Hierarchies of being human: Intergroup dehumanization and its implication in

present-day South Africa

Melike M. Fourie[1*], Melanie Deist[1], & Samantha L. Moore-Berg[2]

[1]Centre for the Study of the Afterlife of Violence and the Reparative Quest, Stellenbosch University, Stellenbosch, South Africa
[2]Annenberg School for Communication, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, USA

*Corresponding author
Stellenbosch University
Stellenbosch, 7600
South Africa
E-mail: marethem@gmail.com
ORCHID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4879-7250

Abstract

The 20th century saw the dismantling of several oppressive regimes and an international turn toward greater social justice. Yet structural inequality and intergroup animosity persist in many post-colonial and post-slavery contexts, not least because the dehumanization inherent to those regimes remain entrenched socially. Here we examined whether the racialized hierarchy established under the inhumane South African apartheid system is still manifest in patterns of dehumanization today, and how this impacts intergroup relations and behaviors related to structural reform. Specifically, we investigated blatant dehumanization as the explicit attribution of reduced human uniqueness, factors contributing to its tenacity, and its intergroup outcomes in a national sample of the three largest racialized groups: Black African, Coloured, and White. We found that, despite significant changes in power dynamics post-apartheid, dehumanization ratings mirrored the apartheid-inspired hierarchy, with White people rated 'more human' than Coloured people, and Coloured people rated 'more human' than Black African people across participants. Levels of dehumanization were ameliorated by positive intergroup contact, and reinforced by feeling dehumanized (meta-dehumanization) and hierarchy-legitimizing beliefs in White and Coloured participants. Finally, White participants' dehumanization of Black African people predicted, beyond prejudice, several outcomes (social distance, collective action, and petition support) that would sustain the unequal status quo. Our results suggest that intergroup dynamics are influenced by the positions people occupied on the apartheid racial hierarchy, and that curbing dehumanization should be prioritized to advance structural reform in South Africa.

Keywords: blatant dehumanization, social hierarchies, meta-dehumanization, disadvantaged groups, inequality

Public Significance Statement

Our findings suggest that dehumanization in present-day South Africa continues to reflect the socially constructed and hierarchical race categories instilled by the apartheid regime and may be one mechanism through which inequality and intergroup contestation is perpetuated. Developing contextually appropriate interventions to curb dehumanization is therefore of great import and would require careful ethical considerations to aid in breaking down, rather than reinforcing, existing power dynamics.

Hierarchies of being human: Intergroup dehumanization and its implication in

present-day South Africa

In apartheid South Africa, the colonial ideology of 'whiter is more evolved' was a core inspiration for many injustices committed under the regime (Boucher, 2019; Hall, 2018; Jahoda, 1999). In 1950, the Population Registration Act explicitly imposed labels of racial identity on citizens according to three racial categories: White, Coloured (persons of diverse racial origins), and Black African (Indian was later added as a fourth category). Within this system, White was considered superior, Coloured and Indian people occupied intermediate status, yet also suffered systematic racial discrimination, and Black Africans were located at the bottom of the social hierarchy. Inhumane state policies, like the forced removal of Black people (collectively speaking)[1] from their homes, were justified by dehumanizing Black people and invoking active threat (Falkof, 2016; Lephakga, 2013; Maylam, 1995), thereby excluding them from the realm of moral concern (Bandura, 1999).

In 1994 with the demise of apartheid, colonial ideologies were rejected, and a democratically-elected political party came into power that was representative of the Black majority. After almost three decades of liberation, however, racial polarization shows no signs of abating, the White minority continues to hold significant economic power and privilege, and wealth and income inequalities continue to be rampant within Black communities (Chatterjee, 2019; Fourie & Verwoerd, 2021; Hino et al., 2018; Sulla & Zikhali, 2018). This lack of structural change is particularly stark for the millions of people who continue to live in ever-expanding and dehumanizing township settlements (Wale et al., 2020).

Given that apartheid's social-historical race categories remain in use today, could it be that the dehumanization inherent to these socially constructed categories remain imprinted on South

African society? More specifically, does the psychological standard for being human still fall along an internalized, violent, social hierarchy created under an oppressive system and potentially strengthened by present-day inequalities, and how do such notions impact support for structural reform?

Dehumanization: A Brief Overview

Dehumanization, or regarding others as less than human, has long been recognized as a driver of intergroup conflict and violence. Throughout history, depictions of minority groups (such as Jews, Roma, and Muslims) as apes, vermin, and savages have accompanied mass atrocities, and in some instances, have driven justifications for colonization, war, slavery, and genocide (Bandura et al., 1975; Kelman, 1973; Smith, 2011). Dehumanization also serves several functions in contexts less marred by active violence, however. For instance, people deny others humanity to validate discriminatory policies, to avoid the emotional costs of helping, and to cope with their group's past transgressions and feelings of guilt (Cameron et al., 2016; Castano & Giner-Sorolla, 2006; Cuddy et al., 2007; Vaes et al., 2012). Thus, across many situations and settings, dehumanization has been and continues to be a powerful psychological tool that not only removes the moral prohibitions of harming others, but also serves to protect the equanimity and identity of the ingroup.

One model of dehumanization that has garnered significant support suggests that it occurs in two different forms: mechanistically and animalistically (Haslam, 2006). Mechanistic dehumanization involves denying traits and emotions central to human nature (e.g., warmth, compassion, humility) to other groups, whereas animalistic dehumanization involves denying traits unique to humans (e.g., civility, morality) to others (see Haslam & Loughnan, 2014 for a review). Mechanistic and animalistic dehumanization can occur either subtly or blatantly, which

alludes to the severity of the phenomenon and how obviously dehumanizing the mental representations of another group would be to a lay person (Kteily & Landry, 2022). Recent research on more blatant forms of dehumanization suggests that blatant animalistic dehumanization is a particularly strong predicter of intergroup hostility and conflict (Kteily & Bruneau, 2017). For example, the more people explicitly deny humanness to outgroups, the more likely they are to favor restricting donations toward needy outgroup members, support limiting immigration of these groups, and endorse aggression toward them (Bruneau, Kteily, et al., 2018; Kteily et al., 2015). In the current research, we assess blatant dehumanization through the attribution of animalistic traits for racial groups in South Africa and examine various factors that are known to influence dehumanization of outgroup members.

One factor likely to exacerbate dehumanization is the perception that one's group is *being* dehumanized by a particular group (known as meta-dehumanization). For example, Americans who think that Muslims dehumanize them (i.e., greater meta-dehumanization) are more likely to dehumanize Muslims in turn (Kteily et al., 2016). This can lead to reactive dehumanization, where feeling dehumanized by a group is perceived as a threat to one's social identity and the need to reciprocate those sentiments (Landry et al., 2021; Moore-Berg et al., 2020). Just as dehumanization can be distinguished by animalistic and mechanistic forms, so too can *feeling* dehumanized. Because low-status or disadvantaged groups are often perceived as lacking human uniqueness traits (i.e., they are considered more animal-like), whereas high-status or advantaged groups tend to be perceived as lacking human nature traits (i.e., they are considered more robot-like) (Sainz et al., 2019), members of high versus low status groups might also perceive being dehumanized along these stereotypical patterns (Loughnan et al., 2014).

Another predictor associated with dehumanization is the amount and type of contact (quantity and quality) with outgroup members (Capozza et al., 2014). Research suggests that contact quality strongly predicts dehumanization of other groups above and beyond contact quantity, however. Bruneau and colleagues found that across 16 samples from five different contexts across the globe, positive contact with outgroup members significantly reduced dehumanization of those outgroups (Bruneau et al., 2020). In fact, although contact quantity contributed to dehumanization in some situations, increased contact with outgroup members only weakly predicted reduced dehumanization of those outgroups. This suggests that the nature of the contact is decisive in determining its effects on dehumanization.

While contact and meta-dehumanization are shown to predict dehumanization, research also points to several intergroup outcomes of dehumanization. For example, as dehumanization increases, desired social distancing from the outgroup (Cassese, 2021) and support for restrictive policies that limit the freedoms of other groups (Bruneau, Kteily, et al., 2018) also increase. Thus, in addition to investigating several factors that contribute to dehumanization, we also examined dehumanization's association with outcomes that perpetuate the status quo.

Dehumanization and Social Hierarchies

Dehumanization has previously been considered an ethnocentric or own-group bias, with all ingroup members attributing greater human qualities to themselves than to outgroup members (Leyens et al., 2007). Mounting evidence suggests that group status significantly shapes dehumanization, however (Capozza et al., 2012; Iatridis, 2013). Accordingly, dehumanization most often occurs down the power gradient, with high-status groups dehumanizing low-status groups to a greater extent than vice versa, and low-status groups even displaying tendencies to

humanize the high-status group compared to their own. Blatant dehumanization, in particular, appears to be predicated on a hierarchical view of society (Kteily & Bruneau, 2017).

From a high-status perspective, it is easy to understand how dehumanization might be utilized to justify power positions (Gwinn et al., 2013; Lammers & Stapel, 2011), or to reinforce existing social hierarchies, especially toward those believed to infringe on one's rights and privileges. In fact, those who have greater hierarchy-enforcing beliefs—such as those with higher social dominance orientation (SDO)—are more likely to express (blatant) dehumanization toward other groups (Hodson & Costello, 2007; Kteily et al., 2015), and to raise children with greater dehumanizing tendencies (Costello & Hodson, 2014).

Less evident, however, is understanding the conditions that influence the dehumanization (or lack thereof) of dominant groups by those lower on the social hierarchy. Some evidence suggests that the dehumanization of high-status groups might be influenced by the extent to which low-status group members identify with or acculturate to the high-status group, with greater identification with the dominant culture associated with reduced dehumanization (Miranda et al., 2014). Another theory suggests that members of low-status or marginalized groups may be more likely than members of high-status groups to view social systems as legitimate and to rationalize their own disadvantage (system justification theory; Jost et al., 2004). By this account, members of low-status groups might be less inclined to dehumanize dominant group members to reduce psychological conflict between system interests and self/group interests, which, in turn, offers hedonic benefits for the individual to cope with unjust social realities (Jost et al., 2012).

The attribution of humanity is not a monolithic process, however, but rather multi-dimensional so that targets can be perceived as ideally human on some dimensions but

nonhuman on others (Kteily & Landry, 2022). Of significance is that recent evidence points to an interplay between the type of humanity attribution and the status of groups, with potentially serious repercussions for class structure and its justification (Loughnan et al., 2014; Sainz, Loughnan, et al., 2020; Sainz et al., 2019). Animalization of low-status groups might, for example, allow individuals to endorse poverty as a natural outcome for those perceived as less advanced, whereas mechanization of high-status groups might influence how wealth is perceived and legitimized (e.g., the rich may be unemotional but hard-working). Such ambivalent attributions of humanity may facilitate social distance between groups while reinforcing and maintaining unequal social hierarchies.

In South Africa, the apartheid-imposed racial hierarchy has been dispensed with under the democratic social order, yet it is unclear whether this hierarchy continues to shape intergroup dehumanization and social repair, especially given persistent racialized inequality. Indeed, while political power has shifted, socioeconomic status and disparities in wealth between various racial groups largely still parallel those established during apartheid, with the average White household income up to six times greater than that of Black Africans, and Coloured people experiencing outcomes in-between those of Black African and White people (Johnson, 2017; StatsSA, 2019). For those enjoying privileged social status, dehumanization might thus present a means to justify and/or maintain current status arrangements.

Current Research

In the present research, we examined the factors that contribute to outgroup dehumanization and the intergroup outcomes that are predicted by it with participants from the three largest racialized groups in South Africa, namely Black African, Coloured, and White. While previous research predominantly focused on the perceptions of advantaged groups with

respect to disadvantaged groups, here we sought to examine dehumanization as it manifests in the relations between these racialized groups amidst shifting and contentious power dynamics. Our research was guided by the following set of hypotheses.

Given the categorization of people under apartheid, we first examined whether this hierarchical social order remains entrenched psychologically today. That is, we hypothesized that blatant animalistic dehumanization of racial groups in South Africa would show the apartheid-inspired hierarchy (Black African > Coloured > White), regardless of the participant's racial identity.

Second, we investigated whether factors shown by previous research to contribute to dehumanization are associated with dehumanization also in this context characterized by historically asymmetric power dynamics. We hypothesized that feeling dehumanized by an outgroup (animalistic or mechanistic meta-dehumanization) would be associated with greater dehumanization of that outgroup in a cyclical manner. We further predicted that positive intergroup contact would be associated with reduced dehumanization. Finally, we reasoned that beliefs about the inherent inferiority of some groups compared to others (SDO) would contribute to greater dehumanization, particularly in those groups who occupied relatively higher status positions historically and therefore stand to gain from a hierarchical social order.

Third, we examined the downstream motivational and behavioral outcomes of dehumanization as they pertain to structural reform. These included measures assessing (i) the desire to maintain social distance from outgroups, (ii) support for collective action, and (iii) active support for petitions that would negatively impact outgroups' status. We hypothesized that blatant animalistic dehumanization would be associated most strongly with measures impacting structural inequality (i.e., collective action and petition support) (Sainz et al., 2019). Specifically,

we hypothesized that dehumanization of Black African people, as the largest outgroup posing the biggest threat to White privilege (both historically and today) (Posel, 2011), would be most consequential in sustaining the unequal status quo.

Important to the conversation of dehumanization is its relationship to prejudice. Although prejudice and dehumanization are closely related constructs and can occur simultaneously, dehumanization is considered distinct from prejudice (Bruneau, Jacoby, et al., 2018; Bruneau et al., 2019). Because of the close relationship between these processes, we controlled for affective prejudice in all analyses, with a particular interest in isolating the unique effect of dehumanization on various intergroup outcomes. Furthermore, given the heterogeneity of participant samples, we also controlled for demographic variables (age, gender, education, and income level) in all analyses.

Methods

Participants

To determine the number of participants required to detect differences in dehumanization scores, we conducted a priori power analysis for an ANOVA with 3 between-group and 3 within-group variables using G*Power 3.1 (Faul et al., 2007). Analyses indicated that 555 participants would be required to detect small main and interaction effects ($f = .13$) with 90% power at a 5% significance level. Six hundred South African citizens, 200 who identified as Black African, 200 who identified as Coloured, and 200 who identified as White, participated in an online survey (additional sampling information is provided in the Supplementary Material). We excluded 3 participants who fell outside an age range of 18-75, leaving a final sample of 597 ($M_{age} = 33.10$, $SD = 10.24$, 34% male) (Table 1 presents demographics for each participant group).

Measures and Procedure

All participants provided informed consent. They were informed that the researchers do not endorse the legitimacy of artificial, historically imposed racial categories, but accept the realities of resultant racialized identities, which continue to provide a context for people's lived experiences. We furthermore indicated that we focused on participants' responses as it pertained to the three largest racial groups in South Africa: Black African, White, and Coloured.

Demographic Information. Participants reported (i) whether they are South African citizens, (ii) fluent in English, and (iii) the racial group they identify with (inclusion criteria), followed by their gender, age, years of formal education, and income level.

Dehumanization. We asked participants to rate how well six blatant animalistic dehumanizing qualities describe Black African, Coloured, and White individuals on scales ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*very much*): "rational, logical" (reverse-coded), "lacking morals", "savage, aggressive", "scientifically/ technologically advanced" (reverse-coded), "mature, responsible" (reverse-coded), and "backward, primitive" (adapted from Bastian et al., 2013) ($.70 < \alpha s < .85$). Ratings on these items were averaged and recalculated to scores ranging from 1 to 100 to allow for comparison with meta-dehumanization scores. Higher scores indicated greater dehumanization.[2]

Meta-dehumanization. To gauge the extent to which participants perceived that each outgroup dehumanized their ingroup, we adapted meta-dehumanization items from Kteily et al. (2016) and tailored items according to the historical social status of the ingroup (Sainz et al., 2019). White participants, as the historically advantaged group, indicated their agreement with three items of mechanistic outgroup dehumanization on continuous sliders from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 100 (*strongly agree*): "[Outgroup] think that White people are

[unfeeling/heartless/emotionally cold]" (αs > .93). In turn, Black African and Coloured participants, as the historically disadvantaged groups, indicated their agreement with three items of animalistic dehumanization: "[Outgroup] think that [ingroup] are like [animals/less evolved/less civilized]" (.85 < αs < .91).

Social Dominance Orientation. To assess support for hierarchy, we used eight items from the SDO$_6$ scale (Pratto et al., 1994). Participants rated their agreement with four items from the SDO-Dominance (e.g., "Some groups of people are simply inferior to other groups,") and four items from the SDO-Egalitarian (e.g., "We should work to give all groups an equal chance to succeed," reverse-coded,) subdimensions on Likert-type scales ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). An SDO-Total score was calculated by averaging responses on these items (.65 < αs < .75).

Intergroup Contact. Intergroup contact was assessed using two items designed to evaluate the quantity ("How often do you interact with [outgroup]?") and quality ("When you do interact with [outgroup], how often are the interactions positive/pleasant versus negative/unpleasant?") of intergroup interactions (Bruneau et al., 2020). Participants responded on Likert-type scales anchored at 1 (*Never* OR *Always Negative*) and 7 (*All the time* OR *Always Positive*).

Prejudice. We assessed affective prejudice for target groups using the commonly used feeling thermometer scale (Haddock et al., 1993). Participants evaluated how warm (favorable) they feel toward members of each group (Black African, Coloured, and White South Africans) using continuous sliders from 0 (*very cold and unfavorable*) to 100 (*very warm and favorable*). Scores were reverse-coded so that higher scores indicate more prejudice.

Intergroup Outcomes.

Social Distance. Affective desire for social distance regarding each outgroup was measured using a three-item scale adapted from Bogardus (1933). Respondents were asked to rate the extent to which they would feel bothered (i) "if my son or daughter ended up marrying an [outgroup] person", (ii) "if I had to live in the same house/flat as an [outgroup] person", and (iii) "if a child of mine was close friends with an [outgroup] child", using continuous sliders from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 100 (*strongly agree*) (.80 < αs < .89).

Collective Action Support. Participants were asked to indicate how much they support collective action by a group of people who engage in protest action to enhance their status or achieve a common objective on a sliding scale anchored at 1 (*strongly oppose*) and 100 (*strongly support*). Four items assessed support for protests challenging structural racism by historically disadvantaged groups (e.g., people from impoverished Black African and Coloured communities) about (i) tertiary education fees, (ii) job creation, (iii) slow land reform, and (iv) municipal services delivery, and were combined to create a composite measure of Black[1] collective action (.73 < αs < .81), whereas one item assessed support for protests against the murder of White farmers (White collective action) (see Supplementary Materials).

Outgroup Petitions. To assess active support for real-world outcomes that will negatively impact outgroups, we presented participants with five purportedly real online petitions either (i) urging parliament to revoke progressive policies that would benefit historically disadvantaged groups[3] (Black petitions; completed by White participants) or (ii) urging parliament to implement aggressive policies at the expensive of previously advantaged White people (White petitions; completed by Black African and Coloured participants) (see Supplementary Materials). Petition topics included Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment (BBBEE) legislation,

tertiary education fees, employment equity, land expropriation, and reparation tax (Dixon et al., 2010). For each petition, participants indicated whether they wanted to add their signature to the petition (coded as 1), to a counter-petition (coded as -1), or to neither (coded as 0) (.79 < αs < .87). Using these codes, we created an average index ranging from -1 to 1, where higher values indicate greater opposition of outgroup welfare.

Results

Dehumanization and Meta-Dehumanization

A 3 (participant group: Black African, Coloured, White) x 3 (target group: Black African, Coloured, White) mixed factorial ANOVA indicated that the main effect of target group was significant, with dehumanization scores following the hierarchical pattern established under apartheid, $F(1.93, 1139.39) = 76.24$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .12$, $\varepsilon = .97$.[4] Planned contrasts indicated that all participants rated White people *more human* than Coloured people ($p < .001$, $d = .41$) and Black African people ($p < .001$, $d = .44$), and Coloured people *more human* than Black African people ($p = .022$, $d = .10$) (Figure 1a). The main effect of participant group was not significant ($p = .243$, $\eta^2 < .01$).

A significant participant group x target group interaction was also observed, $F(3.87, 1139.39) = 25.44$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .08$, indicating that the participant groups differed in how they rated each target group's humanity. Planned contrasts indicated that there were no significant differences in how participant groups dehumanized Coloured compared to White people ($p = .060$, $d = .07$), but that differences existed in their attribution of humanity for Coloured and Black African people ($p < .001$, $d = .25$). Specifically, Black African participants dehumanized Coloured people ($M = 55.29$, $SD = 13.13$) more than Black African people ($M = 49.77$, $SD = 13.61$) ($p < .001$, $d = .41$), whereas White and Coloured participants dehumanized Black African

14

people (M = 57.78, SD = 14.68 and M = 53.15, SD = 14.25, respectively) more than Coloured

people (M = 51.35, SD = 12.68 and M = 50.16, SD = 13.42, respectively) (ps < .003, ds > .21).

Hence, Black African participants viewed White and Black African people at the top of the racial

hierarchy and equally human (p = .761, d = .02), followed by Coloured people. By contrast,

White and Coloured participants viewed dehumanization in line with the apartheid racial order

(Figure 1b).

To present outgroup dehumanization scores in relation to ingroup scores, we calculated

dehumanization difference scores (outgroup dehumanization — ingroup dehumanization). In

these assessments, a positive value implies greater dehumanization than the ingroup (i.e.,

reduced humanity), whereas a negative value implies greater humanity than the ingroup (Figure

1c). One-sample t-test comparisons to 0 confirmed that White participants dehumanized

Coloured, t(195) = 7.53, p < .001, d = .54, and especially Black African people, t(195) = 10.98, p

< .001, d = .78, more than their ingroup; Black African participants dehumanized Coloured,

t(198) = 5.75, p < .001, d = .41, but not White people, t(198) = -0.31, p = .761, d = .02, more

than their ingroup; and Coloured participants significantly dehumanized Black Africans, t(196) =

2.98, p = .003, d = .21, but attributed more humanity to White people than their ingroup, t(196) =

-3.83, p < .001, d = -.27.

Regarding meta-dehumanization, Black African and White participants held the greatest

perceptions of being dehumanized by the other: Black African participants felt considerably

more dehumanized by White people (M = 75.31, SD = 24.13) than by Coloured people (M =

44.94, SD = 28.83), t(197) = 13.50, p < .001, d = .85, and White participants felt significantly

more dehumanized by Black African people (M = 67.91, SD = 25.13) than by Coloured people

(M = 44.34, SD = 23.44), t(193) = 11.80, p < .001, d = .85. Coloured participants felt more

dehumanized by White people ($M = 53.82$, $SD = 27.35$) than by Black African people ($M = 48.60$, $SD = 30.77$), $t(195) = 2.32$, $p = .021$, $d = .17$.

We also compared meta-dehumanization scores to actual levels of ingroup dehumanization using Welch's unequal variances t-tests (Figure 2). Black African and White participant groups significantly overestimated the extent to which they were dehumanized by White and Black African people, respectively: $t(324.69) = 8.50$, $p < .001$, $d = .85$ and $t(270) = 9.06$, $p < .001$, $d = .92$.[5] By comparison, Coloured and Black African participant groups significantly underestimated the extent to which they were dehumanized by Black African and Coloured people, respectively: $t(262.95) = 2.82$, $p = .005$, $d = .28$ and $t(287.87) = 3.59$, $p < .001$, $d = .36$. No significant differences existed between White and Coloured participants' perceived and actual levels of dehumanization ($ps > .266$, $ds < .11$).

Variables Contributing to Dehumanization

Next, we examined the extent to which meta-dehumanization, SDO, and intergroup contact contributed to outgroup dehumanization within each participant group.

SDO in our sample was aligned with participants' actual positions on the apartheid racial hierarchy, $F(2,593) = 3.79$, $p = .023$, $\eta^2 = .01$, with SDO of White participants ($M = 2.73$, $SD = 1.01$) significantly greater than that of Black African participants ($M = 2.46$, $SD = .98$) ($p = .008$, $d = .27$), whereas SDO of Coloured participants ($M = 2.54$, $SD = .97$) did not differ significantly from either of the other participant groups ($ps > .068$, $ds < .18$).

For intergroup contact, both Black African and White participants reported more contact with each other than with Coloured people, $ts > 4.3$, $ps < .001$, $ds > .31$, yet both groups also reported greater contact quality with Coloured people than with each other, $ts > 2.50$, $ps < .014$, $ds > .18$. Coloured participants reported more contact with Black African than with White

people, $t(197) = 6.48$, $p < .001$, $d = .46$, but no difference in contact quality between these groups, $t(197) = .140$, $p = .889$, $d = .01$ (see Supplementary Material for complete contact results).

For prejudice ratings, a participant group x target group mixed factorial ANOVA detected a significant interaction, $F(3.84, 1130.62) = 84.51$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .22$, indicating that participant groups differed in their prejudice ratings for each target group. Post hoc comparisons indicated that all participant groups evaluated their ingroups more favorably than all outgroups (i.e., ingroup favoritism) (ps $< .001$, ds $> .33$). Prejudice ratings thus followed a different pattern to that of dehumanization scores (see Supplementary Material for complete prejudice results).

Descriptive statistics and variable intercorrelations for each group are presented in Tables 2a-c. We performed a series of simultaneous regressions with meta-dehumanization, SDO, contact quality, and contact quantity as predictors of dehumanization for each group, controlling for prejudice and demographic variables (Table 3).

Results of these analyses consistently showed the impact of *feeling* dehumanized on actual outgroup dehumanization: Mechanistic meta-dehumanization significantly predicted White participants' actual dehumanization of Black African ($\beta = .22$, $p = .001$) and Coloured ($\beta = .26$, $p < .001$) people, animalistic meta-dehumanization significantly predicted Coloured participants' actual dehumanization of Black African ($\beta = .28$, $p < .001$) and White ($\beta = .18$, $p = .010$) people, and animalistic meta-dehumanization significantly predicted Black African participants' actual dehumanization of White ($\beta = .30$, $p < .001$) people. All of these associations remained significant even after controlling for prejudice (see Table S2 in the Supplementary Material for full regression results).

As anticipated, contact quality was a stronger predicter of reduced outgroup dehumanization than contact quantity: In the Coloured and White participant groups contact quality significantly predicted reduced dehumanization of both outgroups (βs > -.18, ps < .017). In the Black African participant group contact quantity significantly predicted reduced dehumanization of White people (β = -.15, p = .027).

Finally, SDO predicted greater dehumanization of both outgroups in White and Coloured participants (βs > .15, ps < .041), but not in Black African participants (βs < .10, ps > .146). Greater SDO in groups occupying relatively higher positions in the social hierarchy therefore corresponded with greater dehumanization of all outgroups.

Inclusion of demographic variables did not significantly alter any results.

Outgroup Attitudes and Behavior as a Function of Dehumanization

Support for the intergroup outcome measures (social distance, collective action, and outgroup petitions) differed significantly across participant groups (Figure 3a-c). In particular, Black African participants' support for Black collective action and petitions that would limit White advancement (White petitions) was greater than that of Coloured participants (ps < .001, ds > .47). By comparison, White participants' support for Black collective action was the lowest (ps < .001, ds > .47), and their support for petitions that would negatively impact historically disadvantaged groups (Black petitions), was significantly greater than 0 (p < .001, d = .67) (see Supplementary Material for complete results).

Our main interest was in examining the extent to which blatant dehumanization was associated with each outcome measure in each participant group beyond prejudice. Because Black collective action and Black petitions involved outcomes impacting all historically marginalized groups, White participants' humanity and prejudice ratings for both Black African

18

and Coloured target groups were included as predictors in these analyses. Descriptive statistics

and intercorrelations of all variables are presented in Tables 4a-b.

For White participants, dehumanization of Black African people uniquely predicted all

intergroup outcomes: (i) increased desire for social distance toward Black Africans (β = .22, p <

.001), (ii) reduced support for Black collective action (β = -.24, p = .008), and (iii) increased

support for Black petitions (β = .26, p = .005), after controlling for prejudice. Dehumanization of

Coloured people did not significantly predict any outcome measures (βs < .12, ps > .130) (Table

5a).

By comparison, for Black African participants, dehumanization of White people predicted

only increased desire for social distance toward White people (β = .28, p < .001) after controlling

for prejudice. In the Coloured participant group, dehumanization of White people did not

significantly predict any outcome measure (βs < .09, ps > .215) (Table 5b).

Regarding social distance between Black African and Coloured participants: Black African

participants' dehumanization of Coloured people did not significantly predict increased desire

for social distance (β = .05, p = .484), but Coloured participants' dehumanization of Black

African people significantly predicted increased desire for social distance (β = .16, p = .030)

after controlling for prejudice.

Further controlling for demographic variables did not significantly alter any results.

Discussion

The present research examined whether the racialized hierarchy of the apartheid regime is

still manifest in patterns of dehumanization today and how this impacts intergroup relations and

behaviors related to structural reform in South Africa. Our data show that blatant dehumanization

followed a hierarchical pattern reminiscent of colonial ideals, with White people rated 'more

human' than Coloured people, and Coloured people rated 'more human' than Black African people across participants. Outgroup dehumanization was associated with greater feelings of being dehumanized (animalistic or mechanistic meta-dehumanization) and with less positive intergroup contact in all participant groups, and with hierarchy-enforcing beliefs (SDO) in White and Coloured participants. Finally, White participants' dehumanization of Black African people, controlling for prejudice, emerged as a significant predictor of several intergroup outcomes (social distance, collective action, and active petition support) that would sustain the unequal status quo and hinder behaviors and policies that seek social justice. These results render blatant dehumanization of racialized groups of people highly relevant in the South African context.

Because dehumanization is strongly associated with a hierarchical worldview (Haslam & Loughnan, 2014), it is typically employed by those in positions of power to morally disengage from the suffering, discrimination and/or active violence committed against those disenfranchised or marginalized (Capozza et al., 2012; Castano, 2008). Yet, dehumanization can also occur against the power gradient. Some research suggests that in situations of active and brutal conflict, disadvantaged groups may be equally prone to question the humanity of the advantaged group (Bruneau & Kteily, 2017). Here we extend previous work by empirically examining blatant animalistic dehumanization in present-day South Africa, a context characterised by idiosyncratic power dynamics. There, a privileged and internationally well-connected White minority continues to hold economic power in a country where the historically impoverished Black majority has achieved political power (Chatterjee, 2019; Ratele & Laubscher, 2010; Steyn & Foster, 2008).

Against this backdrop, it is striking to find that dehumanization continues predominantly down the same power gradient as during apartheid, with White individuals in our sample

dehumanizing Black African and Coloured people more than their ingroup, but not vice versa, despite the shift in political power (Lammers & Stapel, 2011). In fact, White participants' dehumanization of Black Africans was the greatest, and predicted attitudes and behaviors likely to perpetuate intergroup separation and inequality, including (i) increased desire for social distance, (ii) reduced support for non-violent collective action, and (iii) increased support for petitions revoking redistributive policies (e.g., affirmative action, Black Economic Empowerment, land and wealth redistribution) instituted post-apartheid. These results suggest that the colonial mindset of 'whiter is more evolved' continues to be present and/or is potentially being reinforced by present-day racialized inequality amongst White South Africans—the beneficiaries of centuries of systemic racialized privileging—predicting behavior and support for policies that maintain the status quo.

By comparison, Black African participants' dehumanization of White people as compared to their ingroup was neither significant (despite feeling excessively dehumanized by White people), nor predictive of outcomes that would limit White advancement. Moreover, Coloured participants assigned privileged human status to White people compared to their ingroup. We offer some interpretation of these findings below, although it should be kept in mind that mechanistic dehumanization of White people (which was not assessed), might be more substantial.

Hierarchical accounts of intergroup relations (e.g., social dominance theory) suggest that advantaged, but also disadvantaged, groups are implicated in maintaining social hierarchies and often support hierarchy-legitimizing ideologies and beliefs, such as meritocracy (Fiske et al., 2016; Sidanius et al., 2004). System justification theory (SJT; Jost et al., 2004) extends this proposal by arguing that members of low-status or subordinate groups who "suffer the most"

(i.e., lowest income) are also, paradoxically, the most likely to endorse the legitimacy of social systems (Jost et al., 2003, p. 13). By this account, Black African and Coloured South Africans may legitimise the current status quo by being less likely to dehumanize their historically oppressive and advantaged White counterparts.

The current results do not support this interpretation, however (see also Brandt, 2013). Black African and Coloured participants' considerable support for Black collective action, and Black African participants' pronounced support for redistributive policies (potentially at the expense of White people), contradict system justification theory's status-legitimacy prediction and strongly suggest that these groups challenge, rather than endorse, the unequal status quo in South Africa. Moreover, lower income in both groups was significantly associated with greater support for measures that would foment social change (rs > -.15, ps < .033), further contradicting the status-legitimacy hypothesis (Brandt, 2013). Finally, neither group displayed outgroup favoritism toward White people in terms of their affective prejudice ratings, another hallmark of system justification theory (Jost et al., 2004).

An alternative interpretation of the present results is that disadvantaged group members' responses reflect public stereotypes or extra-personal (rather than personal) associations readily available in memory (Brown-Iannuzzi et al., 2019; Olson et al., 2009). By this account, Black African and Coloured participants' dehumanization scores would represent the recognition of White people's valued social status compared to their own, rather than its justification, or their personal perceptions thereof (Spears et al., 2001). Indeed, the feeling thermometers that assessed affective prejudice were framed in a more personal way ("How warm/cold do *you* feel toward [outgroup]"), which potentially reduced extra-personal influences (Olson et al., 2009). This latter account does not exclude the possibility that members of disadvantaged groups might

simultaneously internalize their own dehumanized social status, however (Sainz, Martínez, et al., 2020). Such ambivalence between ingroup favoritism and endorsing high-status outgroups' superiority (compared to one's own) might be especially prevalent in unequal contexts where social hierarchies have been relatively stable over time (Durante et al., 2013; Jost & Burgess, 2000).

Compared to Black African and White participants' responses, which were indicative of mutually high meta-dehumanization and support for measures that would disadvantage the other, Coloured and White participants appeared more tolerant of each other. Their perceptions of feeling dehumanized by each other were moderate and fairly accurate, and their actual dehumanization of each other did not significantly predict negative intergroup outcomes.

Yet the relationship was not symmetrical: White participants' dehumanization of Coloured people and their support for outcome measures that would negatively impact Coloured people was substantial, while the reverse did not hold true. In fact, Coloured participants humanized White people, their support for White collective action was similar to that of White participants, and their support for petitions that would negatively impact White privilege was negligible. These results suggest that on some measures, Coloured participants' responses were more congruent with those of White than with Black African participants, in keeping with their intermediate status on the apartheid social hierarchy. While speculative, these results might reflect Coloured participants' continued identification with White people. Because of the marginalizing conditions under which the Coloured racial category was constructed during apartheid, and its relative proximity to Whiteness, a historically prominent feature of Coloured identity is assimilation with White cultural standards (Adhikari, 2005). In this regard, recent research describes the propensity of minority groups to identify and assimilate with the dominant

outgroup culture as a significant factor moderating the dehumanization of dominant group members by minority group members (Miranda et al., 2014).

The third significant intergroup relation, namely between the two historically disadvantaged groups, was indicative of significant bidirectional dehumanization. These results underscore the tenuous social relationship between Black African and Coloured people, despite their shared experience of oppression and exploitation under apartheid (Brown, 2000).

Research on intraminority intergroup relations have informed our understanding of how perceived societal discrimination and (lack of) similarity may influence the relations between disadvantaged groups (Craig & Richeson, 2012; Wiley, 2019). Whereas the collective experience of discrimination may facilitate solidarity between such groups, perceived discrimination might also register as a threat to one's own group esteem due to ties with the common minority group. Social identity threat theory suggests that such value threats can lead to attempts to restore positivity to the ingroup by devaluing the outgroup (Branscombe et al., 1999).

Historically, Coloured people's relative proximity to White social status have contributed to their strained relations with Black African people, often evoking displaced anger and resentment (Adhikari, 2005; Brown, 2000). In democratic South Africa, some Coloured individuals may still feel vulnerable as most political power resides with a predominantly Black African government, whereas Black African people may continue to feel uncertain about Coloured people's allyship (Johnson, 2017). Black African and Coloured people's dehumanization of the other may therefore, sadly, still stem from the hierarchical social ladder and engineered separation crafted under the apartheid state.

While the present research informs our understanding of intergroup relations in South Africa, the observed pattern of results is likely to apply also in other contexts emerging from

oppressive regimes and with palpable inequality. Notwithstanding, a few limitations are worth observing. First, our design was cross-sectional and correlational in nature, so that the causal direction of observed associations cannot be established. A further limitation is that our participants were not obtained from national probability samples and therefore our results cannot be considered fully representative of the general population. An advantage of the samples presented here is that they were not restricted to a specific demographic (e.g., young college students), but covered a heterogenous range in terms of age, education, and income levels, and thus represent a wide range of views. Still, the White sample was approximately 10 years older than the Black African and Coloured samples, even though this reflects the actual difference in mean age between these population groups (StatsSA, 2020). To mitigate this concern, we accounted for the effects of age statistically by entering them (as well as gender, education, and income level) as covariates in all regression analyses.

A final limitation concerns the fact that we assessed blatant dehumanization as hierarchical attributions of human uniqueness (i.e., animalistic dehumanization) in line with apartheid ideology (Posel, 2011). For meta-dehumanization, however, White participants (as the historically advantaged group) reported meta-perceptions of mechanistic dehumanization, whereas Black African and Coloured participants (as the historically disadvantaged groups) reported meta-perceptions of animalistic dehumanization (Table 1 confirmed that White participants' income was still the highest). Consequently, comparisons between White participants' meta-dehumanization (mechanistic) and their actual dehumanization by other groups (animalistic) were less meaningful in terms of gauging perceptual accuracy. That is, mechanistic dehumanization of White people as a high-status outgroup might be greater than their animalistic dehumanization (Sainz et al., 2019). Such distinctions matter because

animalistic and mechanistic forms of (meta-)dehumanization are associated with different consequences (e.g., perpetuating the status quo versus increased social disconnection) (Haslam & Loughnan, 2014; Sainz, Loughnan, et al., 2020). Nevertheless, dehumanization and meta-dehumanization were assessed similarly (animalistically) for the historically marginalized groups who continue to bear the brunt of this phenomenon.

Our findings suggest that curbing dehumanization should be a key mission for practitioners and policy makers to advance structural reform in South Africa, as it may be one mechanism through which socioeconomic inequality and intergroup contestation is perpetuated. While dehumanization reduction has received limited empirical attention, the present data contribute to our understanding of what contextually appropriate interventions amidst complex power dynamics might involve.

First, because of the strong associations we observed between reciprocal meta-dehumanization and dehumanization in all groups, instilling positive meta-perceptions constitutes a powerful intervention strategy (especially between White and Black African South Africans, whose meta-dehumanization scores were particularly alarming). Previous research documents the value of meta-humanization primes in curbing dehumanization, with its efficacy presumably based on people's desire to reciprocate an outgroup's view of the ingroup (Kteily et al., 2016).

Second, our data underscore the important relationship between positive intergroup contact and reduced outgroup dehumanization. Because news and social media outlets are saturated with polarizing narratives, and because South Africans continue to live segregated residential lives (Durrheim & Dixon, 2010), people often have limited exposure to outgroup members' lived realities and perspectives. Spaces (real and virtual) where one can positively encounter and foster

26

more holistic views of outgroup members therefore remain the best advocated strategy to reduce not only dehumanization, but also meta-dehumanization (Albarello & Rubini, 2012; Bruneau et al., 2020; Capozza et al., 2017; Fourie et al., 2017; Kirk et al., 2018).

Yet contact interventions require careful ethical considerations to aid in breaking down, rather than reinforcing existing racial hierarchies. Acknowledging and dismantling power and status dynamics, which lies at the heart of dehumanization, would be central to intergroup encounters where group members enjoy secure social identities and their interaction fosters social change toward greater equality (Saguy & Kteily, 2014; Shnabel & Ullrich, 2016). Such contact should furthermore be embedded within a nuanced understanding of intergenerational structural violence, so that system justifying myths (e.g., that social hierarchies are fair, merit-based, or due to legitimate individual-level characteristics) are not perpetuated (Brandt, 2013; Hetey & Eberhardt, 2018) and White people's critical consciousness is raised (Vollhardt & Sinayobye Twali, 2016). Beyond these individual-level processes, however, the structural conditions that enable institutionalized dehumanization to continue should also be addressed by interventions aimed at meso-, and macro-level processes.

References

Adhikari, M. (2005). *Not White Enough, Not Black Enough: Racial Identity in the South African Coloured Community*. Cape Town: Double Storey Books.

Albarello, F., & Rubini, M. (2012). Reducing dehumanisation outcomes towards Blacks: The role of multiple categorisation and of human identity. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 42*(7), 875-882. doi:10.1002/ejsp.1902

Bandura, A. (1999). Moral disengagement in the perpetration of inhumanities. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 3*(3), 193-209. doi:10.1207/s15327957pspr0303_3

Bandura, A., Underwood, B., & Fromson, M. E. (1975). Disinhibition of aggression through diffusion of responsibility and dehumanization of victims. *Journal of Research in Personality, 9*(4), 253-269. doi:10.1016/0092-6566(75)90001-X

Bastian, B., Denson, T. F., & Haslam, N. (2013). The roles of dehumanization and moral outrage in retributive justice. *PLoS One, 8*(4), e61842. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0061842

Bogardus, E. S. (1933). A social distance scale. *Sociology & Social Research, 17*, 265-271.

Boucher, D. (2019). Reclaiming history: Dehumanization and the failure of decolonization. *International Journal of Social Economics, 46*, 1250-1263.

Brandt, M. J. (2013). Do the disadvantaged legitimize the social system? A large-scale test of the status-legitimacy hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 104*(5), 765-785. doi:10.1037/a0031751

Branscombe, N. R., Ellemers, N., Spears, R., & Doosje, B. (1999). The context and content of social identity threat. In N. Ellemers, R. Spears, & B. Doosje (Eds.), *Social identity: Context, commitment, content.* (pp. 35-58). Oxford, England: Blackwell Science.

Brown-Iannuzzi, J. L., Cooley, E., McKee, S. E., & Hyden, C. (2019). Wealthy Whites and poor Blacks: Implicit associations between racial groups and wealth predict explicit opposition toward helping the poor. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 82*, 26-34.

Brown, K. (2000). Coloured and Black relations in South Africa: The burden of racial hierarchy. *Macalester International, 9*(13), 198-207. doi:https://digitalcommons.macalester.edu/macintl/vol9/iss1/13

Bruneau, E., Hameiri, B., Moore-Berg, S., & Kteily, N. (2020). Intergroup contact reduces dehumanization and meta-dehumanization: Cross-sectional, longitudinal and quasi-

experimental evidence from 16 samples in 5 countries. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 47*. doi:10.1177/0146167220949004

Bruneau, E., Jacoby, N., Kteily, N., & Saxe, R. (2018). Denying humanity: The distinct neural correlates of blatant dehumanization. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 147*(7), 1078-1093. doi:10.1037/xge0000417

Bruneau, E., & Kteily, N. (2017). The enemy as animal: Symmetric dehumanization during asymmetric warfare. *PLoS One, 12*(7), e0181422. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0181422

Bruneau, E., Kteily, N., & Laustsen, L. (2018). The unique effects of blatant dehumanization on attitudes and behavior towards Muslim refugees during the European 'refugee crisis' across four countries. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 48*(5), 645-662. doi:https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2357

Bruneau, E., Szekeres, H., Kteily, N., Tropp, L. R., & Kende, A. (2019). Beyond dislike: Blatant dehumanization predicts teacher discrimination. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 23*(4), 560-577. doi:10.1177/1368430219845462

Cameron, C. D., Harris, L. T., & Payne, B. K. (2016). The emotional cost of humanity: Anticipated exhaustion motivates dehumanization of stigmatized targets. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 7*(2), 105-112. doi:10.1177/1948550615604453

Capozza, D., Andrighetto, L., Di Bernardo, G. A., & Falvo, R. (2012). Does status affect intergroup perceptions of humanity? *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 15*(3), 363-377. doi:10.1177/1368430211426733

Capozza, D., Di Bernardo, G. A., & Falvo, R. (2017). Intergroup contact and outgroup humanization: Is the causal relationship uni- or bidirectional? *PLoS One, 12*(1), e0170554. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0170554

Capozza, D., Falvo, R., Di Bernardo, G. A., Vezzali, L., & Visintin, E. P. (2014). Intergroup contact as a strategy to improve humanness attributions: A review of studies. *TPM-Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology, 21*(3), 349-362.

Cassese, E. C. (2021). Partisan dehumanization in American politics. *Political Behavior, 43*(1), 29-50. doi:10.1007/s11109-019-09545-w

Castano, E. (2008). On the perils of glorifying the in-group: Intergroup violence, in-group glorification, and moral disengagement. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 2*(1), 154-170. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2007.00040.x

Castano, E., & Giner-Sorolla, R. (2006). Not quite human: Infrahumanization in response to collective responsibility for intergroup killing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*(5), 804-818. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.804

Chatterjee, A. (2019). Measuring wealth inequality in South Africa: An agenda. *Development Southern Africa, 36*(6), 839-859. doi:10.1080/0376835X.2019.1690977

Costello, K., & Hodson, G. (2014). Explaining dehumanization among children: The interspecies model of prejudice. *The British Journal of Social Psychology, 53 1*, 175-197.

Craig, M. A., & Richeson, J. A. (2012). Coalition or derogation? How perceived discrimination influences intraminority intergroup relations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 102*(4), 759-777. doi:10.1037/a0026481

Cuddy, A. J. C., Rock, M. S., & Norton, M. I. (2007). Aid in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina: Inferences of secondary emotions and intergroup helping. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 10*(1), 107-118. doi:10.1177/1368430207071344

Dixon, J., Durrheim, K., Tredoux, C. G., Tropp, L. R., Clack, B., Eaton, L., & Quayle, M. (2010). Challenging the stubborn core of opposition to equality: Racial contact and policy attitudes. *Political Psychology, 31*(6), 831-855. doi:10.HH/j.1467-9221.2010.00792.x

Durante, F., Fiske, S. T., Kervyn, N., Cuddy, A. J. C., Akande, A., Adetoun, B. E., . . . Storari, C. C. (2013). Nations' income inequality predicts ambivalence in stereotype content: How societies mind the gap. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 52*(4), 726-746. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12005

Durrheim, K., & Dixon, J. (2010). Racial contact and change in South Africa. *Journal of Social Issues, 66*, 273-288. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.2010.01645.x

Falkof, N. (2016). The myth of white purity and narratives that fed racism in South Africa. *The Coversation. https://theconversation.com/the-myth-of-white-purity-and-narratives-that-fed-racism-in-south-africa-59330*.

Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A.-G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods, 39*(2), 175-191. doi:10.3758/BF03193146

Fiske, S. T., Dupree, C. H., Nicolas, G., & Swencionis, J. K. (2016). Status, power, and intergroup relations: The personal is the societal. *Current Opinion in Psychology, 11*, 44-48. doi:10.1016/j.copsyc.2016.05.012

Fourie, M. M., Subramoney, S., & Gobodo-Madikizela, P. (2017). A less attractive feature of empathy: Intergroup empathy bias. In M. Kondo (Ed.), *Empathy: An Evidence-based Interdisciplinary Perspective* (pp. 45-61): InTech. ISBN 978-953-51-5420-4.

Fourie, M. M., & Verwoerd, W. J. (2021). Covid-19 as natural intervention: Guilt and perceived historical privilege contributes to structural reform under conditions of crisis. *Affective Science, 3, 34-45*.

Gwinn, J., Judd, C., & Park, B. (2013). Less power = less human? Effects of power differentials on dehumanization. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 49*, 464–470. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2013.01.005

Haddock, G., Zanna, M. P., & Esses, V. M. (1993). Assessing the structure of prejudicial attitudes: The case of attitudes towards homosexuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65*(6), 1105-1118.

Hall, R. E. (2018). The globalization of light skin colorism: From critical race to critical skin theory. *American Behavioral Scientist, 62*(14), 2133-2145. doi:10.1177/0002764218810755

Haslam, N. (2006). Dehumanization: An integrative review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 10*(3), 252-264. doi:10.1207/s15327957pspr1003_4

Haslam, N., & Loughnan, S. (2014). Dehumanization and Infrahumanization. *Annual Review of Psychology, 65*(1), 399-423. doi:10.1146/annurev-psych-010213-115045

Hetey, R. C., & Eberhardt, J. L. (2018). The numbers don't speak for themselves: Racial disparities and the persistence of inequality in the criminal justice system. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 27*(3), 183-187. doi:10.1177/0963721418763931

Hino, H., Leibbrandt, M., Machema, R., Shifa, M., & Soudien, C. (2018). *Identity, inequality and social contestation in the Post-Apartheid South Africa*. Cape Town: SALDRU, UCT. (SALDRU Working Paper No. 233).

Hodson, G., & Costello, K. (2007). Interpersonal disgust, ideological orientations, and dehumanization as predictors of intergroup attitudes. *Psychological Science, 18*(8), 691-698. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.01962.x

Iatridis, T. (2013). Occupational status differences in attributions of uniquely human emotions. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 52*(3), 431-449. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8309.2011.02094.x

Jahoda, G. (1999). *Images of Savages: Ancient Roots of Modern Prejudice in Western Culture* (1st Ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Johnson, V. D. (2017). Coloured South Africans: A middleman minority of another kind. *Social Identities, 23*(1), 4-28. doi:10.1080/13504630.2016.1175930

Jost, J., Liviatan, I., Toorn, J., Ledgerwood, A., Mandisodza, A., & Nosek, B. (2012). System justification: A motivational process with implications for social conflict (pp. 315-327).

Jost, J. T., Banaji, M. R., & Nosek, B. A. (2004). A decade of system justification theory: Accumulated evidence of conscious and unconscious bolstering of the status quo. *Political Psychology, 25*(6), 881-919. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2004.00402.x

Jost, J. T., & Burgess, D. (2000). Attitudinal ambivalence and the conflict between group and system justification motives in low status groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 26*(3), 293-305. doi:10.1177/0146167200265003

Jost, J. T., Pelham, B. W., Sheldon, O., & Ni Sullivan, B. (2003). Social inequality and the reduction of ideological dissonance on behalf of the system: Evidence of enhanced system justification among the disadvantaged. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 33*(1), 13-36. doi:https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.127

Kelman, H. G. (1973). Violence without moral restraint: Reflections on the dehumanization of victims and victimizers. *Journal of Social Issues, 29*(4), 25-61. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.1973.tb00102.x

Kirk, P., Cohen, A., Sinnott-Armstrong, W., & Harris, L. (2018). Rehumanizing the homeless: Altered BOLD response following contact with an extreme outgroup. *Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1101/462671*. doi:10.1101/462671

Kteily, N., & Bruneau, E. (2017). Darker demons of our nature: The need to (re)focus attention on blatant forms of dehumanization. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 26*(6), 487-494. doi:10.1177/0963721417708230

Kteily, N., Bruneau, E., Waytz, A., & Cotterill, S. (2015). The ascent of man: Theoretical and empirical evidence for blatant dehumanization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 109*(5), 901-931. doi:10.1037/pspp0000048

Kteily, N., Hodson, G., & Bruneau, E. (2016). They see us as less than human: Metadehumanization predicts intergroup conflict via reciprocal dehumanization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 110*(3), 343-370. doi:10.1037/pspa0000044

Kteily, N. S., & Landry, A. P. (2022). Dehumanization: Trends, insights, and challenges. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 26*(3), 222-240. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2021.12.003

Lammers, J., & Stapel, D. A. (2011). Power increases dehumanization. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 14*(1), 113-126. doi:10.1177/1368430210370042

Landry, A. P., Ihm, E., & Schooler, J. W. (2021). Hated but still human: Metadehumanization leads to greater hostility than metaprejudice. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 0*(0), 1368430220979035. doi:10.1177/1368430220979035

Lephakga, T. (2013). The history of theologised politics of South Africa, the 1913 Land Act and its impact on the flight from the black self. *Studia Historiae Ecclesiasticae, 39*, 379-400.

Leyens, J.-P., Demoulin, S., Vaes, J., Gaunt, R., & Paladino, M. (2007). Infra-humanization: The wall of group differences. *Social Issues and Policy Review, 1*, 139-172. doi:10.1111/j.1751-2409.2007.00006.x

Loughnan, S., Haslam, N., Sutton, R. M., & Spencer, B. (2014). Dehumanization and social class: Animality in the stereotypes of "white trash," "chavs," and "bogans". *Social Psychology, 45*(1), 54-61. doi:10.1027/1864-9335/a000159

Maylam, P. (1995). Explaining the apartheid city: 20 years of South African urban historiography. *Journal of Southern African Studies, 21*(1), 19-38.

Miranda, M., Gouveia-Pereira, M., & Vaes, J. (2014). When in Rome… Identification and acculturation strategies among minority members moderate the dehumanisation of the majority outgroup. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 44*(4), 327-336. doi:https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2025

Moore-Berg, S. L., Ankori-Karlinsky, L.-O., Hameiri, B., & Bruneau, E. (2020). Exaggerated meta-perceptions predict intergroup hostility between American political partisans. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 117*(26), 14864-14872. doi:10.1073/pnas.2001263117

Olson, M. A., Crawford, M. T., & Devlin, W. (2009). Evidence for the underestimation of implicit in-group favoritism among low-status groups. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 45*(5), 1111-1116. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2009.06.021

Posel, D. (2011). The Apartheid Project, 1948–1970. In A. K. Mager, B. Nasson, & R. Ross (Eds.), *The Cambridge History of South Africa: Volume 2: 1885–1994* (Vol. 2, pp. 319-368). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*(4), 741-763.

Ratele, K., & Laubscher, L. (2010). Making white lives: Neglected meanings of whiteness from apartheid South Africa. *Psychology in Society*, 83-99.

Roberts, S. O., Bareket-Shavit, C., Dollins, F. A., Goldie, P. D., & Mortenson, E. (2020). Racial inequality in psychological research: Trends of the past and recommendations for the future. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 15*(6), 1295-1309. doi:10.1177/1745691620927709

Saguy, T., & Kteily, N. (2014). Power, negotiations, and the anticipation of intergroup encounters. *European Review of Social Psychology, 251*, 107-141957579. doi:10.1080/10463283.2014.957579

Sainz, M., Loughnan, S., Martínez, R., Moya, M., & Rodríguez-Bailón, R. (2020). Dehumanization of socioeconomically disadvantaged groups decreases support for welfare policies via perceived wastefulness. *International Review of Social Psychology, 33*(1). doi:10.5334/irsp.414

Sainz, M., Martínez, R., Moya, M., & Rodríguez-Bailón, R. (2019). Animalizing the disadvantaged, mechanizing the wealthy: The convergence of socio-economic status and attribution of humanity. *International Journal of Psychology, 54*(4), 423-430. doi:10.1002/ijop.12485

Sainz, M., Martínez, R., Moya, M., Rodríguez-Bailón, R., & Vaes, J. (2020). Lacking socio-economic status reduces subjective well-being through perceptions of meta-dehumanization. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 60*. doi:10.1111/bjso.12412

Shnabel, N., & Ullrich, J. (2016). Putting emotion regulation in context: The (missing) role of power relations, intergroup trust, and groups' need for positive identities in reconciliation processes. *Psychological Inquiry, 27*(2), 124-132. doi:10.1080/1047840X.2016.1158538

Sidanius, J., Pratto, F., van Laar, C., & Levin, S. (2004). Social dominance theory: Its agenda and method. *Political Psychology, 25*(6), 845-880.

Smith, D. L. (2011). *Less Than Human: Why We Demean, Enslave, and Exterminate Others*: St. Martins Press.

Spears, R., Jetten, J., & Doosje, B. (2001). The (il)legitimacy of ingroup bias: From social reality to social resistance. *The Psychology of Legitimacy: Emerging Perspectives on Ideology, Justice, and Intergroup Relations*.

StatsSA. (2019). Retrieved from http://www.statssa.gov.za/publications/Report-03-10-19/Report-03-10-192017.pdf.

StatsSA. (2020). Retrived from http://www.statssa.gov.za/publications/P0302/P03022020.pdf.

Steyn, M., & Foster, D. (2008). Repertoires for talking white: Resistant whiteness in post-apartheid South Africa. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 31*(1), 25-51. doi:10.1080/01419870701538851

Sulla, V., & Zikhali, P. (2018). Overcoming poverty and inequality in South Africa: An assessment of drivers, constraints and opportunities (English). *Washington, D.C. : World Bank Group*. Retrieved from http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/530481521735906534/Overcoming-Poverty-and-Inequality-in-South-Africa-An-Assessment-of-Drivers-Constraints-and-Opportunities website:

Vaes, J., Leyens, J.-P., Paladino, M., & Miranda, M. (2012). We are human, they are not: Driving forces behind outgroup dehumanisation and the humanisation of the ingroup. *European Review of Social Psychology, 23*, 64-106. doi:10.1080/10463283.2012.665250

Vollhardt, J. R., & Sinayobye Twali, M. (2016). Emotion-based reconciliation requires attention to power differences, critical consciousness, and structural change. *Psychological Inquiry, 27*(2), 136-143. doi:10.1080/1047840X.2016.1160762

Wale, K., Gobodo-Madikizela, P., & Prager, J. (2020). Introduction: Post-Conflict Hauntings. In K. Wale, P. Gobodo-Madikizela, & J. Prager (Eds.), *Post-Conflict Hauntings. Transforming Memories of Historical Trauma* (pp. 1-25): Palgrave Macmillan.

Wiley, S. (2019). Perceived discrimination, categorization threat, and Dominican Americans' attitudes toward African Americans. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 25*(4), 604-610. doi:10.1037/cdp0000275

Acknowledgments

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Ethical Principles

This research has been approved by Stellenbosch University's Humanities Research Ethics Committee and the research was performed to ethical standards as laid down in the 1964 Declaration of Helsinki.

Positionality Statement

Mindful that our identities can influence our research (Roberts et al., 2020), the authors wish to provide the reader with potentially relevant information about our backgrounds. With respect to race and nationality: All authors identify as White, MMF and MD identify as South African, and SMB identifies as American. We furthermore acknowledge that race is a social construct and do not endorse the legitimacy of artificial, historically imposed racial categories, but accept that these terms have social and political meanings (Harris, 2022).

Footnotes

[1]Black here is used collectively to refer to all persons of color.

[2]Significant outgroup dehumanization was operationalized as dehumanization scores exceeding those attributed to the ingroup (i.e., positive difference scores).

[3]Black was used collectively in these petitions.

[4]In instances where the assumption of sphericity was violated, we adjusted the degrees of freedom using Greenhouse-Geisser epsilon corrections.

[5]Meta-dehumanization items for White participants assessed mechanistic dehumanization, whereas actual dehumanization ratings assessed animalistic dehumanization.

Tables

Table 1

Participant Demographics for Each Group

		Black African (*n* = 200)				Coloured (*n* = 198)				White (*n* = 199)			
		M	*SD*	#	%	*M*	*SD*	#	%	*M*	*SD*	#	%
Age		29.66	7.14			30.35	8.15			39.36	11.79		
Years of Education		14.72	2.25			13.74	2.05			13.68	3.06		
Gender	Male			90	45.00			70	35.35			44	22.11
	Female			109	54.50			128	64.65			155	77.89
	Unspecified			1	0.50			0	0.00			0	0.00
Income level	4000-6999			75	37.50			79	39.90			59	29.65
(ZAR)	7000-10999			**31**	**15.50**			**49**	**24.75**			26	13.07
	11000-17999			30	15.00			30	15.15			**43**	**21.61**
	18000-22999			29	14.50			12	6.06			24	12.60
	23000-26999			11	5.50			11	5.56			9	4.52
	27000 <			21	10.50			12	6.06			37	18.59
	Missing data			3	1.50			5	2.53			1	0.50

Note. Age and education data represent means and standard deviations. Gender and income data represent counts and percentages. Median income brackets for each participant group are in bold face.
ZAR = South African Rand

Table 2a

Predictors of Dehumanization: Descriptive Statistics and Variable Intercorrelations for Black African Participants

Measures	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.
1. Meta-dehumanization	-	-.05	-.29***	-.03	.28***	.33***
2. SDO	.08	-	.04	-.10	.01	.09
3. Contact quality	-.38***	-.12	-	.29***	-.56***	-.26***
4. Contact quantity	-.14*	-.09	.44***	-	-.30***	-.21**
5. Prejudice	.26**	.16*	-.48***	-.30***	-	.25***
6. Dehumanization	.13	.09	-.17*	-.04	.34***	-
White target group: *M*	74.98	-	4.92	4.87	40.48	49.44
SD	24.51	-	1.49	1.72	29.26	11.61
Coloured target group: *M*	44.94	-	5.19	4.32	32.54	55.29
SD	28.83	-	1.49	1.70	26.46	13.13

Note. Above the diagonal line = variables regarding the White target group; below the diagonal line = variables regarding the Coloured target group.

SDO = social dominance orientation

p < .05. **p* < .01. ***p* < .001.

Table 2b

Predictors of Dehumanization: Descriptive Statistics and Variable Intercorrelations for Coloured Participants

Measures	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.
1. Meta-dehumanization	-	<.01	-.25***	-.01	.23**	.24***
2. SDO	.23**	-	.12	.10	<.01	.16*
3. Contact quality	-.24***	<.01	-	.20**	-.46***	-.25***
4. Contact quantity	-.08	-.02	.32***	-	-.23**	-.12
5. Prejudice	.26***	.15*	-.41***	-.26***	-	.44***
6. Dehumanization	.39***	.24***	-.35***	-.22**	.27***	-
White target group: *M*	53.74	-	5.34	5.17	30.41	46.17
SD	27.30	-	1.28	1.63	25.95	13.31
Black African target group: *M*	48.60	-	5.35	5.91	26.69	53.15
SD	30.77	-	1.49	1.28	25.51	14.25

Note. Above the diagonal line = variables regarding the White target group; below the diagonal line = variables regarding the Black African target group.
SDO = social dominance orientation
p < .05. **p* < .01. ***p* < .001.

Table 2c

Predictors of Dehumanization: Descriptive Statistics and Variable Intercorrelations for White Participants

Measures	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.
1. Meta-dehumanization	-	.07	-.17*	-.05	.19**	.29***
2. SDO	.05	-	-.35***	-.34***	.35***	.26***
3. Contact quality	-.26***	-.18*	-	.43***	-.54***	-.39***
4. Contact quantity	-.03	-.12	.38***	-	-.30***	-.15*
5. Prejudice	.24**	.33***	-.51***	-.28***	-	.31***
6. Dehumanization	.31***	.22**	-.25***	-.03	.49***	-
Black African target group: *M*	67.58	-	5.12	5.77	32.09	57.78
SD	25.49	-	1.43	1.47	27.03	14.68
Coloured target group: *M*	44.19	-	5.47	4.86	26.59	51.35
SD	23.48	-	1.12	1.67	22.73	12.68

Note. Above the diagonal line = variables regarding the Black African target group; below the diagonal line = variables regarding the Coloured target group.
SDO = social dominance orientation
p < .05. **p* < .01. ***p* < .001.

Table 3

Simultaneous Regressions Predicting Outgroup Dehumanization as a Function of Meta-Dehumanization, SDO, and Intergroup Contact for Each Participant Group

Outgroups:	Black African ($n = 200$)				Coloured ($n = 198$)				White ($n = 199$)			
	Coloured ($R^2 = .04$, $p = .131$)		White ($R^2 = .17$, $p < .001$)		Black African ($R^2 = .26$, $p < .001$)		White ($R^2 = .13$, $p < .001$)		Black African ($R^2 = .22$, $p < .001$)		Coloured ($R^2 = .17$, $p < .001$)	
	β	B (SE)	β	B (SE)	β	B (SE)	β	B (SE)	β	B (SE)	β	B (SE)
Meta-dehumanization	.06	.03 (.03)	.30***	.14[a] (.03)	.29***	.13[a] (.03)	.18**	.09[c] (.03)	.22**	.13[b] (.04)	.26***	.14[b] (.04)
SDO	.06	.74 (.95)	.10	1.15 (.79)	.17**	2.53[c] (.94)	.19**	2.62[b] (.94)	.15*	2.12 (1.03)	.19**	2.37[c] (.85)
Contact quality	-.13	-1.14 (.73)	-.13	-1.03 (.56)	-.24**	-2.25[c] (.65)	-.21**	-2.18[c] (.74)	-.31***	-3.22[c] (.77)	-.18*	-2.05 (.85)
Contact quantity	-.01	-.10 (.60)	-.15*	-1.03 (.46)	-.13	-1.43 (.74)	-.09	-.72 (.56)	.03	.34 (.73)	.07	.52 (.55)

Note. Meta-dehumanization for White participants assessed perceived mechanistic dehumanization, whereas meta-dehumanization for Black African and Coloured participants assessed perceived animalistic dehumanization. SDO = social dominance orientation; SE = standard error
[a]Indicates an estimate that is significant at $p < .001$ controlling for demographics (age, gender, education, income level) and prejudice.
[b]Indicates an estimate that is significant at $p < .01$ controlling for demographics (age, gender, education, income level) and prejudice.
[c]Indicates an estimate that is significant at $p < .05$ controlling for demographics (age, gender, education, income level) and prejudice.
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$

Table 4a

Intergroup Outcomes: Descriptive Statistics and Variable Intercorrelations for White Participants

Measures	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
1. Black African dehumanization	-							
2. Black African prejudice	.48***	-						
3. Coloured dehumanization	.42***	.16*	-					
4. Coloured prejudice	.23**	.61***	.30***	-				
5. Black African social distance	.37***	.42***	.20**	.32***	-			
6. Coloured social distance	.20**	.22**	.20**	.37***	.85***	-		
7. Black collective action	-.28***	-.24**	-.02	-.11	-.05	.03	-	
8. Black petitions	.21**	.05	.001	-.07	-.10	-.17*	-.05	-
M	57.78	32.09	51.35	26.59	36.27	31.22	52.53	.40
SD	14.68	27.03	12.68	22.73	28.64	26.25	25.88	.59

Note. 'Black' was used collectively to refer to all persons of color for the outcome measures Black collective action and Black petitions. Petitions reflect active support for measures that would negatively impact historically disadvantaged groups.
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$

Table 4b

Intergroup Outcomes: Descriptive Statistics and Variable Intercorrelations for Black African and Coloured Participants

Measures	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
1. White dehumanization	-	.27***	.09	-.12	.17*
2. White prejudice	.34***	-	.17*	-.17*	.30***
3. White social distance	.38***	.36***	-	-.10	-.01
4. White collective action	-.16*	-.10	-.25***	-	-.20**
5. White petitions	.13	.27***	.05	-.08	-
Black African participants: *M*	49.44	40.48	25.88	72.51	.36
SD	11.61	29.26	29.46	31.39	.52
Coloured participants: *M*	46.17	30.41	20.23	81.65	-.02
SD	13.31	25.95	25.50	25.38	.55

Note. Above the diagonal line = Coloured participants; below the diagonal line = Black African participants. Petitions reflect active support for measures that would negatively impact previously advantaged White people, but advance equality.
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$

Table 5a

Simultaneous Regressions Predicting Outcome Measures as a Function of Black African and Coloured Dehumanization in White Participants

	Black African Social Distance ($R^2 = .22, p < .001$)		Coloured Social Distance ($R^2 = .15, p < .001$)		Black[†] Collective Action ($R^2 = .10, p = .001$)		Black[†] Petitions ($R^2 = .07, p = .017$)	
	β	*B* (SE)	β	*B* (SE)	β	*B* (SE)	β	*B* (SE)
Black African dehumanization	.22***	.42[a] (.14)	-	-	-.24**	-.42[b] (.16)	.26**	.01[b] (<.01)
Coloured dehumanization	-	-	.09	.17 (.14)	.12	.25 (.17)	-.07	<-.01 (<.01)
Black African prejudice	.32***	.33 (.08)	-	-	-.14	-.13 (.10)	.01	<.01 (<.01)
Coloured prejudice	-	-	.35***	.39 (.08)	<-.01	<-.01 (.11)	-.11	<-.01 (<.01)

Note. Petitions reflect active support for measures that would negatively impact historically disadvantaged groups. SE = standard error.

[†]Black was used collectively to refer to both Black African and Coloured people in these outcome measures.

[a]Indicates an estimate that is significant at $p < .01$ controlling for demographics (age, gender, education, income level).

[b]Indicates an estimate that is significant at $p < .05$ controlling for demographics (age, gender, education, income level).

*$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$.

Table 5b

Simultaneous Regressions Predicting Outcome Measures as a Function of White Dehumanization in Black African and Coloured Participants

	White Social Distance				White Collective Action				White Petitions[†]			
	Black African participants ($R^2 = .20, p < .001$)		Coloured participants ($R^2 = .03, p = .059$)		Black African participants ($R^2 = .03, p = .069$)		Coloured participants ($R^2 = .03, p = .048$)		Black African participants ($R^2 = .08, p < .001$)		Coloured participants ($R^2 = .10, p < .001$)	
	β	*B (SE)*	β	*B (SE)*	β	*B (SE)*	β	*B (SE)*	β	*B (SE)*	β	*B (SE)*
White dehumanization	.28***	.71[a] (.17)	.05	.09 (.14)	-.14	-.38 (.20)	-.06	-.11 (.14)	.05	<.01 (<.01)	.09	<.01 (<.01)
White prejudice	.27***	.27 (.07)	.15*	.15 (.07)	-.05	-.05 (.08)	-.15	-.14 (.07)	.26**	<.01 (<.01)	.28***	<.01 (<.01)

Note. SE = standard error.

[†]Petitions reflect active support for measures that would curb White advancement, but promote equality.

[a]Indicates an estimate that is significant at $p < .001$ controlling for demographics (age, gender, education, income level).

*$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$.

Figures

Figure 1: Dehumanization scores ranged from 1 to 100, with higher scores reflecting greater dehumanization. For presentation purposes only a sub-section of the y-axis is displayed. a) Dehumanization scores for each target group, b) dehumanization scores for each participant group, and c) dehumanization difference scores (outgroup dehumanization ─ ingroup dehumanization). Error bars indicate standard error of the mean.

*$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$.

Figure 2. Perceived dehumanization (i.e., meta-dehumanization) compared to actual levels of dehumanization for each participant group. Both scales ranged from 1 to 100, with higher values reflecting greater meta-dehumanization or dehumanization, respectively. Note that Black refers to Black Africans in the figure, and meta-dehumanization for White participants concerned perceived mechanistic (rather than animalistic) dehumanization. Error bars indicate standard error of the mean.

**$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$.

Figure 3. Participant groups' support for each intergroup outcome. Social distance and collective action ranged from 1 to 100, whereas the outgroup petitions ranged from -1 (no support) to 1 (support). Note that White participants completed petitions that would negatively impact Black people (Black petitions), whereas Black African and Coloured participants completed petitions that would negatively impact White advancement (White petitions).

***$p < .001$.