory, methods, and prescriptions. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 42, 185-227.
- Rai, T. S., & Fiske, A. P. (2011). Moral psychology is relationship regulation: moral motives for unity, hierarchy, equality, and proportionality. *Psychological Review*, 118 (1), 57.
- Shnabel, N., & Nadler, A. (2008). A needs-based model of reconciliation: satisfying the differential emotional needs of victim and perpetrator as a key to promoting reconciliation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94 (1), 116-132.
- Simon, B., & Oakes, P. (2006). Beyond dependence: An identity approach to social power and domination. *Human Relations*, 59 (1), 105-139.
- Stathi, S., Crisp, R., & Hogg, M. A. (2011). Imagining intergroup contact enables member-to-group generalization. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 15 (3), 275-284.
- Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behaviour. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) (pp. 7-24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- TRC (1998). *Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa Report, Volume 5*. Cape Town, South Africa: CPT Book Printer. Retrieved 12 December, 2012 from <http://www.justice.gov.za/trc/report/finalreport/Volume5.pdf>.
- Tredoux, C. G., & Dixon, J. A. (2009). Mapping the multiple contexts of racial isolation: The case of Long Street, Cape Town. *Urban Studies*, 46 (4), 761-777.
- Turner, J. C. (2005) Explaining the nature of power: A three-process theory. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 35, 1-22.

- UK at the UN (2012). Foreign and Commonwealth Office statement on Mau Mau court judgment. *United Kingdom Mission to the United Nations*. Retrieved January 08, 2013 from <http://ukun.fco.gov.uk/en/news/?view=News&id=818923982>
- Wenzel, M. & Okimoto, T. G. (2010). How acts of forgiveness restore a sense of justice: Addressing status/power and value concerns raised by transgressions. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 40, 401-417.
- Wohl, M. J. A. & Branscombe, N. R. (2005). Forgiveness and collective guilt assignment to historical perpetrator groups depend on level of social category inclusiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88 (2), 288-303.
- Wohl, M. J. A., Branscombe, N. R., & Klar, Y. (2006). Collective guilt: Emotional reactions when one's group has done wrong or been wronged. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 17 (1), 1-37.
- Wohl, M. J. A., Hornsey, M. J., & Bennett, S. H. (2012). Why group apologies succeed and fail: Intergroup forgiveness and the role of primary and secondary emotions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 102 (2), 306-322.

Table 1. Means, standard deviations and intercorrelations among principal variables of Study 1 and 2

		1	2	3	4
<b>Study 1</b>					
Segregated Context	M	4.04***	3.88***	4.08***	
	<i>SD</i>	1.13	1.09	0.98	
	Min	1.32	1.10	1.80	
	Max	5	5	5	
Desegregated Context	M	4.25***	3.68***	3.28**	
	<i>SD</i>	0.72	1.01	1.10	
	Min	1.20	1	1	
	Max	5	5	5	
<b>Study 2</b>					
Desegregated Context	M	4.12***	3.74***	3.28**	3.55***
	<i>SD</i>	0.80	0.95	1.21	1.08
	Min	1.40	1	1	1
	Max	5	5	5	5
	<i>F Statistic</i>	ns	ns	$F(2, 348) = 18.94,$ $p < .001$	
1 Identification with victimised group			.79***/.24**	.59***/.22**	
2 Guilt Assignment		.45***		.70***/.42***	
3 Reparation Demands		.39***	.46***		
4 Intergroup Contact		/.06	/.05	/-.06	

Note. †  $p < .10$ , \*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*\*  $p < .001$  (two-tailed). Correlation coefficients of participants from segregated/desegregated context of Study 1 are reported in the upper right



part of the table and of participants from Study 2 (desegregated contexts) in the lower left part of the table. Means\*\* ( $p < .01$ ) and means\*\*\* ( $p < .001$ ) are significantly different from scale centre (3).

Table 2. Indirect effect of ingroup identification for all three samples

	Study 1						Study2		
	Segregated Context (n = 99)			Desegregated Context (n = 114)			Desegregated Context (n = 134)		
	B	SE	<i>p</i>	B	SE	<i>p</i>	B	SE	<i>p</i>
Identification with victimised group on guilt assignment	0.81	0.05	< .001	0.33	0.13	< .05	0.55	0.09	< .001
Direct effects of guilt assignment on reparation demands	0.61	0.12	< .001	0.42	0.09	< .001	0.45	0.11	< .001
Total effect of identification with victimised group on reparation demands	0.51	0.07	< .001	0.33	0.14	< .05	0.59	0.12	< .001
Direct effect of identification with victimised group on reparation demands	0.01	0.12	ns	0.19	0.13	ns	0.34	0.13	< .05
Model Summary for DV Model	$R^2 = .49, F(2, 96) = 46.70,$			$R^2 = .19, F(2, 111) = 12.89,$			$R^2 = .25, F(2, 131) = 22.02,$		
	$p < .001$			$p < .001$			$p < .001$		

---

Indirect Effect	0.50	0.15	<	0.14	0.07	<.05	0.25	0.07	<.001
									.001
95% bias corrected confidence interval	.2179 to .7991		.0229 to .3283			.1265 to .4115			
(Number of bootstrap)									

---

Figure 1: Theoretical model of factors influencing reparation demands of a previously victimised group in a post-conflict context

