

CONSTRUCTIONS OF MULTICULTURAL THERAPEUTIC TRAINING IN THE SOUTH AFRICAN CONTEXT

by

Ilse Ruane

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree

PhD Psychology

in the Department of Psychology at the

UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES

PROMOTER:
Prof T.M. Bakker

December 2014

Dedication

For Caitlin and Kiera

“You can do anything!”

My South Africa

“My South Africa is the working-class man who called from the airport to return my wallet without a cent missing. It is the white woman who put all three of her domestic worker’s children through the same school that her own child attended. It is the politician in one of our rural provinces, Mpumalanga, who returned his salary to the government as a statement that standing with the poor had to be more than just a few words. It is the teacher who worked after school hours every day during the public sector strike to ensure her children did not miss out on learning.

My South Africa is the first-year university student in Bloemfontein who took all the gifts she received for her birthday and donated them - with the permission of the givers - to a home for children in an Aids village. It is the people hurt by racist acts who find it in their hearts to publicly forgive the perpetrators. It is the group of farmers in Paarl who started a top school for the children of farm workers to ensure they got the best education possible while their parents toiled in the vineyards. It is the farmer’s wife in Viljoenskroon who created an education and training centre for the wives of farm labourers so that they could gain the advanced skills required to operate accredited early-learning centers for their own and other children.

My South Africa is that little white boy at a decent school in the Eastern Cape who decided to teach the black boys in the community to play cricket, and to fit them all out with the togs required to play the gentleman’s game. It is the two black street children in Durban, caught on camera, who put their spare change in the condensed milk tin of a white beggar. It is the Johannesburg pastor who opened up his church as a place of shelter for illegal immigrants. It is the Afrikaner woman from Boksburg who nailed the white guy who shot and killed one of South Africa’s greatest freedom fighters outside his home.

My South Africa is the man who went to prison for 27 years and came out embracing his captors, thereby releasing them from their impending misery. It is the activist priest who dived into a crowd of angry people to rescue a woman from a sure necklacing. It is the former police chief who fell to his knees to wash the feet of Mamelodi women whose sons disappeared on his watch; it is the women who forgave him in his act of contrition. It is the Cape Town university psychologist who interviewed the ‘Prime Evil’ in Pretoria Centre and came away with emotional attachment, even empathy, for the human being who did such terrible things under apartheid.

My South Africa is the quiet, dignified, determined township mother from Langa who straightened her back during the years of oppression and decided that her struggle was to raise decent children, insist that they learn, and ensure that they not succumb to bitterness or defeat in the face of overwhelming odds. It is the two young girls who walked 20kms to school everyday, even through their matric years, and passed well enough to be accepted into university studies. It is the student who takes on three jobs, during the evenings and on weekends, to find ways of paying for his university studies.

My South Africa is the teenager in a wheelchair who works in townships serving the poor. It is the pastor of a Kenilworth church whose parishioners were slaughtered, who visits the killers and asks them for forgiveness because he was a beneficiary of apartheid. It is the politician who resigns on conscientious grounds, giving up status and salary because of an objection in principle to a social policy of her political party. It is the young lawman who decides to dedicate his life to representing those who cannot afford to pay for legal services.

My South Africa is not the angry, corrupt, violent country whose deeds fill the front pages of newspapers and the lead-in items on the seven-o'clock news. It is the South Africa often unseen, yet powered by the remarkable lives of ordinary people. It is the citizens who keep the country together through millions of acts of daily kindness”.

Jonathan Jansen is a Professor of Education at the University of the Witwatersrand (Wits) in Johannesburg, South Africa.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincere gratitude towards the following people for their support and encouragement in completing this study:

To the participants of the study;

To my students who continually inspire me;

My promoter and dear friend, Terri, for always expecting and assuming I can achieve the “impossible”;

My family, and in particular Craig, for their support throughout my studies;

Caitlin and Kiera for patiently waiting while mommy finished “her work”;

Claire Wagner, Linda Blokland and Vicky Timm for critical conversations, support and interest in the study process;

To Margot Windisch, my language editor, thank you;

The Andrew Mellon Foundation for awarding me with the Andrew Mellon Early Career Development Bursary.

Abstract

The challenges of providing appropriate Masters training in therapeutic psychology, to ultimately serve the needs of South Africa's diverse population, have been the focus of much attention in psychological practice and training within the post-apartheid climate. Attention has been given to areas such as practical attainment of skills and exposure to diverse curriculum content and experience. The central focus of the study involved an analysis of 27 individual interviews from a cohort of Masters trainers and trainees who were part of therapeutic training at a Historically White University (HWU). In particular, the study focussed on a discursive analysis of constructions of multiculturalism in the therapeutic training that the participants were involved in, and attempted to explicitly uncover and analyse dominant discourses reflected in these constructions. The study aimed to describe the larger social discourses informing these constructions and to highlight the effects these discourses have on the discursive context of a HWU. Furthermore, the uniqueness of the study is seen in that it aimed to explicitly uncover elements of power and positioning and the manner in which power is not only reflected in the social context of the interview situation, but also how power and positioning function within the current ideological context. The study makes use of poststructuralism and social constructionism as theoretical points of departure. The data collected via individual interviews was analyzed using discursive psychology, Foucauldian discourse analysis as well as by applying deconstruction and externalization. Deconstruction and externalisation as research practices were applied within this discursive context to trouble the dominant discourses and subject positions made available. The findings revealed discourses of exclusion, the bigger picture of a country in transition discourse, discourses of multiculturalism, and discourses of race and identity.

Key words: Masters therapeutic training, Counselling psychology training, Clinical psychology training, discursive psychology, Foucauldian discourse analysis, deconstruction, externalization, South Africa, multiculturalism.

Table of contents:

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Dedication | ii |
| My South Africa | iii |
| Acknowledgements | v |
| Abstract | vi |
| Chapter 1: Introduction and background to the study | 1 |
| 1.1 Multiculturalism and the description of the problem | 1 |
| 1.2 Significance of the study | 4 |
| 1.3 Aims and objectives | 5 |
| 1.4 Research paradigm | 7 |
| 1.5 Outline of the thesis | 9 |
| 1.6 Conclusion | 10 |
| Chapter 2: Multiculturalism and Training Psychologists in the South African Context | 11 |
| 2.1 Multiculturalism | 11 |
| 2.1.1 Culture | 12 |
| 2.1.2 Race and ethnicity | 14 |
| 2.1.2.1 Whiteness | 15 |
| 2.1.2.2 The intersection of culture and race | 19 |
| 2.1.3 Class | 20 |
| 2.1.4 Age | 21 |
| 2.1.5 Gender and sexuality | 23 |
| 2.1.6 Physical and mental disabilities | 24 |
| 2.2 Multiculturalism and Training | 26 |
| 2.2.1 New directions for training | 28 |
| 2.2.2 Constructions of 'effective' multicultural training, trainers and trainees, and training environments. | 29 |
| 2.3 Training in the South African context | 34 |
| 2.4 Post-apartheid South African context in psychology | 34 |
| 2.4.1 Relevance debate | 36 |
| 2.4.2 Racism and racist ideology | 39 |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 2.5 South African psychology's support of Apartheid ideology | 40 |
| 2.6 Therapeutic training in psychology in South Africa | 43 |
| 2.6.1 The scientist-practitioner model | 44 |
| 2.6.2 The professional-practitioner model | 46 |
| 2.7 Therapeutic training context | 47 |
| 2.8 Conclusion | 51 |
| Chapter 3: Theoretical framework | 53 |
| 3.1 Postmodernism | 55 |
| 3.2 Social constructionist approach | 58 |
| 3.2.1 Language | 60 |
| 3.2.2 Articulating the relational | 60 |
| 3.3 Poststructuralism | 60 |
| 3.3.1 Discourse, power and knowledge | 70 |
| 3.4 Theory and its methodological implications: Seeking a critical awareness of discourse | 70 |
| 3.5 Discourse analysis | 70 |
| 3.5.1 Discursive psychology | 71 |
| 3.5.2 Foucauldian discourse analysis | 74 |
| 3.5.3 Deconstruction and externalisation as a research practice | 75 |
| 3.6 Positioning theory, agency and position calls | 79 |
| 3.6.1 Positioning theory | 80 |
| 3.6.2 Agency | 83 |
| 3.6.3 Position calls | 84 |
| 3.7 Conclusion | 85 |
| Chapter 4: Research Approach | 86 |
| 4.1 Research question | 86 |
| 4.2 Objectives of the study | 87 |
| 4.3 Research as resistance | 87 |
| 4.4 Moving towards a research methodology that works against discourses of domination | 87 |
| 4.4.1 An emancipatory tradition | 88 |
| 4.4.2 A deconstructive tradition | 88 |
| 4.4.3 Theoretizing as methodology | 89 |
| 4.5 Research context | 90 |
| 4.5.1 Sampling and participants | 91 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| 4.6 Data collection | 95 |
| 4.7 Data analysis | 99 |
| 4.8 Reflexivity in the research process | 109 |
| 4.9 Ethical considerations of the study | 112 |
| 4.10 Conclusion | 113 |
| Chapter 5: Findings and discussion: Discourses of Exclusion | 114 |
| 5.1 The process of discourse analysis | 114 |
| 5.2 Discourses of exclusion | 116 |
| 5.2.1 Constructions of institutional culture | 117 |
| 5.2.2 Discourse of exclusion and discourses of resistance to the system | 118 |
| 5.2.2.1 Constructions of conservative space | 118 |
| 5.2.2.2 Constructions of the absence of a meritorious black student | 122 |
| 5.3 Subject position: You're black or you're white | 128 |
| 5.4 Counter discourses | 130 |
| 5.5 Conclusion | 131 |
| Chapter 6: Findings and discussion: The Bigger Picture Discourses of a Country in Transition | 132 |
| 6.1 Construction: From big stories to local understandings | 132 |
| 6.1.1 Local versus universal psychology discourse | 132 |
| 6.1.2 The effects of race as agency | 137 |
| 6.2 Construction: Guises of oppression | 139 |
| 6.3 The construction of a legacy of offending | 139 |
| 6.3.1 Subject position: Black or white | 143 |
| 6.4 Construction: Permission to speak | 144 |
| 6.4.1 The effect of minimising agency | 148 |
| 6.5 Historical residue | 152 |
| 6.5.1 Generational positioning | 153 |
| 6.6 Conclusion | 157 |
| Chapter 7: Findings and discussion: Discourses of multiculturalism | 158 |
| 7.1 The Impasse of multiculturalism discourse | 158 |
| 7.1.1 Constructions of under- or overstated multiculturalism | 166 |
| 7.1.2 Subject positions: Insiders and outsiders | 169 |
| 7.1.3 Effect of transformation being institutionalised | 176 |
| 7.2 The Immutability of culture discourse | 177 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| 7.2.1 Constructions of culture bound in oppression | 177 |
| 7.2.2 Constructions of discomfort with 'otherness' | 180 |
| 7.2.3 The alternative construction of a negotiated culture | 182 |
| 7.3 Conclusion | 183 |
| Chapter 8: Findings and Discussion: Discourses of Race and Identity | 184 |
| 8.1 Constructions of race as gains and losses and black and white | 184 |
| 8.1.1. Discourses of whiteness and blackness | 189 |
| 8.1.2 Construction of the colour-blind subject | 194 |
| 8.2 Discourses of identity | 196 |
| 8.2.1 Race and identity | 196 |
| 8.2.2 Post-apartheid discourse/s | 202 |
| 8.2.3 Historical residue | 207 |
| 8.2.4 Construction of an evolving South African identity | 211 |
| 8.2.5 Generational trends | 217 |
| 8.3 Conclusion | 226 |
| Chapter 9: Research commentary | 227 |
| 9.1 Summary of the findings | 227 |
| 9.1.1 Discourses of exclusion | 226 |
| 9.1.2 The bigger picture discourse of a country in transition | 229 |
| 9.1.3 Discourses of multiculturalism | 231 |
| 9.1.4 Discourses of race and identity | 233 |
| 9.2 Reflections on the findings | 237 |
| 9.2.1 Locating myself | 237 |
| 9.2.2 Knowledge | 238 |
| 9.2.3 Power | 240 |
| 9.2.4 Reflections on the research process | 240 |
| 9.3 The value and challenges of the study | 243 |
| 9.4 Recommendations for future research | 246 |
| 9.5 Recommendations for training in the South African context | 246 |
| 9.6 Conclusion | 249 |
| Reference List | 250 |

List of tables

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----|
| Table 1: Participants | 94 |
| Table 2: Analytical framework | 115 |

Appendices:

| | |
|---|--|
| Appendix A: Invitation to participate | |
| Appendix B: Informed consent forms and trainees | |
| Appendix C: Interview guide for trainers trainees | |
| Appendix D: Permission letter | |

Chapter One

Introduction and Background to the Study

The study aims to explore how multicultural therapeutic training in the profession of psychology in South Africa is constructed, particularly in relation to the dominant discourses in psychology pertaining to multiculturalism.

The purpose of therapeutic training at Masters level is to train clinical and counselling psychologists so they will be capable of providing effective counselling to culturally different clients (Locke, 1990). This training philosophy could not be more appropriate in a country such as South Africa. Among the South African population, as is the case further afield, client needs are becoming more diverse and non-western (Ruane, 2006). Through my involvement in the training of Masters Counselling psychology, I have become faced with dilemmas pertaining to the multicultural aspects of training within a Historically White University (HWU) context. Whenever I interact with Masters trainees, the following two questions are at the forefront of my mind:

1. How has the therapeutic profession, both clinical and counselling in registration, responded to multiculturalism and how effective have those efforts been within South Africa?
2. Are we adequately preparing Masters in Psychology trainees for the multicultural nature of the South African society?

Multiculturalism has become my research focus due to my personal investment in training psychologists to meet the demands of the diverse and changing South African context. The study attempts to bring to the fore the multicultural constructions, and the discourses that inform these constructions, which are present in the current context of a HWU. The hope is that the findings could be used to further develop the programmes offered at this HWU and will also be disseminated amongst other Masters training institutions in South Africa so as to assist in developing the Masters training to a level of multicultural competence, thereby ensuring that the psychologists qualifying are equipped to deal with the demands that our unique and multidimensional society provides.

1.1 Multiculturalism and the description of the problem

Multiculturalism is broadly defined in the Accreditation Procedures Manual and Application for Multiculturalism (CACREP, 1994) as “representing a diversity including different races, economic backgrounds, ages, ethnic backgrounds, genders, sexual orientations, and physical and mental abilities. Implies a pluralistic

philosophy” (p. 108). The Professional Standards and Certification Committee of the Association for Multicultural Counseling and Development (AMCD), however, suggests that multiculturalism should be focused on ethnicity, race, and culture (Arredondo & D’Andrea, 1995). Although I view multiculturalism as being a construct that needs to be interrogated on a broader level than that of ethnicity, race and culture, the definition suggested by the Professional Standards and Certification Committee of the AMCD will be used for this study as it is the universally accepted definition of multiculturalism and proves to be more salient to the study, due to the apartheid history, which has allowed ethnicity, race and culture to dominate the discursive landscape of South Africa. The other factors of multiculturalism namely, class, age, gender, sexuality and disabilities are briefly touched upon.

The legacy of apartheid, the nature of the demographics of both trainees and registered psychologists, and the context of disadvantaged communities within South Africa have had a huge impact on communities’ help-seeking behaviours. Apartheid resulted in poverty, limited resources in some communities, such as black communities (limited finances, services, and infrastructure, to name but a few), and poor education for black populations. The labour market of psychology was predominantly populated by the white elite who could afford university tuition, and only a small number of black psychologists entered the profession (Berger & Lazarus, 1987; Peltzer, 1998; Ruane, 2010). This also meant that the psychology curriculum focused on European and American knowledge to the detriment of local knowledge systems (Bakker, Eskill-Blokland & Ruane, 2007). Local knowledge and indigenous knowledge systems were, and might still be, viewed as inferior and not worthy of postgraduate study (Bakker et al., 2007; Ruane, 2006). The fact that the vast majority of South African psychologists are white has been a point of criticism and contention for many years (Berger & Lazarus, 1987; Peltzer, 1998). Although the Professional Board of Psychology (1999; 2001; 2002) cites this as an area of concern, in practice the situation appears unchanged over time (Ruane, 2006). “Psychology has been accused of being irrelevant, and of advertently or inadvertently bolstering apartheid. Since 1994, much has changed in psychology. However, much has remained the same” (Macleod, 2004, p. 613).

Bakker et al. (2007) comment that the literature yields references to psychology as having little impact in Africa, citing Dawes (1986), Eze (1991), Gilbert (1989), Nsamenang (1995), and Peltzer (1998) in this regard, while Seedat (1997) accuses South African psychology of being in a state of disillusionment and disempowerment. It is furthermore seen as taking inappropriate individualist approaches in cultural

contexts (Mungazi, 1996; Mwamwenda, 1999; Tembo, 1985). Marsella (1998) urges the profession to acknowledge, understand and address the role of cultural variations in behaviour and experience in practice, research and training, while Vogelmann (1987) suggests that the acknowledgement of local cultures is essential for effective psychological practice. Whitehead (2003, p. 23) supports critics in arguing “that the majority of traditionally trained counsellors operate from a culturally biased and encapsulated framework,” which results in the provision of culturally conflicting and even oppressive counselling treatments (Ponterotto & Benesch, 1988; Sue, 1981). These counsellors, although well-intentioned, often unknowingly impose their white middle-class value system on culturally different clients who may possess alternative and equally meaningful and justifiable value orientations (Katz, 1985; Ponterotto & Benesch, 1988; Sue, 1981; Whitehead, 2003).

Research and interventions commented on by South African authors (For example, Eskell-Blokland, 2002; Eskell-Blokland, 2005; Lifschitz & van Niekerk, 1990; Ruane, 2006) note the nature of psychological problems confronted by therapists, the utilisation of mental health services and the barriers to seeking assistance within South African communities. When unpacking the South African versus the American context, it becomes important to explore the relevance of local literature written from within the South African context itself. Ruane (2010), following on Whitehead (2003) suggests that it is imperative that psychologists have specific, culturally responsive competencies to provide appropriate services to culturally different populations, such as different racial and religious populations. Culture is often used interchangeably with race as racial divides still exist in South Africa to the extent that cultural differences frequently become synonymous with race. The suggestion that psychologists should have culturally responsive competencies is particularly valid when describing the South African population, which consists of large numbers of people with psychological problems, including those in township areas (Eskell-Blokland, 2001; Lifschitz & van Niekerk, 1990; Ruane, 2006; Ruane, 2010; van Niekerk & Prins, 2001). “It places the accent on accessible psychosocial services, re-defining the roles of psychologists, democratising psychological practice, prevention, competencies, empowerment of under-represented groups, collaboration, and inclusive modes of knowledge production” (Seedat, Mackenzie & Stevens, 2004, p. 595). The limited number of professionally trained psychologists who are able to provide psychosocial assistance to communities further compounds these problems (Ruane, 2006).

Within South Africa, support for a multicultural approach can be found as there is a need for psychology to increase its outreach efforts in black communities (Berger & Lazarus, 1987; Bodibe, 1990a; Eagle, 2005; Ruane, 2010; Seedat, MacKenzie, & Stevens, 2004; Wittstock, Rosenthal, Shuda, & Makgatho, 1990). The fostering of more accurate images of psychology and psychologists will facilitate community willingness to view psychologists as sources of assistance for emotional and interpersonal crises and difficulties. Increased cultural competency may engender the type of positive experiences necessary to improve psychologists' image, particularly in the black and other previously disadvantaged communities (Eagle, 2005; Hopa, Simbayi, & du Toit, 1998; Nsamenang, 1995; Ruane, 2010). Furthermore, according to Ruane (2010) universities must make conscious efforts to include multicultural content, with multicultural training specially needing to be addressed at Masters level.

Current both undergraduate and postgraduate study (Bakker et al., 2007) including Masters training is centred on western therapeutic modules and theory (Du Preez, 2004; Eskell-Blokland, 2005; Seedat, 1997). I am not proposing that these methods be abandoned in favour of traditional healing systems, as Western methods remain effective within the South African context. However, when training in these therapeutic tools, techniques and theory is done from a multicultural angle, the use thereof is of much more value, especially when combined with traditional healing systems and local knowledge. Whitehead (2003, p. 26) stated that "traditional [meaning western] counselling approaches and techniques have not been effective when applied to... ethnic groups", which illustrates how traditional Masters training needs to be transformed by developing multicultural competence within the profession of psychology.

Multiculturalism is presented in the literature from a traditional psychology-as-a-social-science perspective, as described in the research reviewed (see chapter 2). It neglects the discursive landscape in which training, research and praxis occur. This study aims to enter the discursive landscape of multicultural training in the South African context.

1.2 Significance of the study

The struggle of how to provide culturally responsive services to the diverse South African population has been under discussion since before the election of our democratic government in 1994. The provision of appropriate services to communities, specifically black and other previously disadvantaged communities, is therefore dependent on psychologists' culturally responsive competencies to provide

appropriate services to diverse populations, such as different racial and religious populations.

Training programmes must therefore “produce graduates committed to a South African, not American, future” (Vogelman, 1987, p. 502) but this needs to be addressed on multiple levels such as course content, exposure and within the discursive context. It is at the discursive level that this study becomes significant and unique in its contribution to the field of psychology.

Training takes place within a discursive context that permeates the training approaches and content in very real terms. The discursive contexts which psychologists are trained and work in, are heavily loaded with hegemonic discourses. The trainer and researcher Eagle (2005) works in the difficult area of ‘culture’ and multiculturalism in the training of psychologists within South Africa. Her work speaks to the process of uncovering sensitive topics and areas of discussion on a discursive level. These are topics and areas of discussion which society, and perhaps academe, would rather avoid. She hopes that her article will “stimulate debates about the ‘rules of engagement’ in relation to sensitive topics in contexts of old and new power relations” (Eagle, 2005, p. 41). It is precisely these discourses that I aim to open up and flesh out in the study.

These dominant discourses, when left unexposed and unchallenged, impact on the training and development of psychologists within the South African context due to it being a multifaceted discursive landscape. Without exposing the dominant discourses within the discursive training context, counter discourses cannot be developed and included in training programmes. Counter discourses can also not be brought into the discursive context of Historically White Universities (HWU) and later into the places where the trainees work. Therefore this insider research study into engaging with the discursive landscape of a HWU may provide some vital insights into multicultural programme development. It is at this complex level that this study aims to explore the discursive constructions and determine the positions made available within the context of a HWU.

1.3 Aims and objectives

The central focus of the present study involved an analysis of the talk from 27 individual interviews with a cohort of trainers and trainees who were part of therapeutic training at a HWU. In particular, the study focussed on a discursive analysis of personal constructions of multiculturalism in the therapeutic training they were involved in, and attempted to explicitly uncover and analyse dominant

discourses reflected in these constructions. Furthermore the uniqueness of the study is seen in that it aimed to explicitly uncover elements of power and positioning and the manner in which power is not only reflected in the social context of the interview situation, but also how power and positioning function within the current ideological context.

The study had the following specific objectives:

- to describe the nature of the participants' constructions regarding multiculturalism present within the discursive landscape of a HWU;
- to describe the larger social discourses informing these constructions;
- to highlight the effects these discourses have on the discursive context of a HWU and on the participants themselves in terms of positioning, resistance and agency;
- to apply deconstruction and externalisation as research practices within this discursive context to trouble the dominant discourses and subject positions made available;
- to explore the discursive landscape within which the constructs of multiculturalism and therapeutic training are housed at a HWU;
- in so doing, to contribute new knowledge to an existing body of knowledge regarding the current situation on multiculturalism within training programmes.

The motivation for using one context only within this study is based on this method that enables the capture and understanding of context of the phenomenon of multicultural training within a single HWU. Rooted in the positioning of a single context is my belief in the possibility of change within an institution such as this HWU, through becoming cognizant of the discursive context of the institution. Insider research (Brannick & Coghlan, 2007) engages players across institutional hierarchies, and thus engages the participation of individuals across power hierarchies. I was interested in studying a formerly privileged environment where whiteness still operates as a dominant construction. Furthermore I wanted to turn the spotlight onto the dominant constructions within multicultural training, while still including the dominant discourses operating in the discursive context of a HWU. There is a need to understand the cultural space reflected in the notion of whiteness and privilege within this HWU. This understanding grants such a study the possibility of challenging the hegemonic discourses prevalent within multicultural training at this HWU.

In summary, the study aims to explore the discourses around multicultural training in the profession of psychology at one training site. The reason for my inclusion of both clinical and counselling training is that the core competencies are similar (Professional Board, 2007), as is cultural competence within both scopes of practice. Both clinical and counselling trainees may be presented with clients from diverse backgrounds and of a multicultural nature, especially considering that the invisible perceptual boundary between townships and affluent communities is dissolving (Ruane, 2010). Within the post-apartheid climate, many boundaries other than boundaries related to residences exist. The post-apartheid climate is a complex context in which people are in transition and many are struggling to adapt to the various changes in this context.

1.4 Research paradigm

In this qualitative study, I assume a poststructuralist social constructionist approach (Locke & Strong, 2010) and use a discourse analytic framework (Willig, 2013) for the analysis of the data gained during the research process. The study utilises two methodological approaches of discourse analysis, namely discursive psychology and Foucauldian discourse analysis as well as applying deconstruction and externalisation within the research process. (In chapter 4 I outline the method I designed for this project). It was my intention that this method both draws from and compliments the poststructuralist and social constructionist approaches in this study. It also offered an ethical engagement with participants as it invited them to contribute to both the initial data collection and the deconstruction (Crocket, 2010).

My theoretical point of departure is social constructionism, which aids in uncovering the co-created realities and constructions within the interview context. Poststructuralism is then used to describe the discourses that inform and are informed by the constructions.

Within the post-modern context there is a move away from understanding knowledge as the correspondence with an objective reality, to knowledge as a social construction of reality. There is a change in emphasis from observation of, to conversation and interaction with, the social world. Thus I make use of a poststructuralist reading of social constructionism as proposed by Crocket (2010).

Social constructionist research requires a shift away from uncovering pre-existing realities, to the co-creation of realities where context is acknowledged as a co-creator of reality (Du Preez, 2004). Du Preez (2004) goes further to explain that social constructionism as research epistemology therefore holds a view of reality that states

that values, knowledge, social institutions and theory are products of social interaction and not entities separate from human existence (Gergen, 1985, 2001b). This approach recognizes people's own sense of reality and how it changes as their interpretations of their lives change (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Miller & Fox, 1999). In social constructionism discourse informs life, research narratives and therapeutic practice, such as narrative therapy practice (White, 2007) because of the intellectual and cultural background in which discourse is embedded (Freedman & Combs, 1996; Freedman & Combs, 2012).

Training received at universities is perceived by society as being elitist and coherent to the current societal power. According to Stead and Bakker (2010), by studying the manner in which discourses reproduce power relations, it becomes possible to develop 'counter-discourses' (Foucault, 1977). Counter discourses provide ways of engaging with dominant discourses in a manner in which a variety of changes become possible. However, it is important to remember that

discourses are tied to institutional practices and therefore are allocated the stamp of truth; not by powerful people but by the prevailing discourses in society... The culture provides the foundations for certain discourses to be accepted or tolerated, while other discourses may be unacceptable and therefore marginalized in a particular culture ... People who find themselves at the marginal edge of dominant cultural, gender, economic or political discourses often develop painful life situations or problems. Seeking help for these problems may paradoxically confront them with the same dominant discourses within the helping discourse (Stead & Bakker, 2010, p. 78).

In order to analyse the discourse surrounding multiculturalism, the study in the first instance investigates how the discourses arose, who benefits from them and keeps them in power, and in which context they are used. The study further aims to subvert and trouble the discourses that inform:

- the constructions that are enabled and informed by the dominant discourses;
- the constructions that are attached to places (such as different contexts), bodies and institutions (universities and training facilities) and so forth.

Moreover, the study identifies discursive constructions and explores the positions made available, for example agency as a position.

The deconstruction of these dominant discourses may grant psychologists, Masters trainers, and psychology trainees more autonomy regarding the effects of those hegemonic discourses on their lives (White, 1994). Deconstructing dominant

discourses may expose the power relations implied in said discourses and bring about changes within the field of multiculturalism as well as to the exposure that psychologists receive. According to Parker (1992), discourse analysis can be employed to deconstruct the prevailing academic discourses of psychology and provide different and innovative ways of understanding them, through identifying discursive constructions and determining the positions made available by discourses. On a practical level, deconstructing the dominant discourse aims at developing thicker descriptions, for example around the complex ways in which psychologists can tackle presenting problems such as culturally specific disorders (for example ¹Ukutwasa) that challenge therapists due to the discursive landscape in which these culturally bound disorders are found.

1.5 Outline of the thesis

In this chapter I introduced the research topic and described aspects of the academic and personal contexts in which it developed. I also presented the aims and objectives guiding the study.

In chapter 2 multiculturalism and the training of psychologists in the South African context is described. The training context of psychologists within South Africa will be described from the point of departure of social constructionism as well as from the position of using discourse analysis as a research method. I review existing literature with regard to multiculturalism from the theoretical point of departure of social constructionism and discourse analysis.

In chapter 3 I discuss the theoretical framework that informed the study. I discuss some of the main tenets of social constructionism and the manner in which subjectivity is theorised from such a position. I also consider the role of discourse in knowledge production.

In chapter 4 I describe the research process including the research paradigm, the methodology used and the actual research method that emerged from this study. The process of recruiting participants, data collection and data analysis are also included in the discussion. The chapter further includes a discussion on reflexivity within the research process.

¹ Ukuthwasa refers to the process of emerging as a diviner. In the beginning stages of this process it appears that most diviners, who are called by the ancestors, suffer a trouble or inkathazo, which has numerous disruptive symptoms.

In chapter 5 the description of the dominant discourses found in the study begins. In this, the first of 5 chapters describing the findings, the discourses of exclusion are presented. I elaborate on the participants and the interview contexts. I also present the results and discussion of the discourse analysis.

In chapter 6 the bigger picture discourse of a country in transition is expanded upon.

In Chapter 7 I extend my discussion of the discourses to include discourses of multiculturalism

In Chapter 8 discourses of identity are described.

In chapter 9 I present my research commentary. The value and the challenges of the study are explored as well as possible avenues for future research. I reflect on my own positioning in the study and reflect in more details on some of the pertinent findings of the study.

1.6 Conclusion

Without describing the discursive context which psychologists are trained and work in, the process of exposing hegemonic discourses becomes impossible. Without exposing these discourses, counter discourses cannot be developed and included in training programmes and therefore introduced into the discursive context of this HWU and later into the places where the trainees work. Further research into engaging with a deeper and more challenging critique of the role of psychology within the particular challenges and problems of contemporary South African society is vital. It is at this level that this study aims to explore the discursive role of psychology. Therefore this study proposes to describe the discursive landscape of multicultural training that is in stark contrast to the current research and literature presented regarding this field (See chapter 2).

In this chapter the study has been outlined, as well as the research process and theoretical paradigm used. In the following chapter I set out to explore the training context within South Africa.

Chapter Two

Multiculturalism and Training Psychologists in the South African Context

This chapter is presented in two sections. The first section presents the relevant literature regarding multiculturalism. In the second section, multiculturalism and the training context are specifically looked into. The South African context is given attention to as this is the backdrop for the study.

2.1 Multiculturalism

This section aims to tease out the ideas around multiculturalism and the construction of multicultural training. The definition of multiculturalism in Chapter 1 (CACREP, 1994), emphasises the following factors, namely race, ethnicity, culture, age, class, gender, sexuality and disabilities. In this chapter I briefly engage with all these factors as per the definition. However, I focus my attention on race, ethnicity and culture as suggested in the literature (Arredondo & D'Andrea, 1995), as these factors are the most salient to this study. Therefore this chapter aims to situate the research study within the field of multiculturalism. The research reviewed in this chapter is part of the discursive landscape of the study and of multicultural training in the South African context as well as psychology in South Africa in general.

Multicultural counselling has been evolving into an area of specialisation over the past 30 years (D'Andrea & Daniels, 1997). The foundation of a democratic South Africa and the growing recognition of racism and other forms of discrimination have resulted in focused interest on ethnic and majority status within the field of therapeutic psychology. The multicultural perspective aims to include all aspects of individual functioning within one theory (Tuckwell, 2002). "It is based on a broad, inclusive view of culture, which provides a metaphor for understanding self and others" (Tuckwell, 2002, p. 61). The term multiculturalism reflects the changing composition of society, especially in urban areas where culturally and racially different communities reside in close proximity. According to Pederson (1994), the "multicultural perspective seeks to provide a conceptual framework that recognizes the complex diversity of a plural society, although at the same time it suggests bridges of shared concern that binds culturally different people to one another" (p. 15).

Within the above description, culture, race and identity come to the fore. These are the first three factors of multiculturalism that I present, as these were the most salient to the study.

2.1.1 Culture.

Culture is intricately linked with multiculturalism. Culture is subjective and dynamic (Locke, 1990). According to Carter and Qureshi (1995), “culture is defined as the transmission of knowledge, skills, attitudes, behaviours and language from one generation to the next... culture is learned behaviour” (p. 12). Valentine (as cited in Lago, 2006) added that “culture of a particular people or social body is everything one must learn in order to behave in ways that are recognizable, predictable and understandable to those people” (p. 239). Thus the multicultural discourse positions trainers and trainees “to recognise the ways in which their own cultural upbringing is likely to have affected their perceptions of the problems which their client brings” (Murphy, 1986, p. 179). The profound and unconscious impact that our own cultural discourse and heritage has upon our attitudes and perceptions towards others is constructed as being dominant in the multicultural discourse.

The multicultural discourse also informs us that there is a difference in understanding and internalisation of culture (Wohl, 1989). When people share cultural origins and understandings, they often share, without awareness, sufficient understanding of each other’s present behaviour and possibly future behaviours. Thus the multicultural discourse views sameness of culture as being automatically able to understand the other. For example being part of the same culture, automatically means an understanding of all aspects of that culture as well as the assumption that the culture is experienced as being the same by different people within the particular culture. However, culturally different persons may not enjoy these shared assumptions, thus the discourse emphasises the importance of trainers and trainees, as well as psychologists in general, to become culturally informed (Lago, 2006). Discursively then being culturally informed would be opposite to being culturally uninformed and therefore lacking in something. But what is this ‘something’ that is needed? Literature alludes to the ‘something’ but does not inform us what it is. Rather the discursive context of culture is further complexified. For example Locke (1990) went on to describe multicultural counselling as an interaction of the culture in which counselling occurs, the cultural identity of the client, and the beliefs and racial attitudes of the counsellor, which all intersect with one another. It sets up the construct of culturalism on a binary, either culturally the same or culturally different, or culturally informed or culturally uninformed, as though these are ‘things’ the psychologist needs to attain. There is little room for alternate ways of viewing the construct, such as a more situated and contextualised definition that voids the either/or binary.

According to Eagle (2005), the word culture is a “loaded term carrying strategic, interpersonal and rhetorical weight” (p. 43). In South Africa, culture is often used as a synonym for race, due to the racial divides, which still exist. Thus within this multicultural discourse, culture becomes a code for a range of other terms and issues (Eagle, 2005). Eagle went further to say that culture is employed by many different groupings with different rhetorical objectives, including resistance, dominance, assertion and subversion. Thus there are multiple meanings, and it plays into a multitude of discourses, served by the term culture.

With reference to training, Masters training has tended to overlook clients from differing cultural backgrounds who found themselves at a disadvantage in a predominantly white culture and middle-class world. Psychotherapy, rooted in western approaches, was limited to the white, upper and middle-class people and neglected lower classes and people of differing cultural backgrounds. Burkholder (2007) suggested that culture can be ‘taught’ from either a universal or an idiographic view. It can thus be taught again as the thing or the something that can be attained through learning. However, a universal view is so broad that the sources of problems become obscured. This view sees cultural differences simply as individual differences and allows the dominant culture to move the focus away from racism. Within South Africa a focus on race and racism has assisted in reinforcing dominant discourses of race that are opposed by many but challenged by few. The idiographic view challenges individuals to ‘evaluate’ themselves, their institutions and their interactions in terms of their own levels of racism and contributions to that harmful system. This view requires that psychologists and researchers, and people in general, acknowledge their own roles in contributing to current discourses and empowers them to take an active stance in challenging the dominant discourses within a society. However, this idiographic view still supports the construction of evaluation of internal characteristics of the psychologist, the characteristics of the training environment, and thus supports the notion of the attainment of skills.

From the above description of culture it becomes clear that this construct is keenly linked to race and ethnicity in the multicultural discourse. The multicultural discourse also sets culture up as something that can be taught, evaluated, learnt and attained. This constructs culture as being essentialist, internalised subjective, as it also implies that internal elements of psychologists are changeable through the exposure to and gaining of knowledge. In the next section the constructs of race and ethnicity are unpacked.

2.1.2 Race and ethnicity.

In “Race: The floating signifier” Hall (1996) argued against racial identification and the racial identity, as these change depending on the time and place in which they are interpreted. It means that although the signifiers of race are most often found in the body, there is nothing in the body that gives those signifiers meaning (Mitchell & Rosiek, 2006). Similar to culture then the understanding and internalisation of race warrants further interrogation. Within multiculturalism, race is then a socially constructed category. The terms black and white do not hold any objective reality, and may thus be regarded as being socially constructed, serving to advance the interests of those (the white group) who benefit from this means of classification (Tuckwell, 2002). The poststructuralist approach to race therefore seeks to understand, through the lens of historical events and socio-political factors, how individuals construct and position themselves within discursive contexts. In this way institutions and systems have a functional nature in determining relative positions in society, and individuals/speakers are able to negotiate their own position within the social hierarchy. Race is therefore a signifier of a different reality, which is reinforced by racism in society (Tuckwell, 2002). The terms black and white are used here to define these different social experiences and subject positions speakers gain or do not gain by virtue of their race.

“While ‘race’ has no basis in fact racism does” (Gunew, 1994, p. 8). Racism, as defined by Van Dijk (2007), is a system of white group dominance that requires daily reproduction at the level of action and interaction. In South Africa, our view is that this reproduction process is crucially sustained by structures and processes of discourse and communication. Race therefore poses an essentialist position where bipolar thinking is to be found in the discourses of racism and identity. For example, you are either white or not white. Although most people in South Africa are people of colour, the discourse of exclusion and discourses of a country in transition situate people of colour as Other. A detailed mechanism thus exists of these discursive and communicative practices of western-approach-to-therapy dominance in the South African psychology society with specific reference to mental health services (Du Preez, 2004; Eagle, 2005; Eskell-Blokland, 2005; Knight, 2004; Ruane, 2010; Seedat, 1997). By their everyday acts of meaning, people act out the social structure, affirming their own statuses and roles, and establishing and transmitting the shared systems of value and of knowledge (Fairclough, 1995). Within this context of practising psychologists, it becomes apparent that the challenge facing psychologists

is to deconstruct power relations (Marchetti-Mercer, Beyers & Daws, 1999), to challenge value systems and to reinvent the concept of knowledge.

In order to understand the history of the ideology of race and to combat racism today, the construction of whiteness as the foundation of racism and racial categorisation needs to be understood and challenged.

2.1.2.1 Whiteness.

The reference to whiteness in this race binary, either as self-identification or identification with a group, may outwardly be a direct reference to skin colour. However, when people are referred to as white people, the reference is often in line with the construct of whiteness. Whiteness then is used as a description for privileges and power that people who are white receive. For example, access of resources and privileges. Whiteness is a social construction with real, tangible effects.

Kivel (1996) stated that

Racism is based in the concept of whiteness – a powerful fiction enforced by power and violence. Whiteness is a constantly shifting boundary separating those who are entitled to have certain privileges from those whose exploitation and vulnerability to violence is justified by their not being white (p. 19).

Henry and Tator (2006) noted that

‘Whiteness’ like ‘colour’ and ‘blackness’ are essentially social constructs applied to human beings rather than veritable truths that have universal validity. The power of whiteness, however, is manifested by the ways in which racialized whiteness becomes transformed into social, political, economic and cultural behaviour. White culture, norms, and values in all these areas become normative natural. They become the standard against which all other cultures, groups, and individuals are measured and usually found to be inferior (p. 46-47).

Frankenberg (1993), a trainer, wrote that

whiteness is a dominant cultural space with enormous political significance, with the purpose to keep other on the margin... white people are not required to explain to others how ‘white’ culture works, because ‘white’ culture is the dominant culture that sets the norms. Everybody else is then compared to that norm... in times of perceived threat, the normative group may well attempt to reassert its normativity by asserting elements of its cultural practice more explicitly and exclusively (p. 21).

As a social construction, whiteness has several key features:

- It is socially and politically constructed and therefore a learned behaviour.
- It does not just refer to skin colour, but is an ideology based on beliefs, values, behaviours, habits and attitudes that result in the unequal distribution of power and privilege based on skin colour (Frye, 1983; Kivel, 1996).
- It represents a position of power where the power holder defines the categories and who is white and who not (Frye, 1983).
- It is relational. 'White' exists in relation to other categories in the racial hierarchy produced by whiteness. In defining 'others', whiteness defines itself.
- It is fluid and changes over time (Kivel, 1996).
- It is a state of consciousness. It is often invisible to white people, and this lack of understanding of difference is rooted in the cause of oppression (Hooks, 1994).
- It shapes how white people view themselves and others, and places white people in positions of structural advantage where cultural norms and practices go unnamed and unquestioned (Frankenberg, 1993).
- Cultural racism is founded on the belief that "whiteness is considered to be the universal... and allows one to think and speak as if whiteness described and defined the world" (Henry & Tator, 2006, p. 327).

When thinking of the multicultural constructions of white versus whiteness it becomes clear, once more, that race is a socially constructed category, which powerfully attaches meaning to perceptions of skin colour. Inequitable social/economic relations are structured and reproduced through notions of race, class, gender and nation. The meaning of whiteness is historical and has shifted over time. For example, at different times in history different groups of people have been classified as non-white. According to Ignatiev (1996), "The white race is a club. Certain people are enrolled in it at birth, without their consent, and brought up according to its rules. For the most part they go through life accepting the privileges of membership, without reflecting on the costs" (n.p).

Whiteness protects participants from all kinds of hostility, distress and violence (McIntosh, 1988). Whiteness is the distinction between earned strength and unearned power that is conferred by privilege (McIntosh, 1988).

Whiteness is therefore constructed as being invisible to those in possession of it and manifests itself in the discourses of multiculturalism with little effort. Whiteness is privilege and power. According to McIntosh (1988)

white privilege is an invisible package of unearned assets that I can count on cashing in each day, but about which I was “meant” to remain oblivious; white privilege is like an invisible weightless knapsack of special provisions, maps, passports, codebooks, visas, clothes, tools, and blank checks (p. 1).

Describing white privilege makes one newly accountable, as illustrated by several excerpts from McIntosh (1988) portraying some white privilege constructions:

- “Unearned skin privilege” (p. 1)
- “Whites are taught to think of their lives as morally neutral, normative, and average, and also ideal, so that when we work to benefit others, this is seen as work that will allow ‘them’ to be more like ‘us’” (p. 1)
- “If I declare there is a racial issue at hand, or there isn’t a racial issue at hand, my race will in the end have more credibility for either position than a person of color will have” (p. 2)
- “White privilege has turned out to be an elusive and fugitive subject” (p. 3)
- “I see a pattern running through the matrix of white privilege, a pattern of assumptions that were passed on to me as a white person” (p. 4)
- “To redesign social systems we need first to acknowledge their colossal unseen dimensions. The silences and denials surrounding privilege are the key political tool here. They keep the thinking about equality or equity incomplete, protecting unearned advantaged and conferred dominance by making these subjects taboo. Most talk by whites about equal opportunity seems to me now to be about equal opportunity to try to get into a position of dominance while denying that systems of dominance exist” (p. 6).

During apartheid, most whites were in an economically advantaged position, having their children grow up with the best formal education and future possibilities; shockingly, the exact opposite was the case for non-whites (Spaull, 2013). White privilege was maintained by embracing a capitalist approach and often limited the manual labour market to non-whites, so as to ensure economic suppression and disadvantage (Giliomee & Schlemmer, 1985).

Even though democracy has paved the way for all South Africans to enjoy equal

financial opportunities and privileges, these seem to be reserved for those who have the economic and social resources to take advantage of them, thus still discriminating against those in extreme disadvantaged positions. Thus our country's past is creating a current holding environment for the association between financial status, social class and being in a privileged position in South Africa. Apartheid is constructed as the political pawn for white/ racial privilege. As a way to assert political power, white privilege was a phenomenon that was very overtly instated in South Africa during the Apartheid era, defining race as a form of privilege (Giliomee & Schlemmer, 1985).

The effects of white privilege during the apartheid era can still be seen, but is often not acknowledged or realized. During the apartheid era, non-white people were forced to live on the outskirts of town, often referred to as the townships and as a result had to travel long distances to and from work as a political mechanism to implement and maintain racial segregation in South Africa (Findley & Ogbu, 2011; Giliomee & Schlemmer, 1985). It is still very evident that the segregated communities that were formed during apartheid have to some extent remained separated geographically today, as township communities formed and developed over time, separate from the cities occupied mostly by white people (Findley & Ogbu, 2011). With a vast majority of the country's economic resources and capital being invested in the inner cities (especially during apartheid), this still very evident geographical segregation today has serious consequences for equal opportunities between different races in our modern, democratic South Africa today. As a matter of convenience and as a way to assert equality, schools, small businesses, etc. grew in township areas, but maintaining such structures became challenging, especially in the light of the country's increasingly fragile economic climate and limited existing infrastructure and resources. However, there are contradictions and ambiguities that have begun to infiltrate these rigid divisions of the past. There have been movements geographically, socially and economically within South Africa in the more recent history. Therefore individuals are moving between and across these previously defined spaces. For example, rural black people have moved into urban areas. The boundaries between previously white residential and black residential neighbourhoods have been challenged. All these factors impact on identity development. For instance, young black people moving into the inner city are accused of having become 'white' when they go 'home' to the rural areas or the township, or black people are labelled as 'coconuts' because they ascribe to Eurocentric principles in terms of values, dress and language (Ncgoba, 2008).

2.1.2.2 *The intersection of culture and race.*

Gaudio and Bialostok (2005) argued that the absence of overt racism has led some to suggest that racism itself no longer exists. Denying and downplaying the ongoing presence of racism in social life can be understood when looking at culture as a guise of racism. The rhetoric of culture employs everyday racism that pervades middle-class discourses about cultural difference and social inequalities in South Africa (Eagle, 2005). Implicit in accounts related to cultural differences and social inequalities is the proposition that the cultural values of the white middle-class are superior to those of other ethnic groups and class groups (Macleod, 2002). The responsibility for being a person who is cultural different and social inequality resides then with the individual, that is the 'poor' person of colour needs to adopt a new culture to traverse this border. Gaudio and Bialostok stated that culture provides a way for conservatives to argue against policies that make reference to race and how the issue of racism is tied into social inequality. They warn that people across the political spectrum make use of racial disparities in income, education and scholastic achievement in terms of ethnicity or culture. For example, in South Africa there is a perception that black people lack the cultural values necessary to succeed in school, without taking into account the poor educational facilities available. The discursive landscape in many ways then prevents people of colour or the poor from making this cultural transformation. This thinking makes it possible to perpetuate racial domination without referring to race at all. "Under the guise of culture, linguistic manifestation of racist ideas has become so familiar, recurring and generalizable that it hardly seems to count as racist" (Gaudio & Bialostok, 2005, p. 53). Discursively therefore the speaker no longer looks bad and oppressive. These arguments appeal to culture without considering the actual histories of race, class and power relations. Culture provides the justification to the extent that it is being used to perpetuate systems of domination that have their roots in racism. Culture serves as a euphemism for race, even while it denies the social, political and economic reality of racism (Gaudio & Bialostok, 2005).

Thus race and culture are linked. But how are race and identity constructed? The distinction between race and ethnicity is an increasingly blurred one. In an earlier era, ethnicity was seen as a way of circumventing the racist history of race and was associated with choice. It was largely conceived in cultural terms as a matter of rituals of daily life, including language and religion (Rodríguez et al., 2012). Race on the other hand is determined by our biologically engineered features. According to the social constructionism paradigm there is no such thing as an external reality and

that all reality is constructed through social discourse and interaction (Willig, 2013).

As mentioned previously in chapter 1 and in this chapter, race, ethnicity and culture are suggested in literature to be the key factors of multiculturalism. In the next sections I delve, briefly, into the other factors of multiculturalism as per the AMCD definition (CACREP, 1994), namely class, age, gender, sexuality and disability. The motivation for such a brief inclusion is based on the fact that race, ethnicity and culture are more salient to the research topic, and the constructions of class, age, gender, sexuality and disability individually constitute a large field of research and thus an in-depth description is not within the scope of this study. However I am conscious of the fact that race, ethnicity and culture intersect with class, age, gender and so forth and that people on these intersections carry a greater burden in terms of marginality and exclusion from power.

2.1.3 Class.

Class is constructed in literature as being concerned with the presence or absence of wealth (Andrews, 2007; Bell cited in Weis, 2007; Jones, 1997; Turner, 2006). Although the term 'class' is also used colloquially to depict a moral and ethical code. For example "that person has no class". For the purposes of the study, class will be discussed as it's constructed in literature. The construction of wealth becomes tied into constructs of socio-economic status and social mobility within the literature. Jones (1997) and Andrews (2007) offered a definition of social class as a term generally used to refer to a group of people who share the same socio-economic status or who have shared economic, cultural, and social characteristics and as an expression popularly used to divide people into categories of upper, lower or working class. Jones (1997) also noted issues of social mobility, collective action and community to be alluded to by the concept of social class. The term is used to tie economic power and social groupings. Thomas and Bell (as cited in Weis, 2007) speak of categories of wealth and social position derived from peoples' location in the production and distribution of wealth.

Turner (2006) notes that "common to all sociological conceptions of class is the argument that social and economic inequalities are not natural or divinely ordained, but rather emerge as a consequence of human behaviors" (p. 581). Common in all these researchers' words is that class is tied into wealth and wealth is constructed as being only in the possession of a few. Within the construction of multiculturalism, class becomes interwoven into the very fabric of multiculturalism. Class is posed as a distinction between people who have advantages, privileges and status versus those who have less thereof.

The construction of class is dependent on purpose and meaning and thus the subjective nature of class within the multicultural discourse (Brown, 2006). The context in which class is discussed invariably forms the very definition of it. Discursively how class is reflected in talk is of importance. From the beginning social class was given pronounced economic meaning. This is problematic as the term social class and social economic status carry differing connotations and meaning. For instance, social economic status (SES) is usually a collection of data through consensus and other databases and used by social planners to categorise communities on the basis of factors like the mean income. These categories used by SES (upper, middle and lower socioeconomic status) do not express the profound differences between wealth and privilege or between poverty and oppression that are rife within South Africa given the gross discrepancies between the wealthy and the poor.

Thus constructing social class is an elusive task as the construct itself is housed within many other discursive constructions, such as wealth, mobility and attitudes and interests. It also invisibly intersects with the race, culture and ethnicity discourses because in South Africa working with black clients often implies working with the poor. For example, within the context of the study, many trainees resist having to drive to the township practical placements, citing a range of excuses such as violence and poverty, thereby illustrating how class is discursively embedded in other discourses, such as violence discourses. This is despite the fact that the distinctions are shifting in terms of class, race and ethnicity. In the next section I unpack age as a factor of multiculturalism.

2.1.4 Age.

When unpacking the literature regarding age, it became interesting to note that age is constructed within multiculturalism as being tangled with stereotypes. The idea of stereotypes is a social psychology concept and multiculturalist writing is shown to be aligned with traditional psychology constructs and theories. The literature states that age is a social construct with socially constructed meanings and implications (Hooyman & Kiyak, 1993). However, keenly tied into the meanings and social implications of age is the concept of stereotypical constructions regarding age. Stereotypical constructions are either positive or negative views and beliefs held about a group of people (Hooyman & Kiyak, 1993). Negative constructions tend to be problematic, as on a discursive level they create labelling and categorizing of others as being natural to society. Society and one's social context determines the extent to

which ageism is experienced and the meaning that the process of aging takes on (Hooyman & Kiyak, 1993)

In all societies the classification of people according to age results in segregating the young and old (Hooyman & Kiyak, 1993). The classification sets people up on a continuum between young and old. This continuum, young to old, has discursive and real life implications. Younger individuals tend to evaluate older individuals more negatively as they are not seen as being part of their own group (Kite, Stockdale, Whitley, & Johnson, 2005). It may be speculated that this devaluation may reduce the anxiety that might be felt with regard to aging and increases younger groups' own positive self-concept. Older people, however, tend to evaluate younger individuals less negatively and see fewer differences between the old and the young (Kite et al., 2005). This is likely due to the fact that whilst younger individuals do not form part of their in-group, they once were young and a part of that group, therefore devaluing the old does not help them maintain a positive social identity (Kite et al., 2005). Of interest is the fact that middle-aged individuals discursively are constructed as having the greatest age-related bias, which may be a result of them seeing old age as something near and fast approaching, but not yet being ready to accept their aging and thus having a greater need to degrade older individuals as a way of maintaining their own positive self-image (Kite et al., 2005).

In the past the elders of societies were held in high esteem; due to their age and greater life experience they were seen as wise and were entrusted with a group's history and with carrying out the traditions of the culture. Even in biblical times those over the age of 50 were seen to have been given divine purpose by God (Nelson, 2005). However negative society's views of the aged and the elderly today may be, they are at times inconsistent. Whilst society may believe that cognitive functioning declines with age or that the elderly may not be economically or vocationally successful, it still tends to value the wisdom of the older generations and often sees them as 'survivors' (Cuddy, Norton & Fiske, 2005; Kite et al., 2005). Suggested reasons for the dramatic shift in society's perceptions of the elderly have been due to the printing press and the industrial revolution which have made the functions of elders, such as the oral tradition of passing down stories and their knowledge of and skills in production, redundant (Cuddy et al., 2005; Nelson, 2005).

In the next section gender and sexuality as multicultural factors are unpacked.

2.1.5 Gender and sexuality.

Gender is constructed as an acquired identity that depends on social and cultural influences (West & Zimmerman, 1992) and not merely biological sex. Gender is therefore described as an achieved status that is constructed through social means (West & Zimmerman, 1992; Lynch, 2011). The social character of gender has been emphasised as being distinct from but related to biological sex. This idea was further developed by theorising sex as biological femaleness and maleness, and gender as socially and culturally informed (Oakley, 1972). This distinction between sex and gender allows feminist theorists to construct the meanings of femininity and masculinity as it varied over time and context, and have been able to illustrate that, since gender is variable, these meanings can be contested and changed (Jackson & Scott, 2002).

West and Zimmerman (1992) also critiqued the sex/gender division by questioning the view that sex is a natural given onto which gender is built. They note that if one is born female it is assumed that one will achieve a (stable, unvarying) feminine gendered identity. In this sense the sex/gender division, despite its insistence on the fluidity of gender, maintains a deterministic view where sexed males become gendered males, and sexed females become gendered females (West & Zimmerman, 1992). West and Zimmerman instead argued that sex is socially constructed, similar to gender. The identification of sex as either male or female (because variations in between are widely rejected) occurs through the application of socially agreed-upon biological criteria for classifying an individual's sex – the process of identifying sex as male or female is therefore a social process.

Gender and sexuality are intricately linked within the multicultural discursive realm. The deterministic construction of sex/gender as rooted in biology has also had implications for how sexuality has been constructed in research. The conceptualisation of sexuality as an inherent essence that resides within individuals characterised most thinking around sexuality. Sexual orientation may be described as the view that sexuality is an intrinsic property of a person that is independent of social or historical context (Rubin, 1984; Stein, 1992; Weeks, 1987). This view supports a realist ontology, in that the categories that are used to describe reality are considered to refer to actual phenomena that exist independently from other understandings thereof (Bohan & Russel, 1999a), for instance the understanding of sexuality as a discursive construct. Such construction of sexuality reduces sexual orientation to a binary construction, with heterosexuality and homosexuality being regarded as the only valid categories for sexual identification (Bradford, 2004). These

two sexual types are regarded as independent and mutually exclusive (Stein, 1992). This dichotomy is structured hierarchically, with heterosexuality often being considered normative and homosexuality being marginalised through depictions of pathology and deviance (Bradford, 2004). In these critiques the binary view of sexual orientation is considered simplistic, in that it reduces a vast array of expressions of sexuality to two categories (Bohan & Russell, 1999b).

Thus gender and sexuality become factors or variables that play into the discursive constructions of multiculturalism and specifically culture. Gender and sexuality are positioned within this multicultural discourse in similar ways, which are that differences in gender and sexuality are viewed as differences in culture, that is other from me. Furthermore, by insisting on grouping people according to what are considered to be internally homogenous categories, such as male or female, heterosexual, homosexual or bisexual, the varied experiences of people, such as maleness/femaleness who do not qualify as belonging to a category, are dismissed.

Gender and sexuality have received much attention in research over the past few years. However, another factor of multiculturalism, namely physical and mental disabilities has not been in the limelight to the same degree. Discursively this may be due to the dominant societal discourses of 'normal' and 'abnormal' that permeate the thinking of individuals in society. Physical and mental disabilities are marginal to the normative discourses of society and thus receive less attention.

2.1.6 Physical and mental disabilities.

Feminist theorists state that "disability, like femaleness, is not a natural state of corporal inferiority, inadequacy, excess or a stroke of misfortune" (Garland-Thomson, 2002, p. 5), but rather a culturally fabricated narrative of the body. Feminist theory believes that such a narrative has led to unequal distribution of resources, status and power to people with disabilities. Looking back at the history of people with disabilities provides an explanation why people with disabilities experience certain societal attitudes, prejudice and discrimination. This language used in literature is again essentialist and positivist. Mackelprang and Salsgiver (1996) stated that the way in which society has treated and experienced disability is dependent on their cultural belief system at the time. When looking at disabilities as a construction over time it can be noted how disabilities were viewed within a continuum. This continuum started with the perception that people with disabilities were possessed by evil spirits and the belief that drilling holes in the skull would release the evil spirits (Mackelprang & Salsgiver, 1996). Religious discourses proposed constructions that

disability (physical and mental) was the result of witchcraft, the devil and/or evil spirits. Or, to the contrary, having a disability sometimes meant that such an individual had a special power, a beyond human status. Extremist constructions can also be found. Plato, for example, stated that people with disabilities hinder the way to a perfect world and therefore should be put away (Mackelprang & Salsgiver, 1996). During the 18th century there was a movement to perfect the imperfection, thus to cure the inadequacies. Over time the dominant discourse became one of shame with regard to disabilities. In the early 20th century people were ashamed of the disabled, for example some parents hid their disabled children in homes and institutions as their disability was seen as an inadequacy (Mackelprang & Salsgiver, 1996). The discursive landscape added pressure to these dominant discourses of shame and inadequacy and during the last decade a movement started that focussed on promoting independent living for the disabled. This movement believed that societal discrimination and prejudice were infringements of their civil rights. Thus constructions regarding legal rights became the order of the day, although, ironically, still not acknowledging the disabled person's discursive world. Within this movement, the attitude and viewpoint of professionals (medical doctors and/or psychologists) changed in terms of teaching skills and facilitating self-management as opposed to only taking care of the disabled (Mackelprang & Salsgiver, 1996).

The multicultural discourse constructs disabilities as other and experientially a non-disabled person feels uncomfortable and awkward due to a lack of understanding. Pfeiffer, Sam, Guinan, Ratliffe, Robinson and Stadden (2003) stated that the attitudes of non-disabled individuals towards disabled individuals tend to be constructed as negative. Aiden and McCarthy (2014) explained that most of the discomfort and awkwardness towards an individual with a disability is due to a lack of understanding. It would seem then that through interaction and education, society's understanding and acceptance may increase (Aiden & McCarthy, 2014). Furthermore, people's attitudes, feelings of awkwardness and eventual discrimination are more prevalent and worse when confronted with a non-visible disability, mental health, as opposed to a visible disability. Linking disabilities then to the other multicultural variables, once people, and psychologists, attain the needed skills or 'things', they will no longer be involved in the process of othering persons with disabilities. Thus the internalised skills set becomes paramount within the multicultural discourse and psychologists, in fact all people, will change their ways upon attainment of these skills. At this time of attainment, people with mental and

physical disabilities will be viewed with more compassion despite the construction remaining that disability is 'other'.

Multiculturalism, based on the descriptions given above, is therefore a diverse construct in itself. Within the study multiculturalism becomes further problematized because of its link to training in the profession of psychology. Multiculturalism and training consequently become constructs that need to be troubled further, as the inclusion of multicultural training may not be deemed by all discursive actors to warrant attention. Multiculturalism is presented in the literature from a traditional psychology-as-a-social-science perspective, as described in the research reviewed. Thus it neglects the discursive landscape in which training, research and praxis occur. This is precisely the area into which this study aims to enter, namely the discursive landscape of multicultural training in the South African context.

In this study therefore identity is viewed as being culturally derived and constructed in language. Identity shifts and adapts to various relationships in time and across contexts (Sampson, 1998). Identity is thus viewed, from a social constructionist perspective, as being multiple, and constantly fashioned by various discourses such as race, gender, age, statuses and so forth. Identities are interwoven with power relations (See chapter 3) and ideologies (Stead & Bakker, 2010). The thread that connects this multicultural research review, discussed above, on an international and local level appears to be around creating a sense of what effective multicultural training entails.

In the next section I present the research and literature regarding multiculturalism and training.

2.2. Multiculturalism and training

Literature reveals that the inclusion of multicultural training in Masters programmes is a highly debated issue (Burkholder, 2007; Carter & Qureshi, 1995; Lee et al., 1999; Ponterotto, Alexander & Grieger, 1995; Sue, 1992). Burkholder (2007) mentioned four difficulties and debates around the development of multicultural training programmes. First, the journey of becoming a competent cross-cultural counsellor does not have an endpoint (Sue, Arredondo & McDavis, 1992). It is a process that a trainee starts, in the formal educational sense, within their first year of professional training and which continues throughout their professional lives as psychologists. Second, institutional, departmental, and programme barriers make significant multicultural change challenging. Third, little agreement exists on the most essential and effective types of multicultural training. Multicultural skills are not easily taught in

lecture rooms (Lee et al., 1999). Multicultural training occurs in context. Fourth, there are many philosophical and ideological assumptions of Masters trainers about the underlying definitions and understandings of culture (Carter & Qureshi, 1995), as multicultural counselling is not value free (Locke, 1990). Psychologists have historically compartmentalised issues of race, ethnicity, gender and social class that compose the multiple identities of both therapist and client as individuals.

American authors Ponterotto et al. (1995) stated that even though many academic fields comment on the necessity of improving their multicultural programmes, the majority simply respond by adding multicultural courses and recruiting so-called black members of staff. In my opinion, the manner in which multiculturalism is addressed in South Africa is by selecting a couple of black trainees each year to train within a particular clinical or counselling Masters course. This however, does not address the multicultural issue as the training remains western in its orientation. As suggested by Burkholder (2007), this may be due to trainers being unsure of how to develop effective comprehensive programmes that have multicultural outcomes. However, the profession of psychology has a responsibility to its communities to produce relevant and competent multicultural psychologists (Burkholder, 2007). Furthermore, psychologists are ethically mandated to practise within the boundaries of their competence (Professional Board of Psychology, 2007; Sue et al., 1992), which includes providing culturally responsive services within a diverse community.

In search of multicultural competence within psychology training programmes, Ponterotto and Casas (1987) concluded that the profession in America was not meeting racial and ethnic mental health needs effectively. It can be said with relative certainty that the situation in South Africa is similar as is borne out by a volume of literature which supports this opinion. Words such as competence and effectiveness have become the order of the day in the research reviewed on multiculturalism (Kiscelica; 1998; Lark and Paul, 1998; Ponteroto, 1998). Competence and effectiveness have become ideals to aspire to within multiculturalism. These positivist views are located within traditional psychology, where people own characteristics that are internal and competence is not a process or a frame of understanding but rather the attainment of a skill set or bag of tricks. Discursively these discourses of competence and effectiveness have become significant as they imply that there are such constructions, and that competence and effectiveness are achievable constructs. It also suggests that effectiveness and competency lie within the trainer and trainees, thus they are concepts that are internalized and therefore negate the

discursive landscape within society. Discourses therefore create ideals of internalized states and skills for trainers and trainees to attain.

However, let us first venture further into the literature before looking at how these new directions affect the trainers and trainees discursively.

2.2.1 New directions for training.

It is clear that Masters trainers need to continually expand the ways in which they teach multicultural counselling. Kim and Lyons (2003) shared that despite the progress made in multicultural training, the issue of *how* to effectively teach the competencies has not been sufficiently addressed. They suggested the key may be using experiential activities which challenge the existing manner of teaching and thus challenge the dominant discourses within the training, society and further afield. Constantine (2002) stressed that the complexity of concerns mandates counsellors be trained in non-traditional ways. Locke (1990) wrote the focus of training should be on how to work in different cultures rather than simply learning about cultures. The examples of progressive multicultural training programmes discussed by Burkholder (2007) above have a strong experiential component. Striking again in the presented research are words such as effectiveness and progressive programmes. Discursively these present an unfolding picture of the landscape. Discourses of competence and effectiveness litter the landscape and pull trainers and trainees into constructs that are housed within the person or within the training environment with little to no acknowledgment of the discursive landscape in which these constructs play out.

International and local literature yields the views of many psychologists who believe that focusing on racism and the reflective journeys of trainees is an essential element of multicultural counselling training (Constantine, 2002; Eagle, 2005; Faubert & Locke, 1996; Locke & Kiselica, 1999; Marchetti-Mecer et al., 1999; Reynolds, 1999). Learning content information about different cultures and cultural groups is important but is it included in the Masters curriculum? Learning to appreciate and getting along with those of different cultural backgrounds is necessary for change, but not sufficient. Research in America has shown that counsellors value cultural and racial groups more when they are aware of their own racial attitudes and feelings (Constantine, 2002). South African authors Swanepoel and De Beer (1995) also argued that training a culturally diverse group while ignoring the issue of race might in fact be detrimental to the process at hand. Reynolds (1999) pointed out that the goal in multicultural therapeutic training should be to aid trainees in understanding the wide-ranging system of racism and how we have each internalized that system.

Thus exploring the dominant discourses around racism, culture and diversity may assist in opening up the possibility of including multicultural training in the Masters programme. In addition, understanding racism, both intellectually and personally, is vital to healing the damage it has caused (Locke & Kiselica, 1999), specifically within a country such as South Africa.

Discourses of racism, whether we openly admit them or not, are present in South Africa. Therefore they are present in training groups, the communities they serve as students as well as the communities they will serve once qualified as psychologists. As stated by Reynolds (1999), refusing to confront racism, albeit 'closet racism', is equal to acting co-dependent and maintaining a damaging system. Confronting racism, sexism and classism etc., means trainers need to confront these issues within themselves, so they can guide their trainees in a similar process. This after all is a process that the South African society as a whole is busy working on in terms of transformation and redress.

Of striking significance once more is how the discursive landscape is negated. The attainment of multicultural training is again set up as the acquisition of the needed skills and abilities of trainers and trainees. I continued my journey into the discourse of 'effective' multicultural training, trainer and trainee as well as effective training environments.

2.2.2 Constructions of 'effective' multicultural training, trainers and trainees, and training environments.

Ponterotto (1998) detailed the characteristics of 'effective' multicultural training, which are discussed from the positions of what the characteristics of effective trainers, of promising trainees and of effective multicultural training environments are. Kiselica (1998), Lark and Paul (1998) and Rooney, Flores and Mercier (1998) explored the area of effective multicultural training from these three positions. In integrating their experiences and views regarding multicultural training, the resultant "nonexhaustive list of characteristics can be perceived as 'qualitative hunches' and can serve as foundations for research inquiry" (Ponterotto, 1998, p. 46). The discourses of effective multicultural training are reinforced by constructs of effective trainers and trainees.

Kiselica (1998), Lark and Paul (1998) and Rooney et al. (1998) highlighted the significance and importance of having interpersonally competent and multiculturally aware trainers in psychology training programmes. Kiselica speaks of warmth, modelling and courage forming a safety net for trainees to embark on their own

process of cultural exploration. Ponterotto (1998) presented a profile of multiculturally competent trainers as being trainers who

- are in a process of examining their own racial identity and developing a multicultural identity; adopting “into his or her person a lifestyle that incorporates not only increased knowledge about new ideas and perspectives but also strives to experience new and diverse contacts with those who are culturally different” (Rooney et al., 1998, p. 31).
- acknowledge that gaining a multicultural identity is a life-long process;
- are working with their own experiences of being oppressed on some level (for example being persons of colour, homosexuals, women, persons of disability, or being short or tall, or overweight or underweight people);
- understand the dynamics of oppression, and have struggled and are working with the participation in oppression and privilege (for example as whites or men) or in internalized racism, sexism, or homophobia;
- openly self-disclose and model their experiences, frustrations and joys in developing multicultural awareness and insight;
- are open with students regarding their own identity development, as well as the current questions they may be facing and current goals they may have
- encourage students to explore their own racial, gender, and sexual orientation attitudes and serve as multicultural mentors;
- give trainees permission to make cultural mistakes due to lack of knowledge and experience, and encourage risk taking in terms of discussing and processing multicultural and self-identity issues;
- facilitate an atmosphere of respect and confidentiality, thus providing the basis for risk taking and self-exploration;
- are courageous and competent in dealing with strong emotions, and help trainees process reactions to multicultural issues;
- effectively deal with and process the more painful and frustrating aspects of training, for example giving unwelcome feedback to trainees;
- have group process skills and can facilitate ongoing discussion, set limits, mediate and intervene to support those who have become vulnerable through self-revealing;

- are supportive and empathic towards trainees and encourage them to reflect on, observe and take responsibility for their attitudes and behaviour;
- shape an environment characterised by inquiry, observation and self-analysis instead of blame and fault finding;
- allow trainees multiple routes of self-expression such as journals, portfolios and small groups discussions;
- have a multicultural orientation towards life and the profession and role model this to trainees, and display multicultural awareness across the board.

This trainer list speaks to internal factors, skills and ‘things’ that trainers must possess to be multiculturally effective. Trainees also come under fire in the effectiveness discourse as being ‘promising’ multicultural trainees. The binary of effective versus ineffective trainer and promising versus not-so-promising trainee set up the effective discourse impossible to achieve when it is interrogated from a discursive position. How can trainers and trainees be constructed in these ways without the acknowledgement of large discursive landscape playing into the context? Trainers and trainees have prior knowledge and experience which may factor into their effectiveness and promise.

Ponterotto (1998) gives a general profile of trainees most likely to have the greatest capacity to respond to multicultural training and contribute to making a department multiculturally progressive.

These trainees:

- exercise openness and curiosity with regard to training activities;
- demonstrate willingness to examine their own socialisation, history, family of origin, community upbringing and so forth;
- exhibit courage to self-disclose their own views, opinions, feelings and questions in the group and class discussions;
- are non-defensive in their interpersonal interactions and can absorb and consider feedback regarding their own sexist, racist and homophobic attitudes and expectations;
- have high levels of resilience, hardiness and cognitive complexity, to deal with the intensity of multicultural involvement and possible feelings of vulnerability during the training;

- are committed to developing multicultural competence in spite of the many challenges that are involved in the process, and extend this commitment to social justice issues and to the appreciation of the culturally different;
- commit to learning more about multicultural issues through additional coursework, conferences and workshops.

The construct of a 'progressive' multicultural context reinforces this effectiveness discourse. In order for training environments to be effective multicultural training environments, they need to continue promoting racial and multicultural identity development among its trainers and trainees. Various themes run through effective multicultural training environments, namely:

- The programme recruits trainers who are multiculturally aware and who are open to ongoing racial identity development. Trainers are hired regardless of race, gender, sexual orientation or speciality when they exhibit multicultural characteristics.
- Academic leaders, such as deans, heads of departments and programme coordinators, are also multiculturally aware and support efforts aimed at multicultural development of the departments and greater universities. Steward (1991) made a point against multicultural courses being delivered by a junior staff member, as these courses are evocative and can uncover strong feelings in trainees. This may lead to poor trainee evaluation of the courses. Also, the focus on the multicultural course is highly experiential in nature. The argument against a junior staff member presenting such courses is based on the cognitive or intellectual level of engagement this topic requires (Pope-Davis & Coleman, 2007; Reynolds, 1999).
- The focus of the entire department on the multicultural development and orientation towards programmes should be evident in the department teaching evaluations and peer reviews.
- Multicultural programme development, as well as individual multicultural identity development, may be hindered by racially homogenous training groups. Racial identity development models discussed in Kiselica (1998), Atkinson, Brown, and Casas (1996) and Atkinson and Lowe (1995) posit that interracial interaction is needed to progress in one's own identity quest. Within the study the trainee cohort from which the sample was drawn was skewed to the homogenous. Thus

recruiting, retaining and nourishing the promotion of a culturally diverse environment is vital.

- Multicultural growth cannot happen in a semester course. Self-awareness and multicultural issues must be incorporated within the entire training programme such as all courses, practical placements, assessments and exams. Thorough descriptions of multicultural training programmes exist (D'Andrea & Daniels, 1991; Ponterotto et al., 1995; Pope-Davis & Coleman, 2007).
- New trainers entering into training programmes, and trainees selected into these programmes, need to be screened for multicultural awareness and non-defensiveness. The profession of psychology needs to look beyond the traditional academic measures of academic and programme success (Hayes, 1997; Lark & Paul, 1998; Rooney et al., 1998). Non-traditional criteria have been suggested, such as experience of working with minority populations, multicultural research interests, travel and living abroad and linguistic competence, to be considered alongside more traditional criteria (Atkinson et al., 1996; Atkinson, Staso & Hosford, 1978).
- Evaluations such as portfolios (Coleman, 1996) and supervisor and self-report measures can be included in assessment portfolios. Ponterotto, Reiger, Barrett and Sparks (1994) even suggested the inclusion of psychometric assessments like the Cross-Cultural Counseling Inventory Revised, the Multicultural Counseling Awareness Scale and so forth.

The characteristics mentioned are reciprocal in nature in that trainers and trainees affect the training environment, and in turn the environment influences the nature of the trainers and trainees who are attracted to it and remain in the environment. Research into troubling the construct of 'training characteristics' and 'effectiveness' could assist in clarifying the positions offered in this dominant effectiveness discourse. Key factors involved in the identity development process are also mentioned in this discourse. This view puts the responsibility of self-development solely on the individual and is in contrast to social constructionist ideas (See chapter 3). Research to date provides 'self-development' trajectories for trainers and trainees.

From the description above it becomes clear that the discourses of effectiveness and competence permeate the training of Masters therapeutic trainers, trainees and the training environment, at the expense of viewing training as part of a dynamic and ever changing context in which many discourses, in addition to discourses of effectiveness and competence, operate. In the next section I set out to explore

training in the South African context, the Post-apartheid South African context and South African psychology. It is necessary to describe the broader discursive landscape in which the study is situated, as the broader landscape directly affects the discursive context of this HWU.

2.3 Training in the South African context

Tracking the historical development of the hegemonic training discourses in South African psychology over time, from apartheid to post-apartheid, provides a location for this study and for the participants themselves. The location of the study and participants is vital so as to fully understand the positioning that South African psychology has as a profession, placed on those working within the field. Furthermore by identifying the signs of challenges and different ideas within South African psychology opens up the possibility of change of the dominant discourse over time, through the development of counter discourses. This links to the research methodology used in the study, as well as the findings which troubled and unpacked the dominant discourses to uncover chinks in its armour which may be used to bring about change and further develop counter discourses related to change.

This section (2.3) starts with a description of the literature of the South African context, specifically the South African training context, from a social constructionist position. The dominant literature is explored with regard to the post-apartheid South African psychology context with particular attention being given to two areas, namely a) the debate regarding the relevance of mainstream psychology within the South African context and b) racism and racist ideology. I then set out to describe the training of psychologists in the South African context with reference to the scientist-practitioner and professional-practitioner training models. In conclusion of the chapter, the training context is elaborated on. A discussion around the orientations, scientist-practitioner and professional-practitioner, is necessary due to their influence on the development of training programmes in clinical and counselling psychology (Haring-Hidore & Vacc, 1988). All this is included in this chapter, as it provides the backdrop of the training offered at the HWU as well as the training offered nationally and options proposed by the international psychology training community.

2.4 Post-apartheid South African context in psychology

The transition from apartheid to democracy is constructed as having created a space where psychologists could further engage with what Macleod and Howell (2013) broadly termed “socially relevant and critical work” (p. 224) which was developed before the transition to democracy. This was the key area of attention in work that

criticised the narrow focus of apartheid psychology. This critique was very dominant in the field of psychology during the apartheid era, and currently still is, because, as Cooper and Nicholas (2012) stated, “a transformed psychology has the potential to play a significant role in addressing human issues confronting South Africa” (p. 89). The transition process from a narrow focus of apartheid psychology opened a space for the focus to become broader and for the profession to become more relevant within the South African context. Psychologists, during and after apartheid, became engaged in the debate of relevance of mainstream psychology within the South African context and also became aware of their positioning, and the profession’s position, in terms of racism and racist ideology.

Suffla, Stevens and Seedat (2001) constructed psychology as embedded in the South African context and how it was affected by the socio-historical developments within the country.

Organised psychology’s historical role and evolution has often mimicked and mirrored socio-historical developments within the South African social formation at different historical junctures, and in this way has acted as a microcosm of South African society at different points in time (p. 28).

Post-apartheid psychology discourses position certain groups of psychologists as mobilised for change within South African psychology. The positioning is currently available for psychologists as Duncan, Stevens and Bowman (as cited in Hook, 2004) state “the historically racialised nature of South African psychology and its historical complicity with apartheid has yet to be fully acknowledged and addressed” (p. 382). Much has changed during post-apartheid South African society, but a great deal has remained the same in terms of psychology (Macleod, 2004).

In the next two main sections, I will be expanding on the relevance debate, universally relevant psychology versus local relevance in psychology, and the post-apartheid construction of racism and racist ideology resulting from apartheid. The inclusion of a discussion around post-apartheid constructions of racism and racist ideology becomes important when a social constructionist lens is applied in this study. The social constructionist lens provides an understanding as to how these constructions developed over time and how language assisted in the development of dominant discourses around race. These constructions are paramount to the study because I am aiming to uncover the discursive effects of dominant discourses within a South African training context.

2.4.1 Relevance debate.

During apartheid the relevance of psychology was debated in South Africa (Gentz & Durrheim, 2009). This debate continues today. The recognition of the embeddedness of psychology within apartheid ideology resulted in a number of psychologists raising questions related to the relevance of South African psychology (Macleod & Howell, 2013; Palmary, 2010). What Gentz and Durrheim (2009) referred to as “isolated voices” (p. 18) began “to acknowledge and express their protest, anxiety and sometimes shame” about the profession’s relevance (Richter et al., 1998, p. 1). In addition to the profession’s narrow demographic reach, to the “historically unserved” and “oppressed” communities (Duncan & Lazarus, 2001, p. 3) and “culturally and contextually accessible services to marginalised and vulnerable groups” (Seedat et al., 2004, p. 597), concerns were raised about its cultural foreignness, individualistic and decontextualized approach (Gentz & Durrheim, 2009; Holdstock, 1981). South African psychology was accused of being non-critical, conservative and working actively or passively towards supporting the apartheid ideology (Dawes, 1985; Palmary, 2010), ignoring the working class (Dawes, 1986), and perpetuating inequalities in mental health provision (Macleod & Howell, 2013; Vogelmann, 1987). “Psychology, its training and constructs were criticised for being nested in a Western worldview of the person, largely inapplicable to the African context.” (Gentz & Durrheim, 2009, p. 19). Eagle (2005) explained that

Given the fraught political history of the country with its legacy of colonialism and inter-group conflict, apartheid and state repression, capitalist exploitation and extreme wealth disparities, it is not surprising that... psychology, along with other professions, has been challenged in terms of its legitimacy within this context. Criticisms have been levelled at the elitism of clinical practice, at the limitations of psychological intervention in the face of material deprivation and at the western biases of existing training models. During the 1980s the central critiques of clinical training and practices constellated around notions of “relevance”, reflecting the political discourse of the day (p. 45).

Gentz and Durrheim (2009) further explained that these criticisms did however create points of resistance not only to the South African psychology of the day but also to the apartheid ideology.

However, Dawes (1998) saw this debate in broader terms. For Dawes the ‘relevance’ arguments pertain to the utilitarian value of psychology in Africa and South Africa, challenging the discipline at this level rather than in terms of overarching theoretical

orientation. The relevance debates are concerned not only with the usefulness of psychological interventions in the South African context but also with the explicit and implicit importation of what is generally referred to as Eurocentric or Western theories and models of training (Eagle, 2005; Mkhize, 2004; Naidoo, 1996; Nsamenang, 1995).

It is important to discern what the implications of the debate regarding the relevance of South Africa psychology in its current format had on the profession and specifically on the training of psychologists. Knight (2004) warned that “[i]t would be naive to believe that after decades of apartheid, mental health institutions and training programmes would not have been negatively impacted. Even after ten years of democracy, there are remnants of a racially divided society” (p. 2). Knight elaborated further by saying that the majority of practitioners in psychology are “white and that much of the teaching, training and practice of therapeutic psychology remains mostly in the domain of white, middle class, urban, men and women” (p. 2). However, despite the racial imbalance in psychology, “black men and women comfortable in western culture seek professional psychological interventions” (Knight, 2004, p. 3) while rural, poorer and less educated black communities seek assistance from traditional healers within their community and culture. Thus the post-apartheid psychology discourse remains white and western in orientation.

Naidoo (1996) continued the discussion around the issue of psychology traditionally being western. He explores the dereliction and disregard for human service professions in addressing the mental health concerns and needs of other racial groups as being the key areas in the relevance debate (Akbar, 1989; Sue, 1981). In the article of Naidoo (1996) it is noted that Westerners are opposed to other racial groups. The construct here is that race and culture once more become intricately embedded in one another. He went further to include the “renewed interest and activism for a psychology with an Afrocentric paradigm” (p. 2) and includes “calls to contextualise and indigenise psychology” (p. 2). Naidoo supports Bulhan (1985) who charged that psychology had been developed by and for the white, middle class person. That psychology is culturally encapsulated and cross-cultural relevance is absent. Katz (1985) stated that psychology is based on white culture and by definition has synthesised white norms, values, beliefs and behaviours into its principles.

It becomes also important to consider the discursive effect that the relevance debate had on South African psychology. Macleod and Howell (2013) take a discourse stance in saying that the oppositional discourse that was the order of the day during

apartheid, gave way to a discourse of social responsiveness. In the words of De La Rey and Ipser (2004), psychology is “judged in terms of the degree to which [it] has responded to government-led initiatives to promote social and economic development” (p. 548). Long (as cited in Macleod & Howell, 2013) recently criticised this by saying that the concept of relevance has been abandoned to an extent and “has been absorbed by a new dispensation that commodifies knowledge” (p. 12). Macleod and Howell (2013) argued that “relevance has outlived its usefulness” (p. 224). Knowledge again becomes the power tool of a select few within a country of many. Also the knowledge production component of dominant psychology has been highlighted by several writers (Barnes, 1972; Bulhan, 1985; Guthrie, 1970; Williams, 1972) as being instrumental in rationalising and justifying the status quo and its consequences such as racism and oppression. These practitioners appeal for the professional to be re-examined and re-evaluated in terms of theory and practice depending on the particular cultural milieu of therapeutic practice (Berger & Lazarus, 1987; Bodibe, 1993; Holdstock, 1981; Naidoo, 1996).

De La Rey and Ipser (2004) suggested an extension of the concept of relevance to include questions and policy responsiveness to issues of a multicultural nature, such as race and gender and also “critical issues related to the nature of knowledge production in South African Psychology” (p. 549).

Within the field of psychology and training of psychologists, Duncan, Stevens and Bowman (as cited in Hook, 2004) speak of how professional psychology is discursively positioned to perpetuate the relationship between the production and transmission of knowledge. They go on to say that most universities have adopted an equality policy of some sort to increase the numbers of black staff involved in the training of students. And some institutions have also attempted to include more contextually relevant course content and therapy models to enable trainees to be more responsive to their clients’ needs. However, there is still a heavy reliance on European and US-American models that are not conducive to the context of practice in South Africa (Stevens, 2003).

The dominant post-apartheid psychology discourses revealed here include the universal relevance discourse and the ‘western is superior’ discourse. These discourses make few alternate positions available to both trainees and trainers. The ‘western is superior’ discourse situated the other-than-western as being subordinate or inferior. This would then include multicultural ideas, theories differing from western approaches as well as the trainers and trainees who present as other-than-western. The universal relevance of psychology discourse negates all that is local and is

keenly tied into the 'western is superior' discourse. These two discourses operate together and reinforce one another in strategic ways to ensure their control. The counter discourse of local relevance is also to be found where some proponents view relevance as indigenous and local, for example, psychologists who are working towards the Africanisation of psychology. These psychologists wish to build on African cultural views and integrate them into the praxis of psychology (Holdstock, 2000), while those psychologists who are positioned in the relevance discourse are viewing this as purely attending to the needs of black and poor communities. These are some of the contradictory views regarding relevance. The result is that trainers and trainees function within a discursive environment that supports and reinforces views of 'western is superior' and 'local is not relevant' despite strong arguments that promote Africanisation of psychology. The western superiority discourse is a monolithic construction. It is also unitary in the relevance discourse, as though there is only one western psychology and one western culture, which is opposed to African or local discourses, which are also often constructed as unitary and homogeneous. This discursive landscape offers contradictory subject positions. The larger discursive effect is that these dominant discourses feed into and support the discursive context of a HWU.

After discussing the debate regarding the relevance of South African psychology, another construct within post-apartheid South African psychology discourses that is relevant for discussion, based on South Africa's apartheid legacy, is that of racism and race-based thinking. The intersection of race and culture is of particular importance in this study because of the embedded and overlapping constructions that these concepts yield within discourses of multiculturalism.

2.4.2 Racism and racist ideology.

The first free and fair elections in South Africa in 1994 signalled the demise of apartheid as a legalised form of institutional racism. Race, however, still remains a problematic social construct and minimal engagement with the topic has been noted (Stevens, 2003). Holdstock (2000) explained racism as including those "who are not overly prejudiced but nonetheless acquiesce in the large culture that continues the work of racism" (p. 32). These views illustrate that racism in its legalised and institutionalised form might have been abolished in 1994 but racism and racist ideology still remain.

In the section below I start by explaining the role South African psychology played in perpetuating the status quo of apartheid. I then go on to explore why South African

psychology appeared not to oppose this position. These are two areas that need to be described in order to comprehend the resulting subject positions that the various dominant discourses provide for participants in the study, and psychologists in general.

South African psychology “played a pivotal role in the perpetuation, elaboration and reproduction of racism” (Duncan et al. as cited in Hook, 2004, p. 363). They went on to write that in the South African context, the form of knowledge and practice of psychology “came to perpetuate what must be South Africa’s most characteristic form of power: racism” (p. 361). They describe South African psychology’s own inner politics, the “formal and informal conditions of restraint, oppression and omission” (p. 361) that South African psychology engaged in.

Therefore “psychology aided the reproduction of racism not only through its routine *denial* of the centrality of the phenomenon in South African society, but also through the academic justifications or ‘authorisation’ that it provided for the phenomenon” (Dunca et al., as cited in Hook, 2004, p. 363). This ‘authorisation’ was further noted by Magwaza (2001), in psychology’s disciplinary and professional practices and organisation. Psychology’s apparent collusion with racism has been widely documented (Baldwin-Ragaven et al., 1999; Cooper, Nicolas, Seedat, & Statman, 1990; Duncan, 2001; Durrheim & Moleki, 1997; Magwaza, 2001; Nicolas, 1990, 2001; Seedat, 2001; Suffla et al., 2001; Duncan et al., as cited in Hook, 2004).

In the following section I set out to describe the process in which psychology, on a practical level, was part of and resulted in South African psychology’s perpetuation and support of apartheid ideology.

2.5 South African psychology’s support of apartheid ideology

South African psychology is constructed as being supportive of apartheid ideology. The ways in which South African psychology supported apartheid ideology ranged from its focus on the experiences of whites by the publications of the time and the silence regarding the negative impact of racism of black people in general (Duncan, Stevens, & Bowman, as cited in Hook, 2004; Durrheim & Moleki, 1997) to the omission and commission of racism through skewed processes of knowledge production and training offered (Magwaza, 2001). Authors such as Seedat (2001) noted that South African psychology failed to address the psychological implications of apartheid. He illustrated how South African psychology’s omission of racism made psychology guilty of perpetuating racism. Magwaza goes on to describe how South African psychology is implicated in serious human rights violations committed in the

service of the apartheid state and its racist policies. South African psychology also assisted in constructing black people as 'different', 'alien' and the negative Other (Duncan, 2001).

After describing the construction of South African psychology reinforcing racism and racist ideology as well as the cognisance of the relevance debate, I was left with the questions why South African psychology is constructed in this way and why South African psychology did not resist taking up such a position?

Literature provided descriptions as to why this positioning was not resisted. According to Cooper et al. (1990), Magwaza (2001), Nicolas (as cited in Baldwin-Ragaven et al., 1999), Savage (1981) and Hook (2004), there were a range of factors as to why South African psychology was placed under pressure to respond to issues of race and racism in the manner it did, which are, unpacked below.

Psychologists, as is the case with other social beings, are socialised into the prevailing dominant ideologies (Dawes, 1985; Hook, 2004; Savage, 1981). It is therefore unlikely that psychologists would be left unaffected by these ideologies, constructions and discourses that were created (Duncan et al., as cited in Hook, 2004). They go on to explain four fundamental considerations. Firstly, racism permeated all facets of the lives of everyone in South Africa during apartheid. Secondly, the social class position of psychology during this time was white and middle class, the principal beneficiaries of apartheid. Less than two percent of the registered psychologists were black by the end of 1970's (Ebersohn, 1983) and by the end of the 1980's this percentage rose to a meagre 10 percent (Seedat, 1990). Thirdly, psychologists who were products of such a racist society would not have been motivated to make changes to the status quo. Fourthly, South African psychology formed part of an international psychology community that is currently struggling to come to terms with its past collusion with racism in its various manifestations (Holdstock, 2000; Howitt & Owusu-Bempah, 1994). Therefore both South African psychology and international psychology is constructed as being in collusion with racism or reinforcing racist ideology.

The discursive landscape of apartheid provided subject positions of opposition or acceptance of apartheid ideology. While the majority of psychologists in South Africa during the time of apartheid would not have been motivated to oppose its ideologies, Duncan et al. (as cited in Hook, 2004) state there would have been those psychologists who, by virtue of their work with marginalised people or by their membership of marginalised groups, would have opposed such ideology (Simon,

1982; van Dijk, 1999). However, the apartheid government placed external restraints to control these groups as well as to control academic and professional activities and productions (Baldwin-Ragaven et al., 1999; Savage, 1981; Seedat, 1990; Welsh, 1981).

The discourses of apartheid also played an active role in reinforcing discourses of knowledge production. Both past and current South African psychologists are trained within universities (de la Rey, 2001; Hook, 2004; Savage, 1981). The apartheid government exercised its control over institutions of training and over knowledge production by creating a climate that would best serve the interests and the maintenance of the prevailing relations of domination (Duncan et al., as cited in Hook, 2004; Robus & Macleod, 2006; Simon, 1982). Universities were used to replicate racial hierarchies that prevailed in broader society (Coetzee & Geggus, 1980; Ralekheto, 1991). Laws were passed to ensure this racial hierarchy was enacted (Extension of University Act, No 45 of 1959). This act ensured whites were granted the best university facilities, while blacks were provided with poorer facilities. However, it was not only through the inequalities of facilities that racist hierarchies were upheld. The content and curriculum were designed in such a way as to reinforce notions of racism (Ralekheto, 1991; Savage, 1981). Black universities were also “staffed and controlled virtually exclusively by graduates from the notoriously conservative and pro-(Nationalist Party) government Afrikaner universities” (Duncan et al., as cited in Hook, 2004, p. 371). They added that the apartheid state would also block appointments and promotions of ‘too radical’ staff to ensure that the staff and curriculum did not pose any threat to the prevailing power-relations in the country. The curriculum reflected a conservative and censored content, with many books and texts banned from South African universities (Kuper, 1974; Oakes, 1988; Welsh, 1981) including important texts related to racism (Duncan et al., as cited in Hook, 2004). But apart from this legal censorship of material, the self-censorship that South African psychologists imposed on themselves limited their ability to respond to issues such as racism (Baldwin-Ragaven et al., 1999; Seedat, 1990). Articles were only accepted for publication if they did not include any texts from the banned and censored list of books (Seedat, 1990). Restrictions were also placed on psychologists by virtue of funding (Duncan et al., as cited in Hook, 2004). Research was only funded if it replicated the power-relations within South African society, namely serving white interests. There were also numerous examples of how government exerted pressure on the private sector not to fund academic activities outside of the hegemonic practice of the state.

Therefore professional therapeutic psychology continues to receive criticism for its role in maintaining the regime of the apartheid government (Knight, 2004; Macleod, 2004; Palmary, 2010; Robus & Macleod, 2006). Psychologists, and trainers, are faced with the task of making the profession relevant within the context of a society in transition and creating new ways of confronting racism and racist ideology. In casting a social constructionist eye on the literature, it can be seen that South African psychology continues to uphold the dominant discourses, such as discourses of universality of psychology, in other words local is irrelevant, that existed in the apartheid era. There are counter discourses, such as local relevance discourses and Africanisation discourses, which rear their heads every now and then, but the dominant discourses seem to prevail.

In the following section the training of psychologists in South African context is discussed.

2.6 Therapeutic training in psychology in South Africa

Formal psychology training has predominantly developed within three contexts; i) departments of psychology at universities, ii) the training of psychiatrists at medical schools, iii) in the departments of social work at universities (Knight, 2004). For the purposes of this study, only professional psychology training, occurring at university level, within the scope of practice of Clinical and Counselling psychology leading to registration with the Health Professional Council of South Africa (HPCSA), will be discussed.

As explored in the sections above many socio-political changes that have taken place in South Africa have had a major impact on the training philosophy and praxis of psychologists. Over the past fifteen years, there has been a significant increase in people from other racial groups, besides whites, being accepted on psychology training programmes (Knight, 2004). Government policy dictates that professional training programmes reflect the racial and gender demography of the country (Knight, 2004). As quoted from Knight (2004) “it is expected that by 2005, 50% of the intake of mental health practitioners should be Black” (p. 4). However, Knight further explained the controversy regarding the official definition of a Black person as black, ‘coloured’ and ‘Indian’ people are grouped together in a racially offensive group of ‘non-white’. This debate also has implications for the multicultural nature of the trainee demographics and the training as a whole regarding the candidate pool from which trainees are selected.

South Africa's history of racial division emphasised the concept of difference between people. Previously so-called white universities mostly dealt with white students while a small number of black students were trained at black universities or not trained at all (Marchetti-Mercer et al., 1999). This may have contributed to many black students leaving the country to study abroad. Some more liberal white universities started training a small number of black students as psychologists in the late 1980's (Marchetti-Mercer et al., 1999). However, Marchetti-Mercer et al. (1999) are of the opinion that the training produced over the last few years is more integrated and representative of the population of South Africa. The South African context is further unique in that the differences extend past the black-white racial divide to the multitude of differences amongst black ethnicity (different language groups and ethnic groups etc.). The training of black psychologists is currently receiving attention (Eagle, 2005; Robus & Macleod, 2006) as the population is in dire need of psychological services offered by people of similar culture to that of the clientele (Ruane, 2006).

In the next section, the training of psychologists will be described in terms of the orientation of the training programmes offering Masters clinical and counselling psychology professional therapeutic degrees. The two most prominent orientations are the scientist-practitioner and the professional-practitioner models. According to Haring-Hidore and Vacc (1988), it is necessary to include a discussion around the various orientations due to their influence on the development of training programmes in both the clinical and counselling fields. The scientist-practitioner and the professional-practitioner models also impact on the training within psychology and specifically in terms of multiculturalism. With reference to this study, participants are being trained in the scientist-practitioner model. This model impacts on the training context in that the focus is strongly aligned with that of academic training. The professional practical training occurs mostly offsite in practical placements and in the second Masters training year.

2.6.1. The scientist-practitioner model.

Training in psychology offers a variety of educational models, each with its own strengths and limitations. To a large extent, academic programmes adhere to the classic Boulder scientist-practitioner model in pursuing research-based practice (Elliot & Klapow, 1997). The scientific-practitioner model aims to equip students with the prerequisite skills for competent clinical service. Although traditional programmes may provide sufficient training for graduates who want to work in areas within the

mental health field, these programmes inadequately prepare graduates for work within health care settings (Elliott & Klapow, 1997).

Universities are faced with a range of challenges including broadening access, mergers, massification, increasingly strained resources and the incorporation of business models of management (Eagle, 2005). Departments of psychology are not immune to these pressures to change. In addition, the Professional Board of Psychology has been pursuing agendas of transformation, introducing new training dispensations and criteria, specifying demographic targets for trainees and subjecting existing programmes to review. Eagle (2005) states that the central theme in transformation is cultural sensitivity, fairness, appropriateness, embeddedness or the overcoming of cultural bias. “Be it in selection procedures, theoretical models, assessment practices, supervisory relationships and/or practicum experiences, trainers have been compelled to examine and critique existing practices in terms of possible cultural assumptions and biases” (Eagle, 2005, p. 46).

Although this model is widely used, there is considerable debate as to its effectiveness as trainers struggle with the application of this orientation in practical training settings (du Preez, 2004), as trainers struggle to put this idealised integration model into practice. In the first year of Masters training, trainees receive predominantly theoretical training with little focus on the practical aspects of the training, which is covered more in the second training year. Therefore trainees may struggle to integrate theoretical knowledge and practical knowledge or only do so in the second year.

The scientist-practitioner model views both research and application of theory as being of equal importance (Du Preez, 2004). The underlying philosophy of this model is a combination of acquisition of psychological understanding and the attitude of constant enquiry towards knowledge. The acquisition of these skills would be carefully mentored in extensive trainee supervision (Parker, 1986). Du Preez (2004) summarised the guidelines of this model as follows:

- The training of psychologists should take place within university departments.
- Psychologists should be trained first as psychologists and then as clinicians.
- Trainees are required to do an internship within a host setting that is accredited by the HPCSA.
- Trainees should receive training which will allow them to achieve a level of competence within the areas of diagnosis, psychotherapy and research.

Based on the points raised above, it becomes clear that these 'ideals' are housed within a western theoretical approach to psychology (Bakker et al. 2007) where successful training results from the achievement of a skill set derived from the universal nature of psychology and not necessarily from the inclusion of other local knowledge systems. The discursive context in which trainees are trained is skewed towards hidden discourses of westernisation. Trainees then become situated within a westernised dominant discourse. Subject positions made available situate many trainees outside of the context of the client and place discursive boundaries between 'us' and 'them'. This binary impacts on the work being done in the therapy context. Culturally speaking the positions available, irrespective of whether the trainees are black or white, situate them in a position of authority and expertise over the clientele population. This positioning is inevitable in the professional field but the effect might cause a rift between psychologists and their clients. These positionings are also in contradiction with a discourse of integration where research, praxis and theory are taught in an integrated and mutually complementary manner.

Critique against the model was proposed by Derner (1959) and Mc Connell (1984), who stated that psychology as a profession cannot advance only as a scientific endeavour while alienating "personal suffering and the development of professional aspects of training" (Du Preez, 2005, p. 93).

In the context of this study, therapeutic training is offered from the scientist-practitioner model by this HWU. The Masters programme is offered over a two-year period. During the first year, the training is primarily based on coursework. In the second year, trainees are placed within practical placements to gain exposure to clients and the world of therapeutic psychology. Upon completion of the 2-year clinical or counselling psychology Masters coursework degree within the scientist-practitioner model, students are required to complete a 12-month internship. Clinical Masters students have an additional one-year community service to complete before they are eligible to register with the Health Professions Council of South Africa. This community service year is not required of counselling psychologists.

The alternative to the scientist-practitioner model is the professional-practitioner model, which is briefly discussed below.

2.6.2 The professional-practitioner model.

This model does not prescribe any particular training ideology but suggests that each individual programme should use the available resources to the greatest effect (Parker, 1986). Guidelines are offered (Du Preez, 2005):

- Field training in various contexts should be emphasised with the aim of integrating experience with acquired skill development.
- Training should be congruent with the needs of the clientele within the given context or community.
- Services for underserved populations should be provided as part of training programmes.

The professional-practitioner model emphasises service and the context in which training occurs while not adhering to a pure ideology in training. As stated above, therapeutic training in South Africa does not make use of this model. Thinking about this from a social constructionist stance, given the context in which South African training occurs, perhaps this training model needs to be explored further. The potential advantages of conducting training within the therapeutic context might aid in bridging the gaps that are discursively placed on trainees within their first training year in psychology. As an alternative this model may provide a way to include the complex discursive context that the multicultural South Africa presents. In providing practical and theoretical training alongside each other, trainees may integrate the theoretical knowledge with their practical exposure. The process might enrich the service offered to clients as well as trouble the discursive effects that western training approaches impose on trainees prior to entering multicultural contexts.

2.7 Therapeutic training context

It is important to note that, due to South Africa moving into a democracy, the current tertiary education landscape, where psychology training occurs, is not greatly different from the apartheid tertiary training landscape despite mergers and incorporations. For Macleod and Howell (2013) change has come in the form of classification. For them it is no longer possible to classify universities according to their previous classification of 'historically white' or 'historically black'. I take cognisance of their statement, but retain the label of 'historically white university' (HWU) when describing the context of this study because this label is used by the participants and reflects their perception of the institution in this study (as discussed at the end of this chapter).

According to Marchetti-Mercer et al. (1999), who are working in a university context similar to where this study took place, South African students are, to a degree, acquainted with the diverse cultures of the country

but on a personal and interpersonal level have had minimum exposure to the rich diversity of culture of the other groups. Yet they have to be prepared to relate with each other in the training context, as well as being trained to work with clients from a variety of racial and cultural groups in diverse contexts such as informal settlements where disadvantaged people live as well as conservative institutions such as military and psychiatric hospitals (p. 190).

It could be argued that the selection of students for Masters therapeutic psychology training is based on qualities such as flexibility, tolerance and open-mindedness, once more illustrating the individualistic view of trainees needed in the profession. The internal qualities that trainees possess or do not possess make them 'trainable'. The multicultural discourse seems to propose that having the 'correct' trainees and trainers will make multiculturalism happen. By implication then the discourse is saying that if multiculturalism is not working, it is due to not having the 'correct' people for the job. This negates the context and the social inequalities. The result is that these concepts become invisible in the multicultural discourse.

Marchetti-Mercer et al. (1999) state that "there is much pressure in the academic context to avoid any issues that might be reminiscent of racism so that any reference to diversity is often perceived negatively" (p. 190). McGoldrick, Pearce and Giordano (1982) argued that the issue of ethnicity, albeit loaded in the training context, needs to be addressed to create a multi-ethnic perspective within the training group. A "multi-ethnic perspective where we are open to understanding values that differ from our own and no longer need to convince others of our values or give in to theirs" (p. 25). South African authors, Swanepoel and De Beer (1995) also argued that training a culturally diverse group while ignoring the issue of race might, in fact, be detrimental to the process of training. Kotze (1994) further supports the issue of diversity by stressing the importance of cultural sensitivity. Therefore "the training context as a reflection of the social and political discourses taking place in society is emphasized" (Marchetti- Mercer et al., 1999, p. 191).

Therefore the training context promotes the ideal of an integrated training group to avoid issues that may be problematic. Within the training context it then becomes apparent that the challenge facing trainers is to deconstruct the many power relationships within the multicultural training group, thereby taking the emphasis away from individual characteristics. These power relationships exist on multiple levels: between students, in terms of diversity differences, and between the trainer and the students, in terms of the trainer holding the position of authority and therefore the position of power. Beyers (1994) emphasised the co-creation of the training

context in which both the student and the trainer participate in the process. Fenster (1996), while working with racially different groups in therapy, argued for two goals: a) increasing the capacity of the individual to relate to the group while b) fostering authenticity autonomy, and the ability to resist group pressures. Therefore the importance of the principles of similarity and difference is emphasised and forms the basis of training within the training group context. Authors Marchetti-Mercer et al. (1999) described the process to training within a multicultural South African university context in three phases:

- *Phase 1: Orientation.* Students become aware of the unique nature of the group where the issue of difference exists and may become an issue.
- *Phase 2: Conflict phase.* This is a period of covert tensions which students do not define as being racially motivated but rather “mask them under the guise of other practical problems, for example language, punctuality for classes, and so forth” (p. 196). Minority group members are expected to adhere to the norms of the majority group (Fenster, 1996). This assumption may be interpreted as a demand by the minority group members and a power struggle ensues. The understanding of this built-in power struggle is crucial to cultural awareness (Marchetti-Mercer et al., 1999). It becomes the role of the trainer to break the ensuing power struggle but this can often be a point of difficulty. According to Marchetti-Mercer et al. (1999), if the trainer can break down the barrier that exists with regard to them being the expert authority figure, and become part of the training group, they can set the tone for the breaking down of cultural barriers between trainees from different backgrounds, thereby creating an ethos within the training group that is conducive to multiculturalism.
- *Phase 3: Similarity and difference.* At this stage in the group’s development, enough trust and cohesion has developed so that differences can be openly addressed without being considered offensive. “In order to achieve this level of understanding one must work from an epistemology that allows for difference and sameness to co-exist and, in fact, almost depend on each other” (p. 198).

The above phases depict one perspective on the training environment within a multicultural context. However, the situation on the ground does not accurately mimic the one proposed in the literature. The training context within ‘multicultural’ settings can be debated. Firstly from the position of what constitutes a multicultural setting. For example, having one black trainee in the trainee cohort or having one practical placement in a township community does not constitute multiculturalism. Secondly,

such an idealistic view of the training situation negates the discursive effects that dominant discourses have on trainees and trainers within the training programmes offered at this HWU. The discursive context of a HWU places discursive effects of privilege, whiteness and potentially racism automatically into the context of training. It is thus my opinion that phases 1 to 3 do not necessarily happen.

The training taking place at universities is also linked to practical placements where trainees are afforded the opportunity to practice their newly acquired skills. Placements are secured within diverse populations to ensure that trainees get a broad spectrum of clients, cases and cross-cultural experience of diversity within the South African context. Many authors share this view that South African universities cannot confine themselves to training students to work in either black or white communities, especially if there is a concerted effort to make psychological services available to the previously disadvantaged black majority (Levine & Perkins, 1987; Ruane, 2006). Often this emerges as a form of modern racism (subtle or disguised) where black psychology interns are taken in at certain training institutions to work only with black clients, because of the so-called language constraints (Pillay & Kramers, 2003). Pillay and Peterson (1996) and Pillay, Ahmed and Bawa (2013) went further to say that as part of the training, the students should be taken into different communities, such as Soweto and Sandton. (Traditionally, Soweto is a black township community and Sandton an affluent white community).

Therefore the training of psychologists within the South African context must continue to be challenged and revised so as to make it more and more relevant to the specific social difficulties facing this society in transition (Knight, 2004). It is an ongoing process in which trainers and trainees live and observe the cultures of their contexts and integrate these into an awareness and a live interpersonal undertaking (Marchetti-Mercer et al., 1999). The training situation may become, in the words of Hatfield and Jacobs (1989), the place for

citizens of a multicultural community to initiate a continuing discourse ... no one cultural or ethnic orientation is given the power or authority to determine and complete this pluralistic discourse . . . The new curriculum becomes the multiple life history of all classroom inhabitants, with the student's cultural orientation and identity the source of the new and emerging text that will provide the source for the dialogical exchange (p. 3).

Within a multicultural training context, trainers strive to engage in a “discourse (which) attempts to incorporate multiple possibilities from a wide range of cultural and

ethnic orientations, we will see few versions, considered, modified and reshaped” (Davis-Russell, Forbes, Bascuas & Duran, 1990, p. 151). Once more this view represents an idealistic discourse in which “no one cultural or ethnic orientation is given power or authority” (Hatfield & Jacobs, 1989, p. 3).

Therefore the discourses of multiculturalism position subjects as having to reach various ideals. Subjects *must* eliminate racism, *should* integrate theory and practice, and *should be* universally culturally sensitive and knowledgeable. These ideals are often contradictory and impossible to achieve. Thus a subject *should* promote the local discourses and Africanisation of psychology. However, subjects *need* to do this from a western, universally relevant psychological discourse. The onus remains on the individual subjects to attain these skills, to improve themselves to make this happen. It is an overwhelming position to be offered, with an understandable resistance to taking up such a subject position. Furthermore the research showed that issues are often psychologized instead of contextualized. That is if the individuals improve themselves then the group dynamics will improve and multiculturalism can be achieved instead of the discursive landscape being described in which these discourses play out. It is at this discursive level that this study investigates multiculturalism and training.

The synthesis between theory, practice and research is constructed as being the ideal. Theory, practice and research are separated in the post-apartheid discourse. They are also presented as having conflicting positions with the ideal being constructed as an integration. The construct of integration speaks to the multicultural discourse that seeks to integrate and close down segregation between people and communities. It also speaks to the larger discursive landscape of South Africa where integration is favoured over separation. This construction of synthesis between theory, practice and research left me with a strong feeling that this discourse positions subjects as either for or against ‘togetherness’. We either stand together or we stand apart. These subject positions have large discursive implications within the South African context of a nation moving away from apartheid. Trainees are positioned as struggling to integrate and trainers are positioned as being responsible for the integration. This constructs integration as a tricky ideal to achieve.

2.8 Conclusion

Within the research and literature reviewed, multiculturalism is constructed in a monolithic and static manner. The aim of the chapter is to highlight this process of presenting multiculturalism from a fixed position. Multiculturalism is presented as

being individualistic, a skills set needed from trainees, trainers and the training environment in order for success to be achieved. It is also presented as being divorced from the contextual factors of social inequality and from the unique context itself. This may be seen as the difference this study aims to make, because the study comes from a social constructionist paradigm.

This chapter also described the constructions of post-apartheid South African psychology. It delved into the training of psychologists in the South African tertiary education context. The historical trajectory of the hegemonic discourses of post-apartheid psychology, from apartheid to post-apartheid, provides a location for this study and for the participants. The positioning made available by the dominant discourses in South African psychology is so vital in the training and working of psychologists because it either enables or disables participants in terms of agency, at times doing both. The process of transitioning, between the theoretical and the practical, between the apartheid and post-apartheid eras, places trainees and trainers in discursive positions that to a large extent decrease their individual agency, as few alternative positions are available. To trouble these dominant discourses and available positions is to uncover the chinks in its armour, as mentioned earlier. Chinks represent cracks and cracks allow erosion to take place. Counter discourses and alternative ways of relating to the discursive context then become possible.

Chapter Three

Theoretical Framework

In this chapter I focus on the various complementary intersections and interactions between the theories, frameworks and paradigms I have worked with. In this study I am working under a social constructionist umbrella from a poststructural position, while focussing on certain key concepts such as language, discourse and power. I also explain the theories behind the methodological approaches of discursive psychology, Foucauldian discourse analysis as well as the use of deconstruction and externalisation in the study.

The chapter sets out to explain the manner in which I move away from traditional ways of making use of a paradigm and theories in the study. As Gergen (2001a) stated, “we must be prepared to stand outside our theories and ask about their properties in terms of coherence, circularity, and the extent to which our explanations add to the vocabularies of cultural understandings” (p. 811). Wilson (2008) is of the opinion that “if...scholars are to be freed from the need to constantly justify our research and knowledge systems from a dominant system perspective, it may be necessary for us to be clearer in our articulation of exactly what our paradigm entails” (p. 12). He proposed that researchers, and trainers, be very clear about their point of departure, so as to provide sufficient motivation for moving away from dominant knowledge systems or ‘traditional’ ways of utilising theory and research as praxis. For that reason, I set out to explain my understanding and use of the theoretical framework adopted in this study. The journey starts with a brief visit to postmodernism, and then a discussion of a poststructuralist understanding of social constructionism. It explains my use of two discourse analysis processes, namely discursive psychology and Foucauldian discourse analysis as well as deconstruction in the analysis, and ends with a discussion on key concepts, such as language, discourse, power, positioning, and agency, which arose from the study.

3.1 Postmodernism

Postmodernism has the fundamental contestation and claim that social reality cannot be described or explained with certainty or in authoritarian terms (Sarup, 1993). Reality is too complex, multiple, and fluid to be captured by singular, universal explanations. Knowledge about reality is not only constructed, but reality is understood to exist solely on representational terms (Weedon, 1987). Thus the question of what constitutes social reality and the social relations that characterise it, cannot be answered in generalities or universal terms (Brown and Strega, 2005). Reality is also historically specific in character. Therefore one cannot say anything

about social reality, one can only interpret it based on one's own culture, values, biases etc. (Lather, 1991). Truth is therefore representational and evolving and hence refuses categorization. There are no truths. There are regimes of truth that occupy a dominant space in representing and creating certain 'truths' about the Other on the basis of their 'difference' (Foucault, 1980). Knowledge is therefore linked to relations of power, where power exists within multiple relationships. Everyone is considered to be a participant in maintaining particular representations or discourses of themselves and of others in society. Hence, postmodernist thinkers are concerned with analysing how we are constituted as subjects of our own knowledge (Lather, 1991). Hierarchical relationships in society, for instance, are viewed as being maintained by all those who participate in the system and not just those who dominate it. In the context of this study, the hierarchy of the university is maintained by those who participate in the system and not only by those in positions of power. Subjects are therefore seen as active subjects and are centralised in analysis, due to their active occupation of their place within hierarchical relationships (Brown and Strega, 2005). So the differences of voices and diversity of meanings are important facets of social reality and have to be acknowledged.

How one views the world is influenced by what knowledge one possesses, and what knowledge one is capable of possessing is influenced deeply by one's world view. The conditions under which people live and learn shape both their knowledge and their world views. The process of developing a world view that differs from the dominant world view requires active intellectual work on the part of the knower, because schools, society and the structure and production of knowledge are designed to create individuals who internalize the dominant world view and knowledge production and acquisition processes (Ladson-Billing, 2000, p. 258).

In the approach of postmodernism, I use social construction as an umbrella theory that informs my poststructuralist position. Poststructuralism is defined by the Oxford dictionary as

An extension and critique of structuralism, especially, as used in critical textual analysis, which rejects structuralist claims to objectivity and comprehensiveness, typically emphasizing instead the instability and plurality of meaning, and frequently using the techniques of deconstruction to reveal unquestioned assumptions and inconsistencies in literary and philosophical language (Psychology, n.d).

Poststructuralism and social construction will be discussed in a later section. These two approaches tend to overlap in the descriptions of the terms. The value of inclusion here is in describing how the three approaches, postmodernism, social constructionism and poststructuralism are linked. Similar to Crocket (2010), who wrote: “This study has called on poststructuralist ideas especially those which ‘flow’ within the streams described... [as] social constructionism” (p. 2), I see intersections and interactions between these traditions, and I am emphasizing the social constructionist framework as it captures the intent of the study more overtly. Thus my reading of poststructuralism is a social constructionist reading (Crocket, 2010).

But allow me first to expand on the approaches of social constructionism and poststructuralism.

3.2 Social constructionist approach

As a social constructionist researcher I am concerned with the process of social construction of ‘knowledge’ and how people construct versions of reality through language (Willig, 2013). In the study for example, I am interested in the process of social construction of knowledge regarding multiculturalism and training. For the social constructionist, our actions are not constrained by traditionally accepted notions of truth or rationality (Gergen, 2008). Many differing versions of forms of reality exist within the study. These are co-constructed by the participants in the study as well as by psychologists in the South African context. As the co-constructions occur, new meanings are produced.

According to Burr (1995), social constructionism has four premises. The first premise of social constructionism as described by Freedman and Combs (1996) is concerned with critical considerations of taken-or-granted knowledge:

The beliefs, values, institutions, customs, labels, laws, divisions of labour and the like that make up our social realities are constructed by the members of a culture as they interact with one another from generation to generation and day to day... The realities that each of us take for granted are the realities that our societies have surrounded us with since birth. These realities provide the beliefs, practices, words, and experiences from which we make up our lives, or ... constitute ourselves (p. 16).

Social constructionism insists that we take a critical position towards knowledge about ourselves and the world that is taken-for-granted (Burr, 1995). The world does not present itself objectively to the observer, but is known through human experience that is largely influenced by language. Social constructionism challenges the

conventional idea that knowledge and understanding is based upon objective, unbiased observations of the world, and argues that knowledge is not coherent or logical (Willig, 2013). As an alternative to this idea social constructionism suggests alternative interpretations that may be offered from various role players that represent different perspectives, such as different cultures, religions and social histories. At this HWU, an example of taken-for-granted knowledge would be that lecturers possess all the skills and knowledge which they are to impart to the students. Another example of taken-for-granted knowledge is the construction of effective training programmes, facilitative trainers and promising trainees (as described in chapter 2).

The second premise speaks to the historical and cultural situatedness of our understanding of the world. “The fundamental way in which the world is understood is a social creation or social product, manufactured by culture” (Pauw, 2009, p. 13). Pauw explains this further by stating that assumptions and ideas on the world are products of active social or collective endeavours. Therefore “what seems to be ‘natural’ at any given stage in history is the product of social and economic conditions of that time” (p. 13). Thus all forms of knowledge are culturally and historically relative (Burr, 1995). According to Gergen (1985), making sense of the world is a process of “communal interchange” (p. 266). The communal interchange that exists between the discursive context of a HWU and the participants working in this context creates the meaning-making process and therefore illustrates how this communal participation makes sense of the world. The manner in which the trainers and trainees, speak creates a sense of the world. The talk creates the discursive landscape which they function in.

The third premise is that knowledge is sustained through social processes. Social processes, such as negotiation, communication, rhetoric and conflict are important in establishing what is experienced as fundamental understanding of the world (Pauw, 2009). According to Burr (1995), “it is through the daily interactions between people in the course of social life that our versions of knowledge become fabricated” (p. 4). How reality is understood at a given moment is determined by the conventions of communication in force at that time. The stability of social life determines how concrete our knowledge seems to be. This approach recognizes people’s own sense of reality and how it changes as their interpretations of their lives change (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Miller & Fox, 1999). In the context of the study the creation of knowledge becomes an important aspect of the findings. The context of a tertiary training institution assumes knowledge production but does not necessarily take

cognizance of the knowledge that is created within social interaction. For example, the knowledge created within the lecture room or practical placement is not necessarily to be found in a textbook.

And lastly, there is language as part of social action. Knowledge and social actions are irrevocably connected because social processes are embedded in social actions; and from the constructionist perspective, language forms an integral part of social action. Burr (1995) argued that when the world is constructed through discourse, there are “numerous possible ‘social constructions’ of the world” (p. 5). Social action is continuous, socially constructed, highly contextualised, fluid and variable (Johnson & Meinhof, 1997). The way people construct reality invites different kinds of action and excludes others (Burr, 1995). Within a social group or culture, reality is defined not so much by individual acts, but by complex and organised patterns of ongoing actions. This implies that the way participants, and psychologists and academe, understand the world they live in and the way they talk about their experiences (social action), particularly concerning multiculturalism, represents their way of making sense of the world and constructing knowledge. The community of scholars, professionals and psychology in general facilitate the co-creation of constructions and participate in discourses of training, professionalism, relevance and cultural sensitivity. The act of talking is an action that is simultaneously informed by the way participants talk about the topic and the multiple discourses that form part of their particular communicative community. The way the participants in the study construct the topic in their conversational practice also reveals social representations and norms that accompany any particular language and communication, as well as a socio-culturally shared knowledge (Van Dijk, 1999). Therefore the social constructionist researcher accepts the notion of specific and local knowledge as a ‘valid’ construction of meaning. This is possible by focusing on the local narrative and acknowledging the possibility of consensus on the meaning of language, together with the idea of power to create local and relevant theory existing in communities.

These fundamental premises of social constructionism include a critical approach to taken-for-granted knowledge, an emphasis on the historical and cultural situatedness of our worldviews and of our subject fields, and the proposition that knowledge is created and maintained by social interactions (Burr, 2003). Therefore social constructionist researchers, and many Masters trainers and psychologists, accept the notion of specific and local knowledge as a construction of meaning. I decided to focus solely on one tertiary education institution and to challenge the hegemonic discourses prevailing in that single discursive context. This is possible by focusing on

the local narrative and acknowledging the possibility of consensus on the meaning of language, together with the idea of power to create local and relevant theory existing in communities (Du Preez, 2004). In the study, I focus on the local narrative in one HWU to construct descriptions of the process and power processes active in this discursive context. This discursive context, once described, is then linked back to the larger social discourses informing the participants' constructions (see chapter 2).

In this study a social constructionist framework is used in the locating of the study's objectives, for example to describe the nature of the participants' constructions regarding the hegemonic discourses present in the discursive landscape of a HWU. By casting a social constructionist eye on how discourses are operative in these constructions as well as uncovering the discursive networks pertaining to multicultural constructions in a therapeutic training context provides a means to develop possibilities for change.

3.2.1 Language.

In social constructionist terms, the world can be seen "as a construction of common language" (Parry & Doan, 1994, p. 16). Therefore language is fundamental in the structuring and creating of the world. Language can be found in many forms such as written and spoken text, non-verbal and pictorial communication, and artistic and poetic imagery (Parker, 1992). The interpretive practices make the world visible by using a variety of materials, such as individual descriptions or narratives concerning multicultural competence and training that may have emerged, interviews, cultural texts and the personal experiences of both myself and the conversational partners (Dane, 1990). The interpretive practices also extend to the wider therapeutic context of psychology. As a social constructionist, I approach the world and this study with a set of ideas, a framework that specifies the set of questions that I then examine in specific ways to obtain meaning from the texts. (It links to my use of discursive psychology in the study). However, a poststructuralism reading of social constructionism and language has me looking at the embeddedness of human interaction in context, and leads to the need to examine issues of power, politics, and ideology in human interactions and whose interests are being served. The emphasis is placed on language usage and how language serves political and ideological interests. (This links to my use of Foucauldian discourse analysis). Thus meaning is understood in contexts (Stead & Bakker, 2010). In the study the subjective meaning that is co-constructed by the participants and myself aids in the understanding of the context of the HWU.

“Language is not a transparent medium for conveying thought, but actually constructs the world and the self through the course of its use” (Wetherell & Maybin, 1996, p. 220). Gergen (2001) went further to say that

language seems almost magical. Only through its powers to name we identify our experiences and our persons. There are no social structures that bear upon us beyond this linguistic order. All that exists is within it. If we want to change our lives, we need to change our patterns of discourse. The “language games” constitute what there is to change... Our narrative forms, our metaphors, our ways of communicating do not emerge from nothingness. They are embedded in the foundations of society. Stories and their structural instantiations reverberate against and with each other (p. 69).

Therefore the process of representation by language reflects the social world (Larkin, 2004). The person is indistinguishable from its roles, culture and relationships, and is continually being constructed through language. Consequently, language is a public relationship and functions pragmatically and politically to bring about change (Gergen, 2001). “Language, myths, and symbolic systems provide unique insights into the way society organizes itself and the ways its members have of making sense of themselves and of their social experience” (Fiske, 1990, p. 133). Language allows for resistance and change, as it offers ways of conceptualising change by intervening on the level of language (Glover & Kaplan, 2000). Text, such as words, phrases and sentences, that individuals choose to use, reflects the position of where they are within a complex of meaning. Understanding human beings as “beings of language” (Braidotti, 1994, p. 190), creates an appreciation for the irrefutable connection between culture and language. Therefore language is interested in a broader understanding of culture (See chapter 2) as a set of structures of meaning and power. Social influences shape how culture is socially constructed in society. According to Berger and Luckmann (1966),

Every individual is born into an objective social structure within which he [sic] encounters the significant others who are in charge of his [sic] socialization. These significant others are imposed on him [sic]. Their definitions of his [sic] situation are posited for as objective reality. He [sic] is thus born into not only an objective social structure but also an objective social world. The significant others who mediate this world to him [sic] modify it in the course of mediating it. They select aspects of it in accordance with their own location in the social structure, and also by virtue of their individual, biographically rooted idiosyncrasies (p. 151).

In the study, language functions on the level of meaning-making as well as part of discourse creation in terms of how the participants construct their realities in the discursive context of a HWU.

3.2.2 Articulating the relational.

How can we comprehend the social world in such a way that it is not composed of entities, but constituted by processes of relationship?

Our common language of description and explanation virtually commits us to understanding the world in terms of units (nouns) that act upon each other (transitive verb)... How, in this case, can we build towards understanding the social world as relational while simultaneously employing an instrument of entification? (Gergen, 2001, p. 2).

Language is seen as co-constituting in that a word can come into meaning by virtue of its difference from other words. Or as Derrida (1978) might put it, the words gain meaning through deferring to other words and so produce a “web of relationship without end” (p. 3).

Another process is also at play, namely the process of co-creation. Bakhtin (n.d.) referred to this as viewing the utterances or actions that serve candidates for meaning in a given relationship as drawn from previous relationships. In other words, they are born from preceding relationships, as are the responses they invite or invoke. Our capacity to generate meaning then follows untold numbers of narrative traces in all we say and do (Gergen, 2001a). “Experience never simply speaks for itself. The language that we bring to it determines its meaning” (Giroux, 1992, p. 17). Burr (2003) explains that social constructionism differs from traditional psychology in several respects - through its anti-essentialist stance it rejects ideas suggesting that human experience or personality have an essential and discoverable nature; through a suspicion towards claims of objectivity; through its understanding that language is a pre-condition for thought; through seeing language as a form of social action; and finally, through its focus on interactions and social practices and the dynamics of social action. Thus words may appear as isolated units and only come into meaning through the processes of co-constitution and co-creation. Chapter 2, for example, describes the essentialist stance taken by research and literature regarding multiculturalism and training in the South African context. The essentialist stance describes characteristics of multicultural competencies in trainers and trainees, as well as the most fertile type of training environment. These essentialist stances create the impression that multiculturalism and training are to be found within the

individual and thus leave little room for the development of alternate ways of engaging with the research reviews.

Social constructionism then became the larger framework from which a poststructuralist theoretical position is adopted.

3.3 Poststructuralism

Poststructuralism is a grouping of theoretical positions formulated to radically extend the claims made by structuralism regarding the focus on the linguistic to include how power operates in the construction of social reality (Sarup, 1993). Poststructuralists contend that words gain their meaning not from essential properties inherent to the words but from the manner in which they relate to and are different from other words (de Saussure, 1972/1983). Therefore 'validity' and 'realness' are only constructions. They also consider the deployment of language in the service of constituting particular versions of reality, human experience and subjectivity (Hepburn, 1999).

Poststructuralists "reject both the notion that knowledge is the product of the opposition of subjects and objects and that there is only one way in which knowledge can be constituted" (Heckman, 1997, p. 9). Poststructuralists, like feminists, point out the roles of the social, the experiential, and the discursive in the construction of knowledge. They "have advocated an understanding that all knowledge is contextual, historical... and produced by rather than reflected in language" (Brown & Strega, 2005, p. 212).

In order to understand the poststructuralist reading that I used in the study, concepts such as discourse, power and knowledge need to be teased out.

3.3.1 Discourse, power and knowledge.

Many definitions for discourse exist. Parker (1992) spoke of discourse

compris[ing] the many ways that meaning is relayed through culture, and so it includes speech and writing, non-verbal and pictorial communication, and artistic and poetic imagery... Although discourse analysts in psychology have tended to focus on spoken and written texts, a critical 'reading' of psychology as part of culture should encompass the study of all the kinds of symbolic material that we use to represent ourselves to each other (pp. 123-124).

Parker (1992) put forward that discourse is realised in texts, which are "delimited tissues of meaning reproduced in any form that can be given interpretive gloss" (p. 6). Discourse can thus be realised in symbolic forms such as visual images and spatial arrangements and not only in language and text (Macleod, 2002). A discourse

can also be defined as “a set of more or less coherent stories or statements about the way the world should be” (Drewery & Winslade, 1997, p. 35). Discourses are conversations that take place over time and privilege some descriptions of the world more than others. Similarly, discourse is to Scott (as cited in Weingarten, 1997) a “historically, socially, and institutionally specific structure of statements, terms, categories, and beliefs that are embedded in institutions, social relationships, and texts” (p. 309). Foucault (1972) argued that to understand discourse we need to be aware of its histories and make explicit the functions that these discourses have in society. Weingarten (1997) argued that discourses are social practices; they are organised ways of behaving, acting as the frameworks we use to make sense of the world and to structure our relationships with each other. A discourse presents a coherent system of meanings (Parker, 1990): it forms a “regulated system of statements” (Henriques, Holloway, Urwin, Venn & Walkerdine p. 105) or a “single system of formation” (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1982, p. 107). Discourses are seen to be constructive as they do not simply describe the world, but are the manner through which the world of ‘reality’ emerges (Macleod, 2002). They contain subjects and construct objects (Parker, 1990) as well as knowledge and truth (Ramazanoglu, 1993). In this study I choose to use an accumulation of definitions, namely Macleod’s, Parker’s and Ramazanoglu’s as stated above. This definition of discourse being a mode through which reality emerges, and containing objects and subjects as well as knowledge and truth allows for the discursive positioning of subjects within discourse. It also allows for the possibility of deconstruction of ‘knowledge’ and ‘truth’. It alludes to the concept of power behind knowledge and truth. It further implies discourse as being a mode of operation. A mode of operation is adaptable, dynamic and diverse in its functioning, which is how I view discourse.

According to Parker (1990), discourses allow us to focus on the unseen but once these have been brought to light we refer to them as though they were ‘real’ (Macleod, 2002). Texts therefore reflect dominant discourses but also provide ways of refusing them. Young (1987) reminds us that discourse can be restrictive as well. It is this dual character “through which action and understanding are simultaneously enabled and constrained that links knowledge to power” (Young, 1987, p. 114). The constant tension between constructive and restrictive allows for flexibility and movement within the discourse. “[D]iscourse transmits and produces power; it reinforces it, but it also undermines and exposes it, renders it fragile and makes it possible to thwart it” (Foucault as cited in Gough, 2004, p. 260). As Parker (1992) points out, a discourse accounts for other discourses through the contradictions

within the discourse. Therefore through the exclusion of subordinate or contradictory discourses, the discourse creates conditions for the modification and undermining of its own presence (Macleod, 2002). By focusing on the unseen and bringing the unseen into the light, these once unseen constructions are brought into reality. In the study the participants highlight unseen constructions and alternative positions to be taken up by various speakers, which in turn makes these unseen constructions a reality.

Foucault (1972, 1977) stressed that we construct ourselves in terms of the dominant discourse and comments on how this invariably impacts on the identity of self. The notion that realities are socially constructed as people live them implies that reality construction takes place in language, through interaction with other people and with the institutions of society. Coupland and Jaworski (1999) argued that “construing language as discourse involves orientating to language as a form of social action, as a functioning form of social action embedded in the totality of social processes” (p. 47). In this study, discourse is also understood to be functional, having risen from the possibility of discussing a particular topic. Language thus does the producing, reproducing or transforming of social structures, relations and identities that are routinely “overlooked” (Fairclough, 1992, p. 211). Transformation in language or the need to develop new and more ‘accurate’ words to describe new discoveries, understandings and areas of interest get overlooked. Language and discourse are associated with power and ideology and are conceptualised as ‘natural’ products of common usage or progress (Brown & Strega, 2005). The individual is positioned as being the subject and the originator of meaning, able to convey and control meaning by the ‘correct’ selection and arrangement of words. So what are the challenges of understanding language and discourse as being transparent, functional and progressive?

Structuralists such as de Saussure (1991) say that language is socially and historically specific and that the meaning of words is constructed rather than pre-existing. Althusser (1984) described language as a social product that reinforces and reproduces ideology. Ideology here refers to knowledge used in the service of power (Burr, 1995). For example feminists (Butler, 1995; Weedon, 1987) and marginalised groups (Brown & Strega, 2005; Hill Collins, 2000; Razack, 1998) have also explored the complex relationships that exist between power, ideology, language and discourse. Feminists have pointed out women’s subjugation through language and various discourses. Other analyses of language and discourse were done from the perspective of academic discourse (Russ, 1983; Spender, 1980), psychology

(Brovenman, 1970; Weisstein, 1971), theology and medicine (Daly, 1978), violence against women (Walker, 1990), and moral theory (Gilligan, 1982). Critical race theorists such as Hill Collins (2000), Razack (1998), Said (1993) and Trinh (1989) have tackled the construction of race and racism through language and discourse. Take Razack (1998), who has explored how liberal and humanist discourses of justice, rights, and equality mask and construct relations of domination and subordination along the lines of gender, race and class. Critical race theorists have also considered the various ways in which language both serves and masks ideology (Brown & Strega, 2005). Some critical race theorists (Hill Collins, 2000; Razack, 1998; Said, 1993) have suggested that, rather than describing reality, language constructs and constitutes 'reality' insofar as we are able to comprehend, understand and describe events and experiences through the words, language and discourses available to us. They propose that the availability of words, language and discourse is produced and constrained by factors related to history and not to progress and to the workings of power and ideology and not out of necessity. Therefore these writers proposed that meaning can be originated and controlled by our choice of words and concepts. These ideas may be linked to Wittig's (1992) statement that our minds are also colonised territories. To link to this study, the discourses that resulted from the apartheid era have to a large degree controlled the meaning of the concepts and choice of words in the profession of psychology (See chapter 2). The construction of reality in the South African context has been hugely influenced by the apartheid and post-apartheid context.

Foucault (1972; 1977) described discourse as a principal organising force and worked on *how* discourse functioned rather than *why* it functioned. He also accepted the existence of some relations as being outside of the discourse and suggested the relationship between discourse and extra-discursive could be mapped. Therefore by mapping discourse and noticing the connections or articulation between discursive relationships and the extra-discursive, we may be able to uncover how experience enters into, or is barred from entering into, what counts as knowledge. This links to the objective of this study of explore the discursive networks at play within this discursive context. By revealing the discursive networks it becomes possible to view knowledge creation differently. Knowledge creation is traditionally viewed in a linear fashion - the trainer teaches, the trainee learns. However, discursive networks illustrate that this learning process is reciprocal in nature. The trainer teaches, the trainee learns and experiences their acquired knowledge through practical exposure and then brings this reworked 'knowledge' back into the training context for further

rumination and construction. Both the learner and the teacher are positioned within discourse and both identities are infused by discourse. The process of deconstruction of knowledge is shown to be keenly linked to the construction of knowledge.

Therefore discourse, knowledge and power are inseparable in both producing and constraining the 'truth'.

Each society has its regime of truth, its "general politics" of truth: that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true; the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish true and false statements, the means by which each is sanctified; the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisition of truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true (Foucault, 1980, p. 131).

Various institutions and communities have their own regimes of truth. It is no different in this HWU study context. Certain truths exist that are widely accepted and these truths are acquired through widely accepted means. These truths are accepted because of power being a transient construction.

For Foucault (as cited in Freedman & Combs, 1996) "language is an instrument of power, and people have power in a society in direct proportion of their ability to participate in the various discourses that shape society" (p. 37). Foucault saw knowledge as having the potential for actions to occur while power was not something people have, but rather an effect of discourses on people (Foucault, 1980). Power is thus constructive in that discourses invite people to construe themselves and the world in particular ways (Stead & Bakker, 2010). Therefore it is important to remember that

discourses are tied to institutional practices and therefore are allocated the stamp of truth; not by powerful people but by the prevailing discourses in society... The culture provides the foundations for certain discourses to be accepted or tolerated, while other discourses may be unacceptable and therefore marginalized in a particular culture (Stead & Bakker, 2010, p. 75).

According to Foucault's view of modern power, the emphasis is on the positive effects of power in discourse. These effects are constructed and circulate throughout the discursive landscape. Furthermore, his view of power is positive in its effects, instead of negatively oppressive and restrictive (Drewery & Winslade, 1997). Foucault uses 'positive' and 'negative' in a strictly neutral sense and does not differentiate 'good' from 'bad' effects of power (Flaskas & Humphreys, 1993). Thus power is productive in the sense that people's lives are actually constructed through

this form of power. This implies that any efforts to transform power relations in a society must address these practices of power at the local level – in everyday, taken-for-granted social practices (White, 2007). For example, to challenge the power in a HWU, one has to address this practice at the level of the individual institution as is proposed in this study and not in a more global sense.

For White (1994), power is also sinister in nature. He says that the techniques or 'tricks' that this power utilises have an underground nature and are rarely a conscious phenomenon. He elaborated further in saying that the disguise is necessary because it operates in relation to certain knowledges that are assigned a 'truth' status and that will bring about preferred outcomes or descriptions, such as relevance, multicultural sensitivity, liberation, oppression and so forth. These descriptions of preferred ways of being are illusory and prescribe people's lives, relationships and ways of being (White, 1994). Even more devious of power is that people do not see these prescriptions as the effects of a powerful discourse, but rather as the effect of personal needs and wants. This is what Foucault refers to as technologies of the self (White, 1995). "These truths are 'normalising' in the sense that they construct norms around which persons are encouraged to shape and constitute their lives" (White & Epston, 1990, p. 19). In the context of the study, the construction of 'norms' might refer to characteristics of trainers, trainees and training environments such as cultural sensitivity and flexibility.

Foucault's view of the power of discourses has serious implications for both psychologists and researchers alike. It implies that we live our lives according to the prescriptions of the dominant knowledges of our culture. This revelation has further implications, for example, for our ideas about multiculturalism, therapeutic training, oppression, gender related issues, race, which makes research and change tricky concepts to practically achieve. Foucault argues that the mechanism of power of discourse subjugates people and recruits them into activities that support the spread of global and universal knowledges (Flaskas & Humphreys, 1993; White & Epston, 1990) to the detriment of local knowledges. For example, psychology is a universal practice but in South Africa we are keenly aware of culturally bound disorders, such as Ukuthuwasa (see chapter 1).

This brings to mind the link between the techniques of power and the techniques of social control, techniques that "objectify" people. These techniques enhance the power positions available within hegemonic discourse. For example, Hruby (2001) points out that socially constructed meanings are often taken at face value by members of a community. Therefore we are all caught up in this web of

power/knowledge and it is not possible to escape it (Brown & Strega, 2005; White & Epston, 1990). In the study participants show how they are embedded in the web of power/knowledge while simultaneously resisting it. We are simultaneously undergoing the effects of the power of discourses and exercising this power in relation to others while reinforcing or opposing it. Thus power is intensely interactional:

Power cannot be seen as something in itself, but rather [it] 'shows itself' through the evidence that can be found in everyday interactions, in institutionalized social practices, in discourses, in the objects that are chosen for study, in the knowledges that come to exist, and in the subjectivities, or the ways we are able to think about 'the person'. (Flaskas & Humphreys, 1993, p. 40)

In this study I aim to tap into these everyday interactions to expose the power relationships and how these affect the dominant discourses at play.

What is explicitly present in the above discussion is power, because knowledge is assumed to be discursive. Knowledge is therefore never disinterested in or neutral about power; it is productive of power and produced by power. Power and knowledge directly imply one another: there is no power relation without knowledge (Foucault, 1972). "Knowledge disputes are also power struggles, and power struggles are also about which/whose version of knowledge will prevail" (Brown & Strega, 2005, p. 226). Thus building on Brown and Strega (2005), knowledge that does not fit the accepted regimes of truth can be viewed as power struggles. For example the relevance debate in psychology (See chapter 2). Various versions of what is relevant for the profession of psychology are proposed as well as versions of how to obtain these proposals. However, proposals are made from power positions, as power moves, and thus the power struggle ensues. Thus power is co-extensive with knowledge and exists in a reciprocal relationship. Knowledge is therefore not discovered but is a product of discourse and power relations, "a discursive struggle over which (and whose) perspective or understanding to organise relations" (Brown & Strega, 2005, p. 218). Or as Ramazanoglu (1993) stated "there is no single truth... but many different truths situated in different discourses, some of which are more powerful than others" (p. 21). Ramazanoglu reminds me here that this study is situated within a discursive network that proposes truth and knowledge to be available in various contexts. For example in the training institution but also in the communities trainees serve. This is an example of how discourses deny their bias. Discourses aim to reinforce themselves as being the 'truth'.

Gunew (1990) stated that “power is reproduced in discursive networks at every point where someone who ‘knows’ is instructing someone who doesn’t know” (p. 23). The discursive networks in a HWU are no different. The trainer ‘knows’ and is instructing the trainee who ‘does not know’. The discursive network further contrasts dramatically with the models of training in the profession of psychology. The scientist-practitioner model (See chapter 2) proposes training to be done in training institutions and only after knowledge has been acquired can the training move to the experiential, thereby perpetuating the idea of knowledge being housed in the ‘powerful’ institution and not in the client base. However, Weedon (1997) stated that most discourses “deny their own partiality. They fail to acknowledge that they are but possible versions of meaning rather than ‘truth’ itself and that they represent particular interests” (p. 94). Discourses do this by noticing and valuing certain knowledges and excluding and obscuring others. Discourse organises social relations as power relations and simultaneously masks these workings of power (Brown & Strega, 2005). Therefore discourse is not only legitimised in words, text and language, but also through the constitution of relationships and of the self in relationship. Mills (as cited in Brown & Strega, 2005) offered the following explanation: “discourse is a set of sanctioned statements which have some institutionalised force, which means that they have a profound influence on the way individuals act and think” (p. 62). Sanctioning is discursive, as can be seen, for example, from the various inputs from media, from what is taught in the lecture room, through to the consequences felt by those attempting to circulate an unsanctioned discourse. As Usher (1997) noted, “not only does discourse permit certain statements to be regarded as the truth but the rules which govern a discourse also determine who may speak, what conventions they need to use and with what authority they may speak” (p. 48).

Hegemonic discourses and subjugated or illegitimate discourses are produced by processes such as including or excluding, and valuing or devaluing certain concepts, ideas, language and words (Brown & Strega, 2005). Brown and Strega (2005) went further to say that discourses promote, reflect and make alliances with discourses in power, and are able to conceal their partiality. But processes of exclusion make discourse vulnerable. “The gaps, silences and ambiguities of discourses provide the possibility of resistance, for questioning of dominant discourse, its revision and mutation” (Heckman, 1990, p. 189). They also provide the landscape for alternative, oppositional and counter discourses to emerge. It is at this level this study aims to enter the discursive network and reveal alternate and counter discourses.

Subjugated knowledges (Brown & Strega, 2005) and the possibility of other truths that can break free of hegemonic discourse are of great interest to me in this study. Therefore I highlight discourse processes of including, excluding, valuing and devaluing, as discourse becomes vulnerable to change. However, the conundrum is presented that the more we know about these dominant discourses practices, the harder it becomes to change them. The study then aims to develop a sufficiently strong counter discourse or alternatively many smaller counter discourses that ultimately may assist in a process change within this discursive context. Discourses serve to construct, sustain and change institutional and societal structures (Chick, 2014). My interest in discourse has been stimulated by my experience of the dramatic socio-political changes that accompanied the demise of apartheid South Africa and gave birth to the growth of a non-racial democracy. Discourse and constructions are powerful structures, as they position us all as social actors. Larkin (2004) explains that social actors have the choice of more than one discourse or construction in order to account for themselves. To conceive of this as agency, once conformity is abandoned, is to think of subjects being aware of different ways in which they are made subject. Thus in questioning who takes up the act of authorship? And in speaking and writing in ways that are disruptive of current discourses that ultimately lead to the creation of new subject positions (Davies, 1991). Thus they choose which preferred position to take up and draw upon preferred discourses. For me I chose the preferred position that resists the hegemonic discourses prevailing in this HWU. It is important to remember that the resulting position has consequences. Some chosen positions warrant a voice and some do not (Larkin, 2004). For example, the minority often remains voiceless and marginalised. In the study I am cognizant of the speakers taking up new positions that may result in consequences that cause them distress or discomfort. But as Parker (1992) argued,

To identify a discourse is to take a position, and the ability to step outside a discourse and to label it in a particular way is a function of both the accessing of the dominant cultural meaning and the marginal (critical) position which the reader takes (within or alongside another discourse or sub-culture or 'common sense') (p. 33).

Thus I set out to identify the dominant discourses and therefore take a position and work towards constructing new meanings and more alternative subject positions for the future.

3.4 Theory and its methodological implications: Seeking critical awareness of discourse

Through the process of deconstruction, the constructions regarding multicultural training in the South African context can be further unpacked. In unpacking the constructions, as a researcher and narrative therapist (White, 1992), I hope to be able to create a pocket of resistance against the dominant discourses prevalent in the hegemonic discourses of multicultural training. Deconstructing dominant discourses may expose the power relations implied in those discourses and bring about changes in the field of multiculturalism and change the exposure that psychologists receive. As a social constructionist it is important to not only consider the constructions gained from the interview text but also to describe the power relations of the discourses in which the constructions are embedded. According to Stead and Bakker (2010), discourse analysis can be employed to deconstruct the prevailing academic discourses of psychology and provide different and innovative ways of understanding it, through identifying discursive constructions and determining the positions made available by discourses.

3.5 Discourse analysis

“[Discourse analysis] is a form of analysis that addresses the ways in which language is so structured as to produce sets of meanings, discourses, that operate independently of the intentions of speakers or writers” (Parker, 1992, p. 92). Discourse analysis looks “beyond the meanings intended by speakers in seeking to identify discursive effects that might otherwise remain concealed” (Crocket, 2010, p. 102). In a research process, discourse analysis can happen at various stages. It can inform preparation, it can be a task attempted in the data gathering as well as a major focus in the data analysis (Crocket, 2010). The approach I brought to discourse analysis was informed by ideas around deconstruction.

In this study I use discourse analysis as methodology. I make use of both streams of discourse analysis, namely discursive psychology and Foucauldian discourse analysis. Van Dijk (1999) mentions that discourse analysis looks into “the way social power abuse, dominance and inequality are enacted, reproduced and resisted by text and talk in social and political context” (p. 353). In the section below I explain my position with regards to discursive psychology and Foucauldian discourse analysis. On a methodological level, I make use of an additional discursive tool, that of deconstruction. The section below explores these three overlapping analysis processes undertaken in the methodology of the study.

These two approaches to discourse analysis, namely discursive psychology and Foucauldian discourse analysis, share important features, as described by Willig (2013). Some researchers argue that they are complementary (Potter & Wetherell, 1995; Wetherell, 2001), but in recent years these two approaches have become differentiated (Willig, 2013). Kress (1985) argued that rather than being concerned only with its form and structure, discourse analysis also deals with the content, function and social significance of language. In South Africa, Macleod (2002) provided an account in which she drew together various aspects in diverse approaches to discourse analysis, emphasizing “that there is no definitive method of discourse analysis, and therefore any methodological discussion or practice contributes to the constant construction and re-production of the intellectual research activity called ‘discourse analysis’” (p. 17).

Deconstruction is primarily a poststructuralist tool. Poststructuralist deconstruction is a useful tool in analyses that attempt to illustrate how categories are constructed to appear natural, neutral and fixed, yet are deployed to create and recreate exclusions and marginalisations in the service of particular political aims (Hepburn, 2000). To this end the principles of deconstruction proposed by poststructuralist theorist Derrida have proven useful to poststructuralist feminist theorists (Hepburn, 1999) and anti-oppressive researchers (Brown & Strega, 2005).

3.5.1 Discursive psychology.

In discursive psychology, what is attributed as constructions are social acts that happen and are expressed in language. Knowing, in a discursive sense, is therefore attributed with an evaluation of information regarding what is being spoken about. What is shared then as a ‘fact’ is done so on the basis of conversational practices of articulation, countering and verification (Lock & Strong, 2010) Inner experiences become reflected in the outer experiences of those involved in these conversational practices. The process in which inner experiences are accomplished is therefore shaped within the to and fro conversational activity. According to discursive psychologists, all such constructs need to be examined in the light of their relational performance and relevance. “Billig further contends that our thinking is shaped by how we anticipate it will perform for us in the conversational interaction with others where we might put such thinking to use” (Lock & Strong, 2010, p. 288). Thus our private thoughts are shaped by how we conceptualized making them public, in other words we incorporate the anticipated arguments and responses of others into how we think. Billig (1988) proposed that our thoughts are shaped by how we feel others would receive them. In summary, discursive psychology is a conversational

accomplishment, and any claim to fact or objectivity relies on particular conventions and conversational practices (Edwards, Ashmore & Potter, 1995; Potter, 1996). However, Parker (1992) contended that not all constructions are equal, such as cultural considerations in the creation of constructions. For example, people would use particular conversational practices to dominate conversations. For Parker this includes the idea of discourse. But discursive psychology puts forward that some realities are more real than others. Their constructionist view points towards dominant constructions being accessible for contestation as the following quote suggests:

What we are left here is not a world devoid of meaning and value ...but precisely the reversed. It is foregrounding of meanings and values, to be argued, altered, defended and invented; including even the metavalue that some of these meanings and values may profitably be declared universal, and even self-evident ('We hold these truths to be self-evident...'). Self-evidence here is the outcome rather than the denial of argumentation (Edwards, Ashmore & Potter, 1995, p. 36).

Accepting a discursive view that things can be talked about and understood differently, for those doing the different kind of talking and understanding is an uncommon stance to take on in relational practice (Lock & Strong, 2010). This brings to light issues on how to communicate to bridge differences in understanding and ways of talking; and as to which ways of understanding and talking should inform practice. Conversational partners therefore have to be mindful of differences in meaning, of what might be taken-for-granted understandings and of how even the language that we are trained in might further other forms of cultural dominance (Lock & Strong, 2010).

Discursive psychology sees conversation as a means of orienting to the discursive uniqueness of the speaker's way of talking about and understanding experience. The challenge lies in listening to how language is used to present experience and how the conversation is performed. Therefore the dominance of a problem discourse relies on its unquestioned use and lack of consideration for alternatives. Finally discursive psychology shows us how "steeped most of us are in psychologized views of relational practices" (Lock & Strong, 2010, p. 292). We relate to each other on the basis of what is socially observable to us. Discursive psychology challenges psychological discourse to turn its focus inwards, because our cognitions are made evident to us through talking, writing and the non-verbal references we make from others' responses to us.

We are concerned with the nature of knowledge, cognition and reality: with how events are described and explained, how factual reports are constructed, how cognitive states are attributes. These are defined as discursive topics, things people topicalize or orientate themselves to, or imply, in their discourse. And rather than seeing such discursive constructions as expressions of speakers' underlying cognitive states, they are examined in the context of their occurrence as situated and occasioned constructions whose precise nature makes sense, to participants and analysts alike, in terms of the social actions those descriptions accomplish (Edwards & Potter, 1992, p. 2).

Thus discursive psychology says we should look at our interactions with others on the basis of 'the stuff' that we elicit and then make inferences from. The stuff of our inner beings is then bound up in discursive processes. "Emotions, thoughts, attitudes and so on do not emanate from within us, irrespective of the culturally available languages and social interactions in which we come to understand and talk about them" (Lock & Strong, 2010, p. 292).

Discursive psychology sets out to answer: "How do participants use language to manage stake in social interactions?" (Willig, 2013, p. 139). According to Willig (2013), in discursive psychology the analysis is focused on how participants use discursive resources and with which effect, hence paying attention to the "action orientation of talk" (p. 117). Discursive analysts identify discursive strategies, such as disclaiming or footing, and explore how these function within a discursive context (Graham, 2005; Macleod, 2002). Willig (2013) suggested we look out for the socially performative functions of utilising discursive resources and not simply read for the referential content of the text. Discursive resources include interpretative repertoires (Potter & Wetherell, 1992) used to construct social reality and rhetorical devices to manage social and personal interests. These can include metaphors, analogies, direct quotations, extreme and graphic illustrations and disclaimers (Potter & Wetherell, 1992; Willig, 2013). Potter and Wetherell (1992) define interpretative repertoire as a "recurrently used system of terms used by characterizing and evaluating actions, events and other phenomena [...which] is constituted through a limited range of terms used in particular stylistic and grammatical constructions" (p. 149).

In the context of this study, it remains important not only to understand the production of specific interests through language, but also to analyse the rhetorical strategies that may be used in interactional processes relating to subject positionality.

3.5.2 Foucauldian discourse analysis.

In contrast to discursive psychology, Foucauldian discourse analysis sees discourse as constitutive and productive as well as inter-dependent on and historically located in practices in society and its institutions (Stevens, 2008). Foucauldian discourse analysis is concerned with language and its part in the creation of social and psychological life (Willig, 2013). Willig further explained that discourses are seen to facilitate and limit, enable and constrain what can be said and by whom, where and when. Researchers focus on the availability of discursive resources in culture. Discourse makes available “certain ways of seeing the world and certain ways of being in the world” (Willig, 2013, p. 130). Discourse offers subject positions, which in turn offer subjectivity and experience.

Foucauldian discourse analysts are also interested in the role of discourse in wider social processes of legitimation and power (see 3.4.3). Foucauldian discourse analysis also pays attention to the relationship between discourses and institutions (Foucault, 1980). Discourses are seen to be institutional practices, for example ways of organizing, regulating and administering the very structures that support and validate the discourses. Foucauldian analysis seeks to answer “What characterizes the discursive worlds people inhabit and what are the implications for possible ways-of-being?” (Willig, 2013, p. 139).

Willig (2013) noted that “the Foucauldian version is concerned with language and language use, however it’s interested in how language takes it beyond the immediate context in which language is used by speaking subjects” (p. 130), whereas discursive psychology is concerned with how language is used in interpersonal communication. Willig went further to explain that Foucauldian discourse analysis therefore questions the relationship between discourse and how people think or feel (subjectivity), what they may do (practice) and the context in which this is occurring. In the study, the language used by the subjects in the interview text is analysed from a broader situated position, including constructions of power, historical situatedness and so forth, thus the local discursive context of the study is analysed from the wider perspective of the discursive landscape of multiculturalism in South Africa. Therefore I move between the local and specific to the broader context of South Africa as a country in transition from apartheid to post-apartheid.

The third tool I make use of in the methodology of this study is deconstruction and externalisation.

3.5.3 Deconstruction and externalisation as research practises.

Deconstruction is central to the work of Derrida (1976; 1978). The writings of Lather (1991, 1992), Spivak (1976), Sampson (1989) and Pryor (2008) have informed how I make use of this tool.

Sampson (1989) suggested that

Deconstruction sets his task and poses the dilemma. To deconstruct is to undo, not to destroy: to undo what Derrida sees to be a tradition that has dominated Western thought since early Greek philosophy and which lies at the very roots of our commonsense understanding. The dilemma is that the tools used to deconstruct this tradition come from that very tradition (p. 7).

Deconstruction therefore challenges the commonsense understandings and the location of practice in Western philosophical tradition and has tradition as its main focus. Lather (1992) wrote that the goal of deconstruction is “to keep things in process, to disrupt, to keep the system in play, to set up procedures to continually demystify the realities we create” (p. 96).

According to Crocket (2010), deconstruction challenges the permanence of institutions, structures and texts, through uncovering the unacknowledged effects of powerful discourses on individuals and groups alike.

A certain view of the world, of consciousness and of language has been accepted as the correct one, and if the minute particulars of that view are examined a rather different picture (that is also a non-picture...) emerges. (Spivak, 1998, p. xiii)

Derrida’s view of deconstruction is that it happens within the text (Derrida, 1997). Derrida describes that he brings forth the deconstruction that is already present within the text, because each text holds within it what it is not. “Any definition is formed in relation to what it is not” (Crocket, 2010, p. 30).

Derrida (1976) noted that deconstructing discourse is a process of “explicitly and systematically posing the problem of the status of a discourse which borrows from a heritage the resources necessary for the deconstruction of that heritage itself” (p. 289). One cannot escape from the heritage one is attempting to deconstruct and instead has to draw on the heritage itself for the tools to disrupt it. By lifting out aspects of the text that are made invisible by the dominant constructions organising the text, the seemingly natural and neutral logic of the text is disrupted (Hepburn, 2000). In this sense deconstruction is an approach to texts that allows us to trouble

the claims to truth made by texts while acknowledging that we cannot step outside of the understandings that inform those claims (Hepburn, 1999).

It should be emphasised that deconstruction does not imply a simple erasure of linguistic categories.

To deconstruct the subject is not to negate or throw away the concept; on the contrary, deconstruction implies only that we suspend all commitments to that which the term 'the subject' refers, and that we consider the linguistic function it serves in the consolidation and concealment of authority (Butler, 1995, p. 49).

Deconstruction attends to how terms are used in different contexts and what effects their uses have (Butler, 1995). Through deconstruction the terms used to construct subjectivity, such as "blackness" or "whiteness", can be subverted and redeployed in different ways and in the service of different political objectives (Hepburn, 2000).

Deconstruction, according to Derrida, has two main tools, namely *sous rapture* and *différance*.

Sous rapture translates as 'under erasure'. Sampson (1989) describes *sous rapture* as a device that requires that a word be crossed out to indicate that it cannot be used and when written not crossed out to indicate that it is needed. In my understanding *sous rapture* links to ideas around 'troubling' as used in the feminist poststructural writing of Davies (1991; 1998) and Lather (2007). For Davies research sets out with the "troubling of those knowledges that have been taken to be certain and secure" (p. 4). For Crocket (2010), "knowledges that have been 'troubled' are treated in a similar manner as those placed under erasure: their certainty is challenged although they also persist" (p. 31).

Différance stands for 'difference and deferral'.

Derrida argues that in whatever we take to be immediate and present there is always absence, difference and deferral. If presence always contains absence there cannot be a neatly drawn line of opposition between these two notions. It is not that presence and absence of opposites, not that *either* presence *or* absence, but rather that there is an inevitable defining of the one through the other: there is both presence and absence; absence inhabits and interpenetrates with presence (Sampson, 1989, p. 11).

Therefore for Derrida, any meaning is established through a process of comparison or establishment of the difference between this meaning and another (Crocket, 2010). "Meanings thus emerge from the basis in difference rather than an essence"

(Sampson, 1989, p. 11). Thus each word or text contains an element of what it is not, or of what is not present. “Derrida argues that what we presume to be present (speech and the voice) is constituted through something that is a not-present difference” (Sampson, 1989, p. 10).

In this study I suggest that each meaning that is produced evokes in some way one of many other meanings. The relation between the meaning produced and the other(s) evoked is one of difference. A discourse of post-apartheid, for instance, draws meaning from other discourses, such as apartheid discourses. To take a post-apartheid stance is to take a stance that is defined with reference to an apartheid stance.

Deconstruction resembles Foucauldian ideas of discourse. Deconstruction and Foucauldian discourse put forward the notions of undecidability or impossibility as preconditions of meaning. Deconstruction offers a critical but not destructive approach to the consideration of experience (Crocket, 2010). Similarly to Crocket (2010), my approach to deconstruction emphasises deconstruction as responsibility. Crocket goes further to say that this responsibility is extended towards participants and the possibility that their story may also have expression in terms which are not familiar to those participants.

This has entailed risking that what the testimonial subject can give is what we need instead of what we think we want: not her truth delivered to us in a familiar framework but the truth of the play of frames and dynamics of presences, absences and traces as all we have in the undecidability of history (Lather, 2001, p. 148).

In this study 27 participants are ‘testimonial subjects’ who I have invited to share their story and to enter into the deconstruction process. The findings therefore included these stories, and reflections of meanings (presences, absences and traces) that I continued to deconstruct within the process of discursive psychology and Foucauldian discourse analysis. Therefore in the study deconstruction was used as a research practice, alongside discursive psychology and Foucauldian discourse analysis. Deconstruction could also inform the process of multicultural training in the HWU, in that it allows for counter discourse to be developed (Drewery & Winslade, 1997; White, 1994; 2007). Deconstructive discourse analysis aims at “undermining the revelation of essence, de-stabilising meaning as presence, and disrupting dominant, taken-for-granted notions of a subject” (Macleod, 2002, p. 8). By troubling the hegemonic discourse present in the HWU, various options of meaning become

available. In so doing, various position options also become available. New positions might mean new ways of interacting with the discursive context and thus ultimately can bring about change to the discursive context itself. The move towards alternate ways of relating to discourse provides new avenues for meaning-making and challenges the institutional culture of the HWU.

Deconstruction is also central to the work of White (1994), a narrative therapist, in deconstructing practices of power and knowledge practices. White uses deconstruction to objectify practices of power - "familiar and taken-for-granted practices of power" (p. 126). This form of deconstruction is achieved by engaging in externalising conversations (see paragraph underneath). White states that "as these practices of power are unmasked, it becomes possible for persons to take a position on them, and to counter the influence these practices have in their lives and relationships" (p. 140). He also uses deconstruction to unmask knowledge practices in stating "the professional disciplines have been successful in the development of language practices and techniques that determine that it is those disciplines that have access to the "truth" of the world". These 'truths' are held by those in professional disciplines and their members are assumed to have an "unbiased and objective" (p. 140) account of reality and of human nature. Narrative therapists contribute to the process of deconstruction of knowledge practice in deconstructing the 'expert' within the therapeutic relationship. These therapists engage in co-authoring (Madigan, 2010; White, 2007) and co-creation of preferred realities, knowledges and practices. They undermine the idea of privileged access to the 'truth'. Therefore White uses deconstruction to trouble dominant views of 'truth', knowledge and 'appropriate' practice within the field of psychology.

I now turn my discussion specifically to externalisation as a research practice. In the chapter named "Deconstruction and Therapy" White (1994), provides the link between deconstruction and externalisation within narrative therapy. White states that "for the deconstruction of the stories that persons live by, I have proposed the objectification of the problems for which persons seek therapy" (p. 126). He goes on to state that this process of objectification "engages the person in externalizing conversations in relation to that which they find problematic, rather than internalizing conversations" (p. 126). These externalising conversations generate what White calls "counter language" (p. 126) and Epston calls "anti-language" (p. 126). In externalising problem discourses, participants in the study and psychologists in general, are able to identify alternate discourses and cultural knowledges that they live by to guide them and use these to speak to their identity. White goes on to explain how these

types of conversations assist people over time to unravel the constitution of their self and their relationships. Externalizing conversations have a special character. By giving the problem a name, it is given a life of its own, and is often cast as recruiting the client to its cause (White & Epston, 1990). Often, problems are situated in dominant discourses, which calls for a special kind of deconstruction: the examination of the influences of cultural truths in the origin of the problem.

Proponents of narrative therapy argue that this approach is ideal for use with individuals from diverse backgrounds. Payne (2000) opines that even though she assumes that most current psychotherapy approaches are anti-isms (for example, racism, sexism, classism, heterosexism, and so forth), “the emphasis in narrative therapy on the need for continual vigilance against the more subtle manifestations of these elements is particularly consistent and emphatic” (p. 31). Semmler and Williams (2002) suggest that narrative therapist’s emphasis on the socially constructed nature of problems allows for the externalization of problems such as racism, which might otherwise be internalized by clients. They also point out that dominant cultural stories often diverge from those of individuals who are of minority groups, and worse, can have negative effects on them. Deconstructing these dominant narratives can help clients identify with the prized aspects of their own cultures.

Externalisation supports people to provide an account of the effects of problem narratives in their lives. When people engage in externalisation, their problem stories cease to speak to them of their identity, of ‘truth’ and people experience themselves as separate from the problem narrative. In this separate space from the problem narrative, people are free to explore alternative and preferred knowledges of who they might be. In this study I also attempted to externalize some of the dominant discourses as a vehicle towards deconstruction.

I move now to exploring positioning theory and agency and position calls as these provide further elaboration on the theoretical background of the study.

3.6 Positioning theory, agency and position calls

Positioning theory, agency and position calls are central to the discussion of theory and to the findings of this study. With regard to the theoretical discussion, discourse makes various subject positions available to participants. Participants are then mobilised to either deny or emphasise how their positioning affects their meaning

making within a discursive context, that is the participants position themselves in discourse and discourse positions subjects such as the participants and the researcher. Participants were positioned within the discursive context of the HWU in a variety of ways. These ways demonstrate the operation and effects that the various dominant discourses had on the participants. They also allude to the ways in which these hegemonic discourses might be challenged.

3.6.1 Positioning theory.

Positioning theory (Davies & Harré, 1999; Van Langenhoven & Harré, 1991; Willig, 2013) arose as a contribution to cognitive psychology. In this study I chose to follow the theoretical understanding of positioning as proposed by Davies and Harré (1999). Davies and Harré (1999; Van Langenhoven & Harré, 1991) defined positioning theory as offering an alternative to the concept of role in analysing the ways in which personhood shapes and is shaped in human interactions. This theory offers a way of understanding the interface between discourse and the person in the moment-by-moment performance of relational subjectivity (Crocket, 2010; Drewery, 2005). Therefore “positioning is a discursive effect” (Crocket, 2010, p. 35). Crocket goes on to say that it occurs in the context of discourse and its effects are in relation to those discourses invoked in and productive of a particular conversation. Van Langenhoven and Harré (1991) identified positioning effects that occur in conversations. “Whenever somebody positions him/herself, this discursive act always implies a positioning of the one who is addressed” (p. 398).

Three forms of positioning are mentioned.

First order positioning happens when an utterance by one person in a conversation positions one or both persons. If the response of the second person challenges this positioning and the first order positioning has to be regenerated then this response is second order positioning, when positioning in one conversation is reported elsewhere this is both third order positioning and rhetorical redescription (Crocket, 2010, p. 36).

In this study conversations reported on are centred around recollections of training and multiculturalism, and are therefore both third order positioning and rhetorical redescription. They evolve from participants reporting on positioning in other conversations and contextualising the earlier conversations in a broader discursive framework.

In any interaction each speaker offers the other a subject position in terms of at least one presenting discourse. This position may or may not be taken up by the other

speaker. The position call may not be recognised as intended by either speaker (Davies & Harré, 1999). In the research process this supposition may be challenged in that the researcher seeks to position themselves in a manner that enables them to engage 'appropriately' in the interview context. And in so doing positions the participants in a space which enables them to engage with the interview relationship. In this study each moment in the interview context, and indeed within the discursive context of the HWU itself as well as in multicultural training, was produced by the operation of one or more discourses. This study further looked into whether a discourse-aware trainer or trainee would be able to recognise position calls made on them within the discursive context of the HWU and be able to accept or refuse such positioning. I was also interested in discursive effects that occur outside of the interview context and therefore enquired about significant discursive positionings or position calls that were attributable to either of the speakers, researcher or participant, by the broader context. According to Lock and Strong (2010), positioning is a generative concept when extended to helping practices. This implies a discursive situatedness. Positioning can constrain thought and action in particular language games.

Davies and Harré (1999) placed these activities within the framework of rights, duties and obligations. These vary in terms of the features of the discursively constructed situations in which interactions are conducted and in the ways in which etiquette is handled (Lock & Strong, 2010). Lock and Strong (2010) said that people 'position' themselves differently in different situations. Positions are context specific, can be changed, accepted and defended, and taken up and left behind in the moment-to-moment conduct of interaction. Positioning is also situated within a large political and ideological discursive context. The positions made available by dominant discourse are those that often reinforce and support the hegemonic views of these dominant discourses. Discursive contexts put forward consequences in the interplay of speaker and listener, in which the speaker and listener need to position themselves. These repositioning calls can often lead to changes in the discursive context. If the changes are significant enough, counter discourses might be uncovered.

Therefore I view positioning theory as a way of unpacking the interplay between rights, duties and obligations. These constructs have moral categories and are therefore political in nature. The consequence is that the social reality and the judgements we make about it are always open to numerous interpretations. Social events therefore have a multiplicity of alternative, possible and ongoing consequences to which one needs to position oneself. Positions, social restructurings

and stories intertwine and co-constitute each other. Change is made possible by these intertwinings. New positions are opened up and changes in power relations between people are constructed. In reference to the study, I view this research as being political in nature, in so far as it sets out to challenge dominant status quos and thus may have consequences which will result in the participants and myself having to reposition ourselves within the discursive landscape of multicultural training in the South African context and specifically in the context of this HWU. This means that changes in power relations between people are constructed in the research which make new counter discourses possible.

The hegemony of the dominant worldview is more than just one way to view the world; it is successfully positioned as the most legitimate way to view the world (Brown & Strega, 2005). Who then is entitled or allowed to create meanings about the world? How do race, gender and class factor into this? For indigenous researchers, “research [is] a significant site of struggle between the interest and ways of knowing of the West and the interests and ways of resisting of the Other” (Tuhawai Smith, 2001, p. 2). This standpoint is similar to the one taken in this study, where the research is seen as being the means of troubling the dominant Western discourses of psychology and the search for the interest in and ways of accepting other forms of psychological discourse.

The first set of problems is concerned with... issues like who writes [about] or studies [the Other], in what institutional or discursive setting, for what audience, and with what ends in mind, the second set of problems [focuses on]... How the production of knowledge best serves communal, as opposed to sectarian, ends, how knowledge that is nondominative and noncoercive can be produced in a setting that is deeply inscribed with the politics, the considerations, and the strategies of power (Said, 1991, p. 36).

Positioning theory also points to the efforts people make to resist and refuse discursive positions they are called into in conversation and in the narration of stories. Foucault (1988) sought to decentre the position of the individual in the authorship of his or her own life and to place the focus on the work done by and through discourse. Social constructionist writers (Burr, 1995; White, 1994) have a vision of a self that is multiply located in competing stories, and produced over and over again in the process of interaction, in discourse, rather than proceeding out of a programmed inner core. The question then arises of how counsellors, and researchers, work with the consciousness of the effects of pervasive social discourses and at the same time attend to the particulars of personal experience.

Davies and Harré (1990) suggested that discursive positioning gives us leverage in addressing the local and particular experiences without losing sight of powerful social discourses in which subjectivity is constructed. It is in this relationship between the personal and the social that people construct their lives (Kristeva, 1986). There are therefore implications for training from this position. For example, the discourses of decolonisation and multiculturalism have developed to contest the dominance of the discourse of Eurocentric superiority. Training thus needs to provide avenues for the development of these positions of resistance to the power of dominant discourse and to craft a viable position for change. So while a discourse cannot be changed in one conversation, positioning within a discourse can change (Winslade, 2005). From this perspective the purpose of counselling and research is always political since it is always about taking a stance in a contest for privilege status of particular meanings.

3.6.2 Agency.

Davies and Harré (1990) describe how the narrator in a positioning tale uncovers the characters' position options. I draw from his discussion of positioning theory and unpack the concept of agency further. According to Hook (2004), agency is a "theoretical term used to convey the belief that an individual has the capacity of *intention* – thus through rational thought, free will, motivation or emotion, to direct their behaviour or to make particular choices" (p. 515). Davies (1991) sees agency as being synonymous with being a person and "used interchangeably with such concepts as freedom, autonomy, rationality and moral authority" (p. 42). In the poststructural sense agency is

spoken into existence at any one moment. It is fragmented, transitory, a discursive position that can be occupied in one discourse simultaneously with its non-occupation in another. Within current ways of speaking it is readily obtainable for some and an almost inaccessible positioning for others (Davies, 1991, p. 52).

Here Davies brought in the position of all speakers. She quoted Maria Lugones on the implications of racism for agency within this humanistic thinking:

The difficulty of forming intentions that are not formed in the mind of the racist; the difficulty of carrying out one's intentions within hostile meaning systems, some of which do not even countenance such intentions; the difficulty of trusting the success of one's intentions within hostile meaning systems (given that some of the time, 'success' just may amount to not being taken seriously) (Lugones as cited in Davies, 1991, p. 45).

Lugones explains how difficult it can be to experience agency when a racist 'other' negatively defines so much of a person's experience (Crocket, 2010).

In poststructuralist reading of Davies, agency is tightly linked to positioning. Subjects are offering varying degrees of agency within interactions. An agentive position (Burr, 2003) offers a subject varying degrees of agency from none through to limited agency. Davies and Harré (1990) argue for a "productive interrelationship between 'position' and 'illocutionary' force". In terms of this research the position that the researcher needs to be able to occupy in order to facilitate the research process must also offer the participant at least some degree of agency. Without both parties experiencing agency, the interview and research process cannot take place.

In this study the construct of agency was actively sought out to thicken (White, 1997) the constructions presented in the interview text and to describe agency implied by the different discourses.

3.6.3 Position calls.

Drewery and Winslade (1997) introduced the term 'position call'. The subject positions here are seen as being the same as the position call. Winslade and Drewery have, separately, taken the concept of position call further. Winslade (2005) wrote about 'utilising discursive positioning in counselling' where he focused on how a counsellor could work with a client.

A counsellor can assist a person to negotiate a positioning shift within a discursive field of play to significantly re-shape the negative effects of a problem and to open up new possibilities for living based on positions of resistance (p. 357).

In this article Winslade sees positioning as a resource that the counsellor may have when working with a client. Crocket (2010) cautions that Winslade does not see the problematic position calls that a counsellor may be faced with in cross-cultural counselling conversations, as the case would be in South Africa with its diverse and multicultural context. Drewery (2005) explored the position calls and the production of subjectivity in everyday speech and narrative therapy. She wrote: "Viewing subjectivity as a product of discursive interaction opens a variety of possibilities for the ways one can receive the call, give the call, resist the call, change the call" (p. 316).

She also considered the importance of the practitioner's stance, noting the potential "coercive control through language by some professionals" (p. 318), and then argued

that therapists can by “focusing on the constitutive effects of discourse [open] potent possibilities for psychological theory and practice” (p. 318). Researchers and trainers, in a similar fashion to therapists, can be

discourse users whose sensitivity to language is brought into service to invite their clients into an agentic position in relation to the problem with which they are concerned. The expertise of the therapist is no longer related to knowledge of essentialised or problematized selves and diagnoses, but instead relates to positions taken up and the ongoing production of relational subjectivity in the complex narratives of our lives (p. 318).

In this description, Drewery provided some theoretical grounding for this study that seeks to understand how attainable it is for trainers and trainees to bring a sensitivity of language to the praxis of psychology through attention to discursive positioning. Therefore, I, as the researcher will be discursively positioned in the research context, accompanied by optimism, that taking a moral stance and still displaying openness while in that position will offer myself and the participants new ways in which to move.

3.7 Conclusion

This chapter set out to describe social constructionism as the key poststructural paradigm for this study. It also serves as a background to the development of the method and the approach to the data analysis. A discussion concerning language, discourse, power and agency was opened. The chapter included a description of discursive psychology, Foucauldian discourse analysis and deconstruction as methodology. The chapter ended with positioning theory, agency and position calls being explored.

Chapter Four

Research Approach

In this chapter I set out to describe the research approach of the study. The discussion extends to the details of the research design, data collection and builds on from the discourse analysis discussion from chapter 3. The research was conducted from a qualitative methodological position and used social constructionism as a lens with which the training situation and multiculturalism were understood (See chapter 2).

4.1 Research question

The following broad research question was used in the study, in order to provide some degree of focus for the researcher and for facilitating participant discussion.

- How is multicultural training constructed within the clinical and counselling psychology Masters therapeutic training at a HWU?

4.2 Objectives of the study

The study had the following specific objectives:

- to describe the nature of the participants' constructions regarding multiculturalism present within the discursive landscape of a HWU;
- to describe the larger social discourses informing these constructions;
- to highlight the effects these discourses have on the discursive context of a HWU and on the participants themselves in terms of positioning, resistance and agency;
- to apply deconstruction and externalisation as research practices within this discursive context to trouble the dominant discourses and subject positions made available;
- to explore the discursive landscape within which the constructs of multiculturalism and therapeutic training are housed at a HWU;
- in so doing, to contribute new knowledge to an existing body of knowledge regarding the current situation on multiculturalism within training programmes.

In the next sections I discuss research as resistance and my move towards a research methodology that works against discourses of domination. The name, research as resistance, is borrowed from a book entitled. "Research as resistance critical, indigenous and anti-oppressive approaches" (Brown & Strega, 2005). The name resonated with me as a researcher, because in doing this research, I take a

position of active resistance against the perceived and dominant discourses that are present within this HWU.

4.3 Research as resistance

This research endeavour is located within emancipatory and deconstructive research traditions, which may be viewed as contrary to the politics of the profession of psychology (Crocket, 2010). From the outset of the study it was vital to take cognizance of the positions in which I, the participants, and the readers found themselves. Using the words of Crocket (2010) “This is an avowedly political project. It is not intended to be neutral” (p. 103). I was seeking to use social constructionist and poststructuralist theory to inform the exploration into the area of therapeutic practice and intended from the onset to challenge the dominant status quo and thereby contribute to the professional praxis of psychology in South Africa. Therefore my research was conducted from my position of resistance to the hegemonic discourses within the therapeutic training of psychologists.

Drawing from the work of Crocket (2010), it became necessary to clarify the position that I was taking within the research when stating my use of poststructural theory. My position is situated within the stream that “explores the possibilities open to persons who are positioned as part of dominant culture and who seek to disrupt the effects of ... discourse in their practice” (p. 95). Being a white, female psychologist and part of the socio-political and historically challenging context of post-apartheid South Africa, I seek to trouble the effects of the dominant discourse within the practice of psychology and specifically within Masters therapeutic training. It is also important to acknowledge that the dominant culture in psychology in South Africa may differ from the dominant psychology culture globally due to aspects of the context that are unique to the socio-political and historical history of South Africa (see chapter 2).

4.4 Moving towards a research methodology that works against discourses of domination

As mentioned previously, due to the nature of the post-apartheid context of South Africa and my being a previously advantaged South African, I actively work from a position of resistance within the context of discourses of domination. Based on this position it becomes necessary to reflect on the literature regarding the chosen methodologies of emancipatory and deconstructive traditions, theorizing as methodology, discursive psychology and Foucauldian discourse analysis.

Many indigenous writers (Bakker et al., 2007; Eagle, 2005; Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Hook, 2004) have extended criticism towards the imperial and colonial practices that

western psychology has imposed on the praxis of psychology within South Africa. Similarly, practices of research have been tainted by imperial and colonial thinking. Denzin and Lincoln (2005) speak of research being “one of colonialism’s most sordid legacies” (p. 1). They went further to state that “from the beginning, qualitative research was implicated in a racist project” (p. 2). In the face of this criticism, the question stands whether this research can produce knowledge that works against the current pervasive social politic and historical discourse (see chapter 2) while acknowledging the “sordid legacy” of research. Denzin and Lincoln also asked how we move the current generation of critical interpretive thought and inquiry beyond anger to action, to a theory and method that connects politics, higher education and ethics to actions in the world. Crocket (2010) proposed that research can move towards a methodology that works against discourses of domination insofar as the researcher is able to “establish a clear ethical stance to take in to the research and is able to identify the practices and effects of dominant discourses and reduce the effects of these in their work” (p. 96).

4.4.1 An emancipatory tradition.

To surmount the situation of oppression, people must first critically recognize its causes, so that through transforming action they can create a new situation, one that makes possible the pursuit of a fuller humanity. But the struggle to be more fully human has already begun in the authentic struggle to transform the situation (Freire, 1972, p. 29).

Emancipation is more than producing more possibilities for minority, marginalized or oppressed groups (Crocket, 2010). Rather, emancipatory projects involve complex interactions in the investigation of the conditions that produce colonial practices (and reproduce them in postcolonial settings), along with the production of new possibilities (Crocket, 2010). As the participants in this research did not get involved in this project as part of an emancipatory initiative, or due to being in need of emancipation themselves, I aimed to design questions that could expand the possibility for emancipation. Foucault (1982) wrote that “maybe the target nowadays is not to discover what we are but to refuse what we are” (p. 785).

4.4.2 A deconstructive tradition.

Deconstruction implies a “challenge of the apparent permanence of institutions, structures and texts, as deconstructive practices are taken up in order to examine and identify unacknowledged effects of powerful discourses on both groups and individuals” (Crocket, 2010, p. 98). Deconstruction was discussed in chapter 3, and

both informed the overall project and became an element of my research methodology. I invited participants to unpack the dominant discourses surrounding multiculturalism within psychology and to assist me in the process of deconstructing them (Madigan, 2010; White, 1995; 2007), as far as possible within the research conversations. Thus the text, gained through the interview process, reflected the dominant discourses but also provided ways of refuting and escaping its effects.

4.4.3 Theorizing as methodology.

Research writers (Dodds & Hart, 2000; Kvale, 1996; Schostalk, 2002) stated that methodology should match the chosen research questions and facilitate the search for answers to the research questions. The chosen methodology draws from the broad social constructionist frame, which is inclusive of two methodologies I now introduce, namely praxis and discourse analysis. These methodologies were respectful of the participants and was consciously located in a post-apartheid socio-political and historical context.

Research as praxis

“Praxis-oriented research implies a commitment to critiquing the status quo and building a more just society” (Lather, 1992, p. 258). The use of praxis as a concept which provides a bridge between theory or ideology and practice can be traced back to Marxist teaching (Lather, 1992) and Freire’s pedagogy of the oppressed (Freire, 1972).

In the context of the study, the struggles can be expected to be those undertaken by trainees with their clients and trainers with their students to both challenge the effects of discourse on the moments of practice and support those clients to be able to better challenge these effects in their own lives.

In the context of action research Denzin and Lincoln (2005) wrote:

Action researchers literally transform inquiry into praxis - action. Research subjects become co-participants in the process of inquiry. Research becomes praxis – practical reflective, pragmatic action – directed to solving problems in the world (p. 34).

Praxis implies the development of emancipatory knowledge which, according to Lather (1992), is “increasing awareness of the contradictions hidden or distorted by everyday assumptions” (p. 259) and “directs attention to the possibilities for social transformation inherent in the present configuration of social processes” (p. 259). She went further in saying that research participants should be afforded the

opportunity to change by coming to know their own situation in new ways (Lather, 1986). Thus the participant is able to engage in a reflective exploration and the researcher is also self-disclosing (Crocket, 2010). The concept of praxis has undergone development and Lather no longer views praxis in the above terms only. Praxis moved along to refer to an intention rather than completed actions as implied in the above. This view of praxis is partnered with an awareness of deconstruction and specifically Derrida's ideas of *différance*, of deferring any definition of meaning and seeing how it differs from other words and their meanings.

These concepts combined challenge the binary effects of discourse (Lather, 1992) by opening possibilities of both richer and finally indefinable meaning (Crocket, 2010). This ultimately opens up possibilities for finding new ways of making meaning within the hegemonic discourses presented in therapeutic training and therefore, upon successful completion of the programme, for the working of therapists with their clients.

However, in this study praxis may work differently for the participants than for myself. As the participants attend to the shifting ground that is the discursive context of their practice and training, for me the shifting ground is multi-layered. It includes the research study and my practices within it, and in broader contexts my communication of the understandings that emerge from this study both to the students that I teach and as a practising therapist.

Therefore this study represents a melting pot of methodological theorizing, academic knowledge gained over 11 years of being part of training psychologists as well as from my position of being a narrative therapist myself.

4.5 Research context

Much has been written regarding research conducted within a single context, for example insider and outsider research (Eppley, 2006), ethnography research, and case study research (Darke, Shanks & Broadbent, 1998; Willig, 2013). Within this study the idea of problematizing the insider/outsider binary became a central stabilizing and consolidating distinction of the research (Butler, 1995). Working from Butler's (1995) approach, insider/outsider research positioning used in this study may be viewed in a similar manner. As a researcher, I attempted to "stabilize and make coherent that which is tenuous and discursively constituted" (Butler, 2004, p. 108). The binary positions of "I am not one of them" or "I am one of them" can then be viewed as suspect and therefore equally troubled on a discursive level. It then becomes clear that insider and outsider research orientations are social, historical

constructions whose meanings are in constant flux. Alcoff (1991) and De Andrade (as cited in Eppley, 2008) illustrated how in their research the insider position “is not simply granted or achieved. It is created through an ongoing process of evaluation” (De Andrade as cited in Eppley, 2008, p. 58) of the researcher’s positioning in the research process. Butler (1995) makes use of Foucault’s support for insider research by stating that these methods of research, namely ethnography, insider research and case study methods, “imagine the other – and that has to be enough” (p. 105). Insider/outsider research positions are socially constructed and entail fluidity that further impacts on the research process. Therefore, as a researcher I have to have some level of outsidership in order to conduct the research. However, this does not mean that the insider position is surrendered. Both exist simultaneously. Hence my position is in defying the binary of either an insider or outsider position.

There is othering in the very act of studying, a necessary stepping back or distancing in varying degrees. There can be no interpreting without some degree of othering. Researchers, then, can be neither insider nor outsider; they are instead temporarily and precariously positioned within a continuum (Eppley, 2006, p. 11).

Darke et al. (1998) spoke of this type of research needing to convince the reader of its validity in “as much a matter of rhetorical style and flair as it is accuracy and care in matters of theory and method” (p. 79). Therefore the researcher needs to continually invite the reader in a convincing and engaging manner to continue reading. For Darke et al., the study must therefore be complete and have sufficient evidence to support its findings.

4.5.1 Sampling and participants

The following section aims to describe the inclusion criteria of the sample.

Inclusion criteria, selection and participant characteristics

The study aimed to explore the discourses around multicultural therapeutic training in the profession of psychology in South Africa, specifically at one HWU. Hence the population of interest are Masters clinical and counselling trainees registered for study and trainers at a HWU within a particular training year² and those recently qualified in terms of the additional participants that were recruited. As previously stated, the reason for the inclusion of both clinical and counselling training was due

² The training year is not stated so as to create a manner of anonymity for the participants. The participants are easily identifiable due to the limited number of participants of diversity. The exclusion of a date is aimed at preventing identification as is the exclusion of the name of the tertiary institution.

to the core competencies scope of clinical and counselling trainees (Professional Board of Psychology, 2007) being very similar and cultural competence being regarded as important within both scopes of practice. Both clinical and counselling psychologists are presented with clients from diverse backgrounds and of a multicultural nature, especially considering that the invisible perceptual boundary between township and affluent communities is in the process of dissolving (Makau, 2003; Ruane, 2006).

Access

At the onset of the study, I envisaged approaching the Masters trainees in their second year of Masters training and Masters trainers, and inviting them to participate in this study. Permission to approach the Masters clinical and counselling trainees and trainers was obtained from the relevant university channels at the time, namely

- Head of Department
- Masters clinical coordinator
- Masters counselling coordinator
- Departmental Research Committee
- Dean of students (as part of the process of obtaining approval of the proposal by the university's Postgraduate and Ethics Committee).

I approached the Masters trainers and trainees to establish their willingness to participate in the study. Invitations (see Appendix A) for participation were sent to all the trainers on the two Masters professional programmes (Clinical and Counselling) as well as to all the trainees in these programmes via email. The resultant cohort of participants was recruited from those who responded positively and accepted the invitation to participate by signing the informed consent form (See appendix B).

Due to the limited demographics of the proposed Masters trainees, I decided to supplement the sample with Masters trainees who had been trained at the university in previous years. The inclusion of these past trainees served to enhance the richness of the data (Morrow, 2005; Willig, 2013) by increasing the diversity of the sample as well as broadening the perspectives of the participants through longer involvement in the practice of therapeutic psychology. The demographics of each year's trainees were largely determined by the pool of candidates from which trainees were selected. The cohort had a very small diversity with regard to multiculturalism, in other words gender, race, ethnicity and culture. Thus the supplementation of the sample, by adding participants from previous training years,

added to the scope of the study and was aimed at enhancing the value and trustworthiness of its findings (Morrow, 2005; Willig, 2013).

Kvale (1996) warns researchers to make their project manageable and that they should therefore not interview too many participants. However, due to the cohort not being multiculturally representative, I ended up having 27 participants (8 trainers and 19 trainees). This meant that the resulting interview data was over 500 pages in length. It became necessary for me to reduce the volume of the data into a more manageable quantity (see data analysis).

The participants currently busy with their Masters training were therefore secured through volunteer sampling (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). For this study, the current trainees and trainers cohort was believed to be too skewed demographically in terms of diversity and thus the sample was supplemented from previous training years. The additional participants were recruited by purposive sampling (Willig, 2013). Willig (2013) stated that this means the participants are homogenous to the extent that they share experiences related to the topic under investigation. The method was convenient in so far as the participants were simply accessed via already established programme attendance at the HWU. In addition to being a volunteer sample, the entire population of Masters clinical and counselling trainers and trainees were invited to participate, as the study involved only this one university at this particular punctuation in time. Finally, the participants were proficient in either English or Afrikaans, as am I. While the participants were not stratified along lines of ethnicity, socio-economic status or age, they form a range of previously designated categories³ of black, white, coloured and Indian, and ranged in age from 23-55. The gender of the participants was significant in that all trainer participants were female and within the trainee group only 5 were male. This is also part of a larger demographic of feminisation of psychology as a profession (Ostertag & McNamara, 2006). All the participants were residing in middle and working class areas in the Gauteng Province, South Africa, at the time of the study.

The table below is a summary of the participants that were included in the study. The table lists the participants with stereotypical pseudonyms. I chose to use stereotypical pseudonyms to ensure anonymity as well as to depict the cultural diversity and gender of the participants. Jan, for example, would be an Afrikaans speaking male, Kokoteso would be a female African language speaker and Rani

³ Within the South African context, racial categorization has been prevalent since the apartheid era. Racial categories of white, black, coloured and Indian continue to dominate the discursive landscape.

would be a female participant of Indian origins. It must be noted that there were two participants who did not participate via interview but rather by writing a letter. One wrote a letter detailing their reasons for not wanting to participate which I did not include, at the request of the writer. Another participant wrote a letter detailing their perspectives on multiculturalism and these were included in the analysis.

Table 1: Participants

| Stereotypical Pseudonyms | Trainer/trainee | Gender |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|---------------|
| Rani | Trainer | Female |
| Clara | Trainer | Female |
| Mpho | Trainer/Trainee | Female |
| Karien | Trainer | Female |
| Desiree | Trainer | Female |
| Julie | Trainer | Female |
| Marise | Trainer | Female |
| Charl | Trainee | Male |
| Heidi | Trainee | Female |
| Fay | Trainee | Female |
| Mary | Trainee | Female |
| Ben | Trainee | Male |
| Pieter | Trainee | Male |
| Vishani | Trainee | Female |
| Shalomi | Trainee | Female |
| Athmika | Trainee | Female |
| Leanne | Trainee | Female |
| Sarah | Trainee | Female |
| Jane | Trainee | Female |
| Tehia | Trainee | Female |

| | | |
|----------|---------|--------|
| Michelle | Trainee | Female |
| Kokoteso | Trainee | Female |
| Palesa | Trainee | Female |
| Sakuru | Trainee | Male |
| Tanya | Trainee | Female |
| Precious | Trainee | Female |
| Jan | Trainee | Male |

4.6 Data collection

Initial contact

Once the study received approval from the university structures, contact was made with the trainees and trainers on the clinical and counselling programmes of the HWU. The pragmatics of the institution, such as class times and schedules, were scouted out and addressed appropriately in the research process to enable contact.

The initial contact with participants was in the form of an email (See appendix A) describing the research that I wanted to undertake and requesting willingness to participate. The recruitment of the trainees rapidly gained momentum with most trainees immediately responding to my contact. The momentum slowed considerably with regard to the contact with the trainers. After weeks of very few responses, a second email was sent out as a reminder of the initial contact made. This yielded more responses than the first email and interviews could then be set up.

Upon positive email confirmation of participation, I sent through the informed consent form (See Appendix B) to each participant to read and went about setting up the individual interviews.

The research process and purpose of the study were explained again, this time verbally, at the individual interviews. Questions of clarification were also addressed at this time. The participants were asked to sign the informed consent form at the start of the interview, thereby providing consent to participation and audio-recording. This meant they acknowledged the nature and scope of the study, and allowed the use of the data for research purposes. These processes were all conducted on the same day.

The interviews were semi-structured individual interviews with an interview guide (See Appendix C). Semi-structured interviews were chosen due to the evocative and potentially emotionally laden and sensitive nature of the topic, and to provide a safer and more confidential talking space than other forms of data gathering such as focus groups. The interview guidelines provided a few questions, with the purpose of initiating a broad discussion around multiculturalism.

All the interviews were conducted in offices on the university premises. The context thus needs to be taken into consideration in the telling of the discourse, as the context prescribed an academic environment of privilege due to the financial demands made on the students and their families to attend this tertiary institution. The training programme is described in chapter 2 and the context of this HWU from the perspective of the participants is described in detail in chapter 5.

The semi-structured interviewing guide

Interviews provide access into the cultural world of inter-subjective meaning (Kvale, 1996). In this study, the interviews were semi-structured with a benign leading question of “How would you describe multicultural counselling?” Semi-structured interviews allow for natural conversation and thereby include rich descriptions from the participants’ personal experiences. This provided a thicker description of the research topic and an opportunity for the co-creation of knowledge on the research topic (Rubin & Rubin, 1995). The personal experiences of those involved in the Masters training, either as trainee or trainer, add a dimension to the study that would not have been present if I had structured the interview in such a way as to gain answers to my questions alone. Discovery-oriented questions (See appendix C) are known to facilitate the search for individual meaning that is relevant to each participant and aims to further ‘unpack’ or deconstruct the dominant discourses. How these discourses have been constructed became apparent on examination of the interview material and the dominant story became situated historically and culturally. Semi-structured interviewing, as a means of data collection, is particularly useful in eliciting unique, intimate and/or personal reflections and information from participants (Schurink, 1988; Willig, 2013). It is these unique, intimate and personal reflections that the study wanted to uncover as these house the constructions which inform and are informed by the dominant discourse in the training of psychologists. The conditions of a one-on-one semi-structured interview with open-ended questions facilitates greater interaction than other methods, for example focus groups or group interviews, especially with regard to sensitive topics.

Interview process

As previously stated individual interviews were conducted in an office at the HWU. In each case, the interview was conducted in privacy and was held confidentially. Each interview commenced with safe and benign introductory questions. This settled the participants, built rapport and allowed the progression to more central questions related to the study. This was followed by open-ended questions to explore aspects of multiculturalism. These were used to deepen understanding of meanings expressed by participants. “By engaging in this form of interviewing, there is thus a transparent and reflexive acknowledgement of the importance of mutually negotiated, interactional, and co-constructed nature of textual data that is generated under these conditions” (Stevens, 2008, p. 201). Throughout the interview process, I made notes and personal reflections that could be used in the follow-up conversations and data analysis process. At the point of termination of the interview, the participants were each asked if they had anything to add to the conversation or further questions related to the process. These were then addressed at the conclusion of the interview. The audio-recording and personal notes were used in the data analysis process.

Continuing conversations

Once the interviews were concluded, I allowed for reflexive conversations. The reflexive conversations took the form of emails (containing the transcripts of the interviews for members to check) and an invitation to further deconstruction and conversations to thicken the constructions and resulting discourses. This process allowed the participants to partake further in the research process, if they wished to, by commenting on the interview text and engaging further with the data. This ensured that the research participants regarded the resultant text as being representative of the conversations that took place. Furthermore, it allowed for the correction of the data resulting from the interview prior to the discourses being documented in the study. Only one participant responded to the email and stated the interview text was an accurate representation of the interview held. I was intrigued that none of the participants took up the opportunity to participate further. This may be due to many reasons, such as busy workloads, but I could not help wondering, if time and context had allowed, what further engagement could have yielded. This study, therefore, was one punctuation in an evolving and continuing process over time.

Post-interview processes and transcription of the interviews

The audio recordings were downloaded to my computer and password protected so as to be accessible only to me. After each interview the recordings were listened to

and initial notes and spontaneous interpretations were made. Thereafter the transcription process took place. Transcription was done verbatim by myself, using minimal conventions for transcribing audio to written data (See CD rom for transcriptions). Both the audio recordings and the transcriptions are stored within the storage lab in the Department of Psychology for the specified 15-year period.

Various transcription conventions exist, most of which emphasise readability at the expense of nuances of punctuation, speed and intonation. Parker (1992) warned against intonation because “artefact[s] of transcription reflecting interpretation of the material on the part of the researcher [can be seen as] windows through which we may divine the true intentions of the speaker(s)” (pp. 124-125). Widdicombe (1995) cautioned that texts should not be treated as though they were produced in a social vacuum. The process of transcription is always one of translation, as it requires decisions as where to put punctuation, and other nuances of speech so as to reflect what was said as closely as possible. Thus I regard the interviews, transcriptions and member checks as part of a process of co-creation of various versions of social reality produced between myself and my participants. The transcription notation I used enables and constrains the type of interpretations that can be made based on the data (Lapadat & Lindsay, 1999). The distinction between these two versions of transcription methods for discourse analysis, discursive psychology and Foucauldian discourse analysis can be seen in the emphasis in discursive psychology on “*how* people *use* discursive resources in order to achieve interpersonal objectives in social interaction”. By contrast, poststructuralist discourse analysis focuses on “*what kind of* objects and subjects are constructed through discourses and *what kinds of ways-of-being* these objects and subjects make available to people” (Willig, 2013, pp. 95-96, emphasis in the original). In discursive psychology the analysis is typically limited to the text that constitutes the data. Foucauldian discourse analysis widens the scope of what can be attended to in an analysis, as it also considers the influence of social and other structures outside of the text being analysed (Willig, 2013). Discursive psychology focuses more closely on detailed transcription of the mechanics of speech through inclusion of pauses, stutters, involuntary vocalisations and other “messy” aspects of speech (Oliver, Serovich, & Mason, 2005). In comparison, Foucauldian discourse analysis typically adopts a denaturalised approach to transcription, where many of the idiosyncratic aspects of speech are removed (Oliver et al., 2005). The transcription notation that I used included contextual aspects such as hesitations and pauses. This was done to focus on the accuracy of the “meanings and perceptions created and shared” (Oliver et al., 2005, p. 1277) during the

interview, as well as capturing the full details of the mechanics of speech, such as pauses, silences and stutters. I also corrected grammar to aid in the readability of the transcribed data.

Furthermore, Dé Ishtar (2005) reminded me to remain cognizant of non-verbal language. Therefore I took personal notes during the interview process:

While spoken language is a source of meaning, it is in those places beyond words that much knowledge is heard and expressed.... To reach this meaning, the feminist researcher draws on the language of the body. Spoken language cannot replace sensuous embodiment; it is but one element of human expression (Dé Ishtar, 2005, p. 363).

Including non-verbal communication during transcription, and the interview process itself, allows interview texts to be analysed from a view that regards spoken discourse as intertwined with experience and therefore enriches the analysis (Dé Ishtar, 2005; Sampson, 1998).

The transcription notation I used was based on the following conventions:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| I <u>really</u> am not like that | Underline for speaker emphasis |
| | Unrelated text omitted |
| [over-talk] | Instances of overlapping talk |
| [interrupt/ion] | Interrupted speech or an interruption |
| [indistinct/unclear] | Unclear speech |
| [laughs] | Non-verbal communication - such as gesturing or laughter, giggle |
| [pause] | Pause in conversation |
| [silence] | Silences in conversation |

4.7 Analysis of data

In this study the analysis of the data took on four phases, namely making use of chunking (Macleod, 2002) and the narrative form (Stevens, 2008) to reduce the volume of interview data, discursive psychology, aspects of Foucauldian discourse analysis and the use of deconstruction and externalization. These analytic tools were adapted for my purposes in the study based on my therapeutic knowledge informing my practice of research (See CD rom for example of narrative form and chunking). Willig (2013) states that “discourse analysis is best evaluated by assessing the

quality of the accounts they produce” (p. 174). By analysing the accounts through these four phases, I believe the quality of the accounts in terms of capturing the meaning participants attached to them, are especially telling.

First analytic tool: Using chunking and the narrative form to reduce interview data into more manageable themes

Lieblich, Tuval-Mushiach and Zilber (1998) said that narratives can either be the object of research or a means of studying another question. In this study, they were a means of studying the discursive networks related to multiculturalism in therapeutic training. As a result of examining the narrative form as a first step in the data analysis process, the text gained through transcription was reduced by generating chunks (Macleod, 2002) or themes. These themes were then used to lump data together, and started taking discursive form.

According to Stevens (2008), narrative form, content and structure consist of a specific series of events that occurred in the past relative to the time of narration. They may also involve a story that contains transformation or change, involve participants and employ linguistic structures (Gulich & Quasthoff, 1985). As the form, content and structure intersect constantly in the process of meaning-making, I made use primarily of the narrative form. According to Lieblich et al. (1998) the narrative form refers to “the structure of the plot, the sequencing of the events, its relation to the time axis, its complexity and coherence, the feelings evoked by the story, the style of the narrative, the choice of metaphors or words” (p. 33), in other words the telling of the story. In the study I tell the story of my engagement with the interview text and data analysis. Macleod (2002) used the narrative form in her processing to chunk the interview data into themes to create more manageable chunks of data to analyse. In this way the thematic story emerges and becomes the data for the second analysis process of discursive psychology and Foucauldian discourse analysis. Constructions of transformation, decline, progress, stability/instability, continuity and growth became the focus of my attention. Thinking of interview text in this way further aids the process of deconstruction and externalisation (fourth analytic tool).

Interview data were read and re-read and coded for themes that characterized their forms. This allowed for the broader functions and effects of constructions within their context to become part of the analysis process. As constructions and themes are interactional processes between a narrator and a listener, this process is one through which power can be located and thus the construction or theme may be viewed as a

source of discursive material (Elliot, 2005; Hollway & Jefferson, 2000; Maher & Tetreault, 1994; Stevens, 2008). This discursive material allows for an analysis of how participants use discursive resources, the effects and functions of subject positionality as well as self-representation on the part of the researcher and participants (Elliot, 2005; Hollway & Jefferson, 2000; Maher & Tetreault, 1994). The narrative form or process of chunking also allowed for reflexivity concerning the interactions of power, subjectivity and positionality as well as meaning-making in the research process.

The second and third analytical processes utilized were discursive psychology and Foucauldian discourse analysis. The analysis process did not occur in a linear fashion as suggested in the writing up thereof. However, due to the length of the transcriptions, coding/chunking of the data was completed first in order to reduce the volume of text into more focused areas for analysis. This involved filtering out recurring themes and networks based on repeated reading of the transcripts, my theoretical framework, my background of being a therapist and on previously read literature (Levett, 1989; Potter & Wetherell, 1995). Within the discussion of discourse analysis, two methods have been put forward, namely discursive psychology and Foucauldian discourse analysis (see chapter 3). These two approaches were discussed in detail in chapter 3. Here I provide the pragmatics of how I made use of them.

Second analytic tool: Employing discursive psychology

Potter and Wetherell (1987) argued that there is no mechanical methodology for discursive psychology but suggested ten steps to guide research, although they should not be regarded as set in stone (Steps 1-6 have been discussed above in the research process).

1. Decide on your research question
2. Select your sample
3. Collect records
4. Interviews
5. Transcribe
6. Coding
7. Analyse

There is no recipe for the analysis in discursive psychology. Rather, Potter (2010) offered a few rules of thumb in terms of questions to be asked. ‘Why am I reading this passage in this manner?’ ‘What features produce this reading?’ In the reading of the text, analysts suggest looking for variability and consistency in what is said and perhaps in what is not said. The analysis starts with systematic reading of all the materials to identify a comprehensive set of examples, including the major and borderline events. This set is then refined when a clearer understanding has emerged. Potter (2010) said that this process leads to “increasingly precise attempts to specify what is going on and is similar to hypothesis testing in that some initial ideas cannot survive a careful exploration of the material” (p. 25). Therefore discursive psychology relies heavily on scholarly insight and conceptual thinking that are the result of reflective thought and probing surface appearances. As Potter (2010) argued “Discursive psychology is an approach rather than a method” (p. 4).

8. Go through all the data again, checking for the presence and support for/of discourses that you have started to find.

9. Validate the findings

In this step, discursive psychologists look for

- a) how the discourses identified help understand the coherence of the data;
- b) how the participants orient themselves to the discourses;
- c) new problems presented. In other words what is still unexplained;
- d) what the discourses tell you.

10. Write up the findings. In the study this is discussed in chapters 6 to 9.

According to Potter and Wetherell (1987), “It should be clear... that there is no analytic method... there is a broad theoretical framework, which focuses attention on constructive and functional dimensions of discourse, coupled with the reader’s skill in identifying patterns of consistency and variation” (p. 169). This is the process that I engaged in.

Third analytic tool: Foucauldian discourse analysis

As a method, the Foucauldian approach uses historical and political tracking over time and the conceptual notion of power for interpretation (see chapter 3). In this study I looked at modern power. Modern power links power and knowledge together in an intricate web where discourses carry power (Foucault, 1980). Modern power is

the power we exercise over ourselves, for example through self-policing, and over others based on the knowledge lens from which we look at them.

By following the broad guidelines that have been drawn from Foucault's writings (1972; 1977; 1980; 1988), I made a distinction between two aspects:

- The outside in

Here I tracked the historical development of the hegemonic discourse in psychology over time, from apartheid to post-apartheid (chapter 2). Next I identified some of the players and the socio-political context which aided the development of dominant discourses (chapter 2). The outside in process ended with locating the challenges presented in the dominant discourse and seeing what had happened to these over time. Guiding questions here were: where did they come from? Why? And if they were rejected, how were they resisted? And by whom? For what purpose?

- The inside out

I aimed at identifying constructions that informed, reinforced or challenged the dominant discourse over time. I actively sought out disunity, discontinuity and the limits to the dominant discourse and sought out counter discourses (Drewery & Winslade, 1997).

One of the criticisms against these approaches, discursive psychology and Foucauldian discourse analysis, is the absence of praxis (Willig, 2013). For me, as a therapist, actually doing something about any imbalances of power and the hegemonic discourses in society led me to applying deconstruction in an attempt to work towards alternate meanings and counter discourses (Drewery & Winslade, 1997; Willig, 2013). By making alternate meanings and counter discourses available, as in this study during both the actual interview process and the analysis, participants are enabled to exercise their agency and empower themselves towards new ways of being and of relating to the discourse. Ultimately, counter discourses may bring about change in the dominant discourse and in the related power it reinforces, which in turn reinforce the said dominant discourse. The collaborative deconstructive process I embarked upon was developed from on social constructionist counselling approaches that employ deconstruction as part of the therapeutic conversation (Drewery & Winslade, 1997; Crocket, 2010). "The focus was to explore and deconstruct discourses that may have been calling participants into positions which were either helpful or unhelpful in their practice" (Crocket, 2010, p. 104). I set out the discussion regarding applying deconstruction in a separate section from Foucauldian

discourse analysis, as in my understanding, as a therapist, deconstruction is a term that means more than only seeking to uncover absences and presences, and traces and obstacles of discourse but, as previously stated, seeks to uncover alternate ways of being and to identify counter discourses (Drewery & Winslade, 1997).

Fourth analytic tool: Applying deconstruction and externalisation

The study drew on Derrida's (1976; 1978) work in attempting to destabilize the hegemonic nature of the meaning in the interview text. This was done alongside the discourse analysis, through identifying oppositions in the text, identifying counter discourses as well as their related subject positions of power and their effects. By revealing how these counter discourses are related historically and not allowing them to remain taken-for-granted, the regimes of truth can then be challenged in discourse (Macleod, 2002). Terre Blanche and Durrheim (1999) further pointed out the ways of seeking out the functions and effects of discourse, through identifying the binaries: the objects being spoken about, and the subjects who are speaking, are spoken about and are spoken to (Stevens, 2008). Stevens argued that

these point to important ways in which meanings are constructed as given and continuous, and that by critically analysing texts in this manner, we can not only uncover their ideological effects, but also allow for alternative or discontinuous meanings to emerge from parallel readings of text (p. 208).

Therefore in this study the analysis focuses less on the surface content of the text and more on the participants' discursive constructions related to multiculturalism.

It does not aim to assess the text for 'truth', but rather questions discourses by exploring (deconstructing) them in terms of the claims they are making. Therefore "the deconstruction focuses on dominance, contradiction and difference. In so doing, it enables us to envisage ways of disrupting the dominant discourse, and to construct positions of resistance" (Macleod, 2002, p. 16). Discourse analysis allowed me to engage with the aim of alluding to the range of discursive events concerning multiculturalism in therapeutic training. My study was a stepping away from viewing multiculturalism and therapeutic training as a static category, both historically and contextually. I aimed rather to explore the discursive landscape within which these constructs (multiculturalism and therapeutic training) are housed in relation to the emerging South African literature and to trainers and trainees in therapeutic training programmes, and to investigate how alternate ways of viewing this landscape can be achieved.

Parker (1990) formulated Derrida's process as follows: (1) identify an opposition, and show how one of the terms is dominant in the truth stakes over the other (for example whiteness-privilege in opposition to black-oppression); (2) subvert the opposition between the two terms by demonstrating that the privilege the dominant terms enjoys can be untenable (for example by demonstrating that the term 'whiteness' relies on historically specific taken-for-granted assumptions concerning the person); and (3) sabotage the conceptual opposition (for example by extending the meaning of the term or employing a different term which would prevent the opposition from reasserting itself). In deconstruction one locates

the text's 'navel', as it were, the moment that is undecidable in terms of the text's apparent system of meaning, the moment in the text that seems to transgress its own system of values...which harbours the unbalancing of the equation, the sleight of hand at the limit of the text which cannot be dismissed simply as a contradiction...a moment that genuinely threatens to collapse that system (Spivak, 1976, p. xlix and p. lxxv).

Deconstruction does not attempt to critique the text from a certain perspective:

The movements of deconstruction do not destroy structures from the outside, they are not possible and effective, nor can they take accurate aim, except by inhabiting those structures. Inhabiting them in a certain way, because one always inhabits and all the more when one does not suspect it (Derrida, 1976, p. 24).

Various authors warn against the danger of deconstruction. Macleod (2002) mentioned that "it can turn into an attempt to re-appropriate the text, showing it what 'it does not know...deconstruction deconstructs deconstruction" (p. 26) thus providing "a way out of the closure of knowledge...the lure into the abyss as freedom" (Spivak, 1976, p. lxxvii). Thus "deconstruction is never complete; it is interminable, unless terminated by the practical analyst" (Macleod, 2002, p. 27). However, Hall (1994) pointed out that in its deconstructed form, the concept can no longer operate within the paradigm in which it was originally formed.

When applying externalisation the process is more intuitive (See chapter 3). As a narrative therapist, I have been trained to use externalisation in the therapeutic context. Narrative therapy and externalisation are thus virtually automatic responses in my engagement with society and research. In the context of the study, as well as in the interview context, externalisation was applied to the interview text. Once the constructions and the discourses informing them were uncovered, I set out to

externalise the 'problematic' constructions and discourses through the use of personification and identification (Epston, 1998; White, 1995).

Externalising practices are an alternative to internalising practices. In narrative therapy (White, 1993, 1995), externalising locates problems not within individuals, but in culture and history. This is the same anti-essentialist stance taken in the study. Problems, constructions and dominant discourses are understood to have been socially constructed and created over time. The aim of externalising practices is therefore to enable participants to realise that they and the construction or discourse are not the same thing. It is also important to note that externalising involves much more than only 'linguistic techniques'. Externalising is linked to a particular way of understanding, a particular tradition of thought of poststructuralism (White & Epston, 1990). Externalisation involves the identification and personification of the problem, construction or discourse and thus enables the development of counter-plots and alternate ways of meaning creation (Epston, 1998).

Externalising conversations expose discourses and their tactics in people's lives (White, 1995). This means that space is created between people and whatever is troubling them. When a discourse and its tactics or allies are externalised, it also becomes possible to identify the particular practices that reinforce this problem (as well as particular practices that might reduce its influence). For instance, if the lack of agency has come to significantly affect a participants' life, there might be practices of judgment, criticism and perhaps abuse of power involved in the context as well. Externalising conversations about these particular practices can lead to increased understanding of their operation. We can also collaboratively develop increased options to avoid their negative effects. Once the problem and the practices that support it have been externalised, it becomes possible to ask the person to take a position in relation to the problem. This is not a simple matter of being 'for' or 'against' the problem, as there are complexities of experience. For instance, in an externalising conversation about the lack of agency the participant might explain that they wish to do away with this subject position and move to a subject position having more agency. Inviting people to take a position in relation to the problem creates further space for people to begin reclaiming their lives from the problem's effects, but the complexities of experience need to be taken into account.

As participants step back and separate themselves from exposing discourses and their tactics, and consider the history and negative effects of these discourses, they can find themselves standing in a different territory to the one they have become used to (Epston, 1998; White, 1995). For example in the study I translate the

therapeutic knowledge into the research process by making use of externalisation to expose the discourses and their tactics so as to gain agency as a researcher and develop a pocket of resistance from which participants might gain agency. This different territory is often a place free of practices such as individualisation of the problem or internalisation of the construction. As the discourse and its tactics and allies are exposed, what becomes constructed in the conversation are people's knowledges of life and skills of living that are relevant to addressing these dominant discourses. These become the focus of exploration. Also, once the discourse is understood as being separate from the identity of the person concerned, it becomes easier to identify family, friends, trainers and trainees who can form a team to support and sustain their efforts in reducing its influence. With the reinforcing emotional connotations reduced, and constructions and informed discourses no longer internalised, collective action becomes more feasible. Consequently, the process of externalization can be said to be anti-essentialist as it is a process to move away from internal characteristics or flaws within the trainers and trainees.

Externalisation is used as a research practice in the study to create a space between the participants, trainers and trainees, so that they can create counter plots and alternate ways of relating to the dominant discourse. The space thus created allows for new subject positions to be made available, such as agency. It also allows for counter discourses to develop. I also re-situate myself, as a researcher, through the process of externalisation so as to assist my deconstruction of the dominant discourses.

In summary

Discourse analysis as a method is validated by: (i) the presence of coherence or fitting together of discursive structures used to produce the effects and functions inherent in discourse; (ii) a participant's orientation as evident from his or her attribution of meanings and distinctions to interactions and utterances in discourse; (iii) understanding of existing problems through discourse analysis that tend to raise new problems; and (iv) fruitfulness of the scope of an analytic scheme to make sense of new kinds of discourse and to generate novel explanations (Potter & Wetherell, 1996). The above is translated into the context of this study as follows: i) the role that the position of power affords the trainers when discussing, or not engaging with, certain topics such as race; ii) the participants' position in their talks regarding their meaning constructions around issues of for example race, identity and culture; iii) the understanding I have gained through this process as to why the current therapeutic training in this

HWU is not necessarily leading to the development of multicultural therapists; and finally iv) the ultimate goal of the research to find counter discourses and alternate ways of engaging and positioning ourselves as trainers, and trainees, in a diverse and challenging discursive context.

Based on the reading of the previous and current chapter, it may be evident that as a researcher and a narrative therapist, I am very cognizant of the role I play within discourse. I am keenly aware of my talk when speaking on behalf of others and the role this plays in the knowledge creation process. For this reason, I have continually been reflexive in my working in this research. The sections below detail my first concern of who gets to do the deconstruction in this research and my second concern of reflexivity within the research process.

Who gets to do the deconstruction?

Research participants are frequently not told the full intention of the study (Crocket, 2010). For Crocket, this form of research presents a relational ethical problem that has troubled post-modern research. “Who gets to do the deconstruction? Is it the researcher, the participants in the research, or both the researcher and the participant?” (p. 104). This notion resonates with me, as I was troubled by the idea of presenting the research findings from the position of talking on behalf of someone else. Due to my concern I decided to embark on a collaborative deconstructive process in an attempt to actively involve the participants in the findings.

A deconstructive approach to this task in research ... invites us to engage with and interrogate the discursive context as part of the construction of knowledge, if this principle is held in mind then our research practice would not treat those who participate with us in the production of knowledge in a functional way as providers of data who have no voice worth hearing in making sense of the data. Rather we accord participants agentive status in the research conversation as commentators, or even theorizers through inviting them to make comment on the data. (Crocket, Drewery, McKenzie, Smith & Winslade, 2004, p. 64).

Therefore, as stated earlier, the collaborative deconstructive process I embarked upon was modelled on social constructionist counselling approaches that employ deconstruction as part of the therapeutic conversation (Drewery & Winslade, 1997; Crocket, 2010).

Next I discuss reflexivity in the research process and specifically how I engaged with the construct of reflexivity in this study.

4.8 Reflexivity in the research process

In the process of reflexivity two major themes emerge, namely a) exploring the researcher's involvement and effects, that is the recognition that the 'knower is part of the matrix of what is known' (Wilkinson, 1986, p. 13) and b) rendering discourse analysis accountable by scrutinizing the interpretive resources and processes as well as the constructive effects of the discourse, in other words drawing attention to the discursive construction of discourse analysis' own theoretical position and its 'data' (Parker, 1992).

a) *Personal reflexivity* involves "reflecting upon the ways in which our own values, experiences, interest, beliefs, political commitments, wider aims in life and social identities have shaped the research" (Willig, 1999, p. 10). Therefore it involves thinking about how the research may have affected and possibly changed me as a person and as a researcher as well as how my personal situatedness impacted the research. I am a white South African academic and trainer. My whiteness holds power. My being a trainer holds authority and power. These subject positions impacted on the data collection and the analysis of the data. Trainers may have felt obligated to assist their colleague, while trainees might have thought participation would be in their interest in terms of positive evaluation and assessment of their person. Therefore it was openly stated that my position in this study was to be politically progressive; to trouble the dominant status quo; to set myself in a subject position where I use the research as resistance. Perhaps on a personal level, I used this research as a vehicle to claim back some of the power taken from me within this discursive context.

The power in research is discussed by Bhavnani (1990), who explained that the researcher is in the position of the expert in relation to the 'subject' and to socially attributed characteristics, such as race and gender of the participants (researcher and 'subjects' of research). Macleod (2002) explained this further:

My interactive positioning ... as a 'middle-class, well-educated white woman' potentially has paradoxical effects, given the racial, class-based and gendered politics of South Africa. For example, 'whiteness', on the one hand, carries powerful legitimization in terms of 'scientific' endeavours, as it remains equated with notions of 'competent', 'cultured', 'educated'. On the other hand, in a time when there is increasing 'Africanisation' both within educational institutions and elsewhere, 'whiteness' becomes equated with 'imperialism' and 'oppression' (p. 13).

Macleod's position here is similar to my own in this study, as I am a white, middle class, well-educated woman. Hence my position may be seen as competent, powerful, educated and oppressive at the same time. However, the irony around being 'powerful' and 'competent' within society as an educated woman does not transfer into the discursive context of the study. Being a woman in a male dominated society and specifically in this psychology department, I am implicitly or subtly excluded from a number of decision-making processes. Therefore I have experienced the context of positioning men and women differently in terms of power within the dominant discourses. I have experienced the feeling of powerlessness within this discursive context, and this was illustrated by the absence of the male trainers' participation in the study. I may not have been viewed as competent in comparison with my male colleagues. These are all subject positions that I have been keenly aware of throughout the study and have actively attempted to engage with in a productive and knowledge-creating manner by openly stating them. By openly stating them I mean that in the various interviews, whenever these subject positions came up, I actively tried to elaborate more on them with the participants and the results discussion yields some of these actions.

According to Bakker (2009), when one assumes a self-reflexive social constructionist position, one has to be cognizant that "what I describe in my research is in no way existent apart from my involvement in it – it is not 'out there'" (p. 1). Bakker went further to explain that the stories of the participants would have been different if told by another researcher. Thus the presence of the researcher in the research process cannot be ignored as it becomes a reciprocal process between the research and the researcher herself. Consequently, my many constructions, life events, values and experiences contributed to the research process. Specifically as a social constructionist, I acknowledge the constructions of social structure and taken-for-granted knowledges that surround me. I was very cognizant of the fact that this study was conducted in a HWU. A university is a construction of power, authority and knowledge. A HWU is constructed as having power and knowledge as well as perceived as being white, male and conservative. These taken-for-granted constructions impacted on the data collection process and on the analysis as well. In the data collection process the trainer participants were only female. How has being female impacted on the study? In the data collection I found it impossible to elicit the interest or participation from the male trainers, although

they were my colleagues and although I had access to them. It can be debated whether this was due to my femaleness or to the emotional assumptions regarding the topic of multiculturalism. The presence of 5 male trainee participants out of a cohort of 27 limited the presence of maleness. However, as stated in chapter 2, the limited presence of actual ‘male bodies’ does not negate the dominance of maleness in the discursive context. Taken-for-granted knowledges also make it difficult to separate existing structures from the effects they have and how they came in existence. In the study context, the part that this university fulfills by being a HWU has direct effects on the trainers, trainees and on the training programme. White, conservative and male is the dominant discursive construction of this HWU (See chapter 5). This is a preconception that I entered the study with and although I constantly challenged my own preconceptions, the discursive landscape prevailed.

Macleod (2002) also warned against focusing too strongly on our account of our positioning and stated that we should focus more on being accountable in terms of what gets researched and what gets reported upon. Macleod commented further that researcher reflexivity brings its own dangers with it: a focus on the construction of the account rather than what is being accounted for can be problematic; and the exercise can become a personal confession of the reflexive positioning of the researchers or of their emotional investments. Macleod quoted Squire’s warning that reflexivity may lead to “dizzying regress to residual, difficult-to-comprehend factors like repression and desire” (Squire as cited in Macleod, 2002, p. 157). Thus the reflexive process needs to be linked to political practice and should address interactional, relational and power dynamics of the research at hand (Macleod, 2002).

b) *Epistemological reflexivity* (Willig, 2013) requires me to question the epistemological framework I used in the study (See chapter 3), in other words my use of social constructionism and poststructuralism. It requires me to engage with questions such as how the research question has defined and limited what can be ‘found’; how the design of the study and the method of analysis has constructed the data and the findings; how the research question could be investigated differently to yield a different understanding of the topic under investigation.

The research question, aims and objectives set out to unpack the constructions and the discursive landscape of this HWU.

The design of the study and the method of analysis sought to trouble the constructions and the dominant discourses in this HWU context. The design and method were meant to be critical of the status quo in order to be able to develop counter arguments and ways of being in the future. Levette, Kottler, Burman and Parker (1997) pointed out how discourse analysis “can provide a facilitating framework for *critical* intervention and *radical* political engagement” (p. 2). This is achieved through the topics that are researched and through critical reflection on the link between political activism and discourse analysis (Macleod, 2010).

Therefore if the research question, aims and objectives had been different the study would have yielded different findings.

4.9 Ethical considerations of the study

A number of issues need to be taken into account when conducting research in social sciences. In this study several ethical issues were considered, some of which have been unpacked in the above writing. There are, however, some issues that require further discussion: informed consent, and violation of privacy.

Obtaining informed consent implies that all possible or adequate information on the goal of the investigation, the procedures that will be followed during the investigation, the possible advantages, disadvantages, and dangers to which respondents may be exposed, as well as the credibility of the researcher, be rendered to potential subject or their legal representatives (Williams as cited in Strydom, Fouche, & Delport, 2002, p. 65).

The participants were provided with accurate and complete information by way of a consent form regarding the nature and objectives of the study and this enabled them to make voluntary decisions about participating (Appendix B). Furthermore, participants were given the option to withdraw from the study at any time. Participants were also given the opportunity for counselling or debriefing after the interview. This service was offered in the informed consent letter.

The identities of the participants are not required for the research process. Therefore, anonymity, in terms of the data once in text form, is maintained to a certain degree. However, all the participants are known to the researcher and each other. All participants are psychologists or psychology students, therefore they are familiar with confidentiality and privacy. An attempt to ensure anonymity was made by the use of stereotypical pseudonyms as well as by the exclusion of the year in which the

interviews were held and the name of the tertiary institution where the interviews were conducted.

4.10 Conclusion

The study aimed to explore how multicultural therapeutic training in the profession of psychology in South Africa is constructed specifically in this HWU. In particular, the study examines how training is constructed in relation to the dominant discourses in psychology around multiculturalism. The chapter includes a discussion concerning the theoretical framework of emancipatory traditions, research as praxis and the data analysis process of discursive psychology and Foucauldian discourse analysis is further teased out. In this chapter the research process from initial contact with the participants until data analysis is documented.

Chapter Five

Findings and Discussion: Discourses of Exclusion

In this chapter I start presenting the findings of the study. I first explain why I approached the data in the manner that I did and why I chose to write it up in the format presented. I present the discourses identified during analysis. Then the discussion of the findings begins.

In this chapter the discourses informed by and informing participants' constructions are uncovered. The various ways in which these reflect, reproduce and contest existing power relations in the context of discourse production are described. It explores the manner in which these discourses represent similarities with discourses in broader society, thereby exploring to some degree their ideological effects (the degree to which discourses are homogenous and contribute to processes of authority and domination, subordination and subjugation). In addition it searches for instances in which these discourses act as a criticism of ideology or stand in opposition to the dominant (the extent to which discourses are heterogeneous and offer alternative readings of the social context).

5.1 The Process of discourse analysis

My focus in analysing the interview texts was on how multiculturalism is constructed as a discursive object in the talk of participants. I was interested in how the various constructions of multiculturalism informed the dominant discourses. I was particularly interested in how the dominant discourses position participants and impact on their subjectivity. During the analysis I paid specific attention to differences in the discursive positions occupied by participants. Poststructuralist theory regards the subject as constituted through discursive practices and as occupying varied and at times contradictory positions (Henriques et al., 1984). This is apparent in the analysis where participants often assume complex and contradictory positions in negotiating this discursive landscape.

The presentation of the data may be viewed as artificially separate from the literature as the journey that I embarked upon in this research process was one of traversing through a narrative tale. I decided to keep the literature in the background until the final chapter, where my reflections are presented. The findings present my story of engagement with the data. I brought myself into the research process, the data and data analysis from my own subjective position of a trainer, therapist and social constructionist.

I discuss the findings in this chapter by presenting the discourses identified in the interview texts in a framework of four main groupings of discourses. To some extent, this structure was influenced by the process of chunking and the use of narrative form in theme creation that were described in chapter 4. Therefore I present the findings as I found them within the interview text. I acknowledge that there are many other ways of organising the data, as my reading of the interview texts was informed by my own subjective positioning in discourse and the particular research questions I posed. During the analysis process I carefully avoided imposing my subjective views on the data or making the data fit into a specific framework. Thus the framework resulted from the data set and was not a pre-existing framework to which I applied my data. The four main groupings that form the framework include the following: discourses of exclusion, bigger picture discourse of a country in transition, discourses of multiculturalism and discourses of race and identity. In the table below I present these groupings as well as the various sub discourses, constructions and descriptions included under each grouping.

Table 2: Analytical framework

| Main discourse | Sub-discourses | Descriptions/effects/operations/subject positions |
|---|---|---|
| Discourses of exclusion | | Constructions of institutional culture Conservative spaces Meritorious black students/trainers |
| Bigger picture discourse/ country in transition or transformation | Universal discourse Bigger picture Guises of oppression | From big stories to local understandings Legacy of offending Permission to speak Historical residue Minimising agency Black or white subject positions Generative positioning |
| Discourses of multiculturalism | Impasse of the multicultural discourse | Under or overstated mc Insiders and outsiders positioning Culture bound in oppression |

| | | |
|---------------------------------|--|--|
| | Immutability of culture | Discomfort with 'otherness' Negotiated culture |
| Discourses of race and identity | Race talk discourses Discourses of identity Post-apartheid discourse/s Historical discourse/s | Gains and losses Whiteness and blackness Colour-blind stance Evolving South African identity Clean slate discourse Racial positioning |

The findings discussion starts with the presentation of the constructions and the discourses identified during analysis. The findings are set out over 4 chapters, namely Discourses of exclusion (chapter 5), The bigger picture of a country in transition (chapter 6), Discourses of multiculturalism (chapter 7) and Discourses of race and identity (chapter 8).

In each of the chapters, the findings are described from three points of departure. Firstly the constructions that informed and are informed by the dominant discourse presented in the chapters, secondly the dominant discourse under discussion and thirdly the subject positions made available within the dominant discourse. In some of the chapters the presence of counter discourses is included in the discussion, while in other chapters counter discourses are significant in their absence.

5.2 Discourses of exclusion

Discourses of exclusion present the first and possibly the most significant discourse found in the study directly related to the institutional culture of this HWU. This section sets the backdrop from which the other findings may be viewed, because it presents the constructions of the institutional culture of the HWU context and the discourses informed by these constructions. This is because the discursive context of the HWU affects and permeates each and every level of discursive operation. In this section the objectives of the study are addressed in the following ways: I describe the participants' constructions in the discursive landscape and relate these back to the larger social discourses that inform these constructions. I comment on the effects of the discourse on the participants and the context. The application of deconstruction and externalisation are highlighted within the text and demonstrate the last objective of the study.

The discourses of exclusion were constructed to the largest extent by the trainees with minimal input from the trainers. I speculated as to why trainees mostly constructed these views. Perhaps trainers are influenced by the many years they have spent in this institutional context. Therefore they are perhaps part and parcel of the reinforcement of the discursive web that the trainees presented. There are obviously trainers who do reposition themselves daily in opposition to the discursive networks.

5.2.1 Constructions of institutional culture and discourses of exclusion.

In this section I will elaborate on these constructions as located in the interview text and describe the context of the HWU at which the study was conducted. The discursive context of the HWU is paramount to the findings and discussion of the study. In postmodern thinking we explore from the local to the broader landscape (Willig, 2013). The HWU is constructed as a white, conservative, often male, and privileged space. This space supports othering in the process of exclusion. These constructions of institutional culture as described in the literature (Cole, 1998; Kezar & Eckel, 2002) speak to me personally as they situate the research context in a discursive landscape, which not only portrays it as an academic training institution but also describes the larger social discourses informing the participants' constructions. It may well be possible that the exposed discourses in this study are present in other training institutions, as discursive landscapes mirror society's discourse, but this is not the scope of the study. The constructions start laying the foundations for the development of an intricate discursive network that supports discourses of exclusion and subject positions of black and white both in the study and in the larger South African context.

In the context of this HWU it is important to get a sense of what the staff and student body looks like at the university where the study was conducted. The top management includes many people of colour as well as women, but the institutional culture remains entrenched. The construct of white, conservative, male and privileged has little to do with the actual number of bodies in the institution and more with the perceptions of the institution. For example, in the department of psychology where the study was conducted, men are in the minority but they are perceived by the women as carrying more power through this invisible alternative discursive power web. Hence an official structure and policy exists which is in direct contrast to the dominant discourse of exclusion. These discourses of exclusion were located within the interview text and described in the section below.

5.2.2 Discourses of exclusion and discourses of resistance to the system.

Within this section the discourses related to the larger institution culture are described. These include discourses of exclusion and discourses of resistance to the system and will be explored from the perspective of the participants. These discourses are discussed from two points of construction namely conservative spaces and absence of a meritorious black student/trainee.

5.2.2.1 Conservative spaces.

Participants' talk is centered on how this university was and still is seen as a university in which race has and continues to play a dominant role in the discursive landscape. *"It's old school frame of mind"* (Sarah) and *"... known as white Afrikaans university"* (Clara) are examples that categorise this space. The construction of this HWU as being a white space is confirmed. For example, Palesa's talk shows how she positions herself in opposition to the dominant discourse's standing, which supports constructions of black trainees being few and far between in the Masters training programme. This is based on "facts" such as a limited number of black candidates applying to this conservative and white institution. *"We only have a few candidates of colour applying every year"* (Marise); *"We've tried to advertise wider"* (Julie) and *"Our pool to choose from is limited"* (Karien). *"...[O]nly one black person a year"* (Mpho). Palesa challenges this power-related positioning, being black in a white institution, by actively working toward her future and the development of black academic and professionally trained psychologists.

Palesa: ... it's a known and is not an alien thing that at [HWU] they only take one black student. They see it as a race card... it's a very conservative institution... You struggle to make a point as a black [pause] you struggle to come out. To be heard... the system doesn't let you take it on... it's all behind the scenes

Ilse: Behind the scenes?

Palesa: ... But as a black student to take on the system... [silence] the system needs to change. It's all about the people in the system. You just came in as an addition to the system. To try change it before is pointless because you are still seen as the minority, your word is not going to be heard... So learn as much as you can about the system, get the qualification you need. Then you can have a word. You can speak...

Participants' talk alludes to the effects of the discursive landscape of HWU. The effects are the 'norm' for white students but set black students up for failure. Both white and black trainers and trainees need to function within a system which promotes and favours whiteness. From the experience in the lecture room to the assessment procedure, the system is partial to white students. *"The black students drop out... They can't cope with the academic requirements of the course"* (Julie). Black students only have permission to be in these spaces once they have received a qualification and thus have gained status and a position of authority. *"I only was heard once I came back as a colleague"* (Mpho) and *"So learn as much as you can about the system, get the qualification you need. Then you can have a word. You can speak"* (Palesa). At this point the power might have moved within the discursive network.

The second construction raised in the talk is the concept of the race card. In South Africa, black people who have reached a certain level of status or position within a company or institution are often accused of "playing the race card". Although there are instances where black people are placed in positions based on their race, for example to meet equity requirements of government, this is not always the case. Positions of power and authority are also granted on the basis of competency. Palesa's talk is structured around how she is unable to position herself as a person of value or authority because of her race. The assumption is that she is in this position because she is black, and is therefore playing the race card. For now she remains disqualified. She repositions herself upon re-entry into the context with a qualification, similarly to Mpho's statement mentioned above *"I only was heard once I came back as a colleague"*. In deconstructing the dominant discourse of exclusion, the discourse of exclusion strongly permeates the academic certification process of receiving a qualification and pays little attention to whether those in subordinate subject positions are qualified or able to belong to the context. They are automatically excluded at each and every turn. White, conservative and male is the default "body" in this discursive web.

Jane also comments on the conservative and white dominated space of the university.

Jane: It's a very big problem because, I mean, my grandparents were here. So that's how long it's been Afrikaans, the institution. I like that there's tradition and I appreciate tradition... it also must be flexible, it's an international institution... Maybe we could change it, but the old system is so strong ...wonder if we even have a chance.

Her talk reveals that the discourse of exclusion operates in a manner of questioning whether or not she is allowed to do so. Is she qualified to enter to discursive landscape, does she have the legitimacy and right to enter this space? She is white but she still needs to have permission. Perhaps because she is female in this male dominated context? Before even embarking on the possibility of changing the system, she is silenced and neutralized. Similarly to Palesa, she is disqualified.

Jane moves between agency and immobility within the same sentence. Another trainee had the following to say concerning the conservative space that the dominant discourse of exclusion operates in.

Sarah: ... it's a very Afrikaans University, there's certain things that are still sticking its head out. They still go according to old school frame of mind, this is how we do things, and slowly but surely there is improvement, but it's going too slowly. And I think maybe if you somewhere like [another more liberal university] that's very, it's progressive and its fast and I'm guessing now that they are maybe a bit better, a bit more progressive.

Sarah paints a picture of a monster “*sticking its head out*”. I could not help but apply my narrative therapy knowledge of deconstruction and externalization to the process and actively deconstruct this idea of the discourse of exclusion as metaphorically being represented as a monster. This discourse linked itself to other monsters such as constructions of race and not being “liberal” and “progressive”. “*It is known they only take one black student a year*” (Palesa). Race is so embedded in this HWU construction as it remains embedded in South African context. I wondered if the discourse of exclusion felt pressure in the process of transformation and thus had to bring along additional support to oppose any resistance to the system.

The trainees also showed in other ways, with the additional support being called upon, that the discourse of exclusion neutralized the resistance. Athmika reveals another trick this monster tried in her talk.

Athmika: I think being in [perceived as being a more liberal university] is a great advantage ... being an English university... you see I mean a lot of the students I see are first generation learners, so that means it wasn't their parents' idea to go to University here at [HWU] ...

Ilse: Why do you think it would be different at [X] as opposed to [HWU]?

Athmika: My personal experience is [X] does have a bigger variety of cultures and is open to difference. [HWU] just seems much more Afrikaans, that's just

my idea I know some people would be reluctant but that's not something you can scientifically put down, so I don't really know...

She externalizes and speaks of another university situated in a more liberal context to illustrate the difference in these universities' approaches to conservative space. A debate can be had as to why she feels 'safer' discussing another institution as opposed to this HWU, but perhaps it is best to stay with her construction for now as the tactics revealed themselves.

Michelle also describes the space as being Afrikaans and how similar the other applicants are to her. Young, white and female, but her Englishness seems to count against her. Michelle: *"I am young... English speaking... at the selection there are a lot of young girls applying... I wondered what my chances are... so many like me [pause] It's an Afrikaans university you know..."* Another participant, Ben is more fortunate in this context and explains his selection process as being favourable as he is the only male. *"I was the only man applying... reckon my chances were good."* Ben's trainee perspective on his favourable position is confirmed by a trainer, who states that *"Are we more strict with the girls than boys?"* (Karien) A male candidate is almost automatically favoured in a pool of very similar young females.

It would appear that HWU has more conservative staff and previously a more conservative student body, and therefore has developed along the lines of retaining the discursive nature of a HWU. Afrikaans is constructed as supporting whiteness and conservatism, and English as the "solution". Conservative, Afrikaans and white become portrayed as the key features of the dominant discourse of exclusion and resisting these is not really possible from the outside, in other words by a person different from conservative, Afrikaans and white. Thus English speakers, people of colour and people of different orientations relating to for example gender or sexuality, are excluded from the discursive context of this HWU. Counter discourses were impossible to find within the texts regarding this discourse. This informed me as to its strength and dominance. But I continued to deconstruct it further.

Other trainees speak to the presence of the student body and staff contingent reinforcing conservative constructions of this space.

Clara: Our students mirror us [trainers]. We choose to complement our arrangement.

What is constructed in the excerpt below is that the nature of the student body may only be able to change once the nature of the staff contingent is more equitable. This construction links to others in attempting to determine how this HWU has maintained

its status as being a conservative, white institution. Participants' talk suggests that perhaps the answer lies in the need for those in power, such as staff, lecturers and managers of the institution, to transform in order to move away from the perception of this HWU still being a white university towards what is 'previously known as' a HWU.

Palesa: It would be very interesting seeing one day [sigh] main campus having five black students and one white.

Ilse: and I wonder what the staff would look like then?

Palesa: [Laughs] none of those there now [Laughs].

The discourse of exclusion was shown to promote the constructions of white, male and conservative spaces. Thus I set out to deconstruct 'smaller' constructions that feed this monster and reinforce this dominant discourse of this institution being conservative and white. The location and space that this HWU occupies were shown to be contributing to this construction. In the next section I explore the second construction related to discourse of exclusion, namely the absence of a meritorious black student or trainee.

5.2.2.2 Constructions of the absence of a meritorious black student/trainee.

Another construction in constant contention for first place, within the training of Masters in psychology and perhaps in the larger university context, is the absence of a meritorious black student or trainee. Many discourses exist surrounding the selection process for the Masters therapeutic psychology training programmes. But the absence of a meritorious black student or trainee continually raised its head in the participants' constructions and therefore warranted further discussion. Participants spoke negatively of how discourses of exclusion make use of many tactics to disguise the issues within selection.

Heidi: If you start selecting people who are more multicultural there would be another issue that is untouchable. At the moment multiculturalism is just the buzz word, where like we said, ten years ago it was the race issue when we talked about race and equity and inequality, but now that is also over. This will also be over and then there will be a new thing like X... What worries me is that again it is just going to be a fad...The quotas have been filled. We comply with this so that we can get our grants...

Mary: It's unfair to select on colour.

Sarah: ... you are the best for the course... quotas are not fair...

Reluctance tactics revealed here are: first it was race, “a fad” (*Heidi*), we gave it some conversational space and then moved on to multiculturalism. Once speakers have provided multiculturalism with a bit of conversational space it too will be dropped and the next ‘topic’ picked up. It is a bit like throwing a ball between the speakers. I was intrigued by this game of catch and pushed forward to unpack more tactics of this discourse. The next reluctance tactic used by the discourse exclusion was the fairness debate. The speaker shows how she feels when catching this ball. Trainees Mary and Sarah bring in the emotional effect of this discourse. The fairness debate revolves around a black candidate being selected on colour and not on suitability, ability or merit. This is linked to the construction of a meritorious black student and the debate as to whether such a person exists. This ball is more of a hot potato than a children’s toy.

Sarah: But that’s the other thing that has to be taken into account... and you must be here because you are the best for the course... We are all the same, not one person because well, you know the colour of your skin; sorry we have a quota to fill. That’s one thing, by normalizing things that will help. But if you sitting in class and there’s someone you feel should not be there and they got it because of equity or even male/ female ratio.

Ilse: That sets up a whole new debate.

Sarah: And that again no matter how hard you try to fix that thing by even having these conversations, will still, it will start off negative in the first sentence. Cause everything that comes out of your mouth would already been loaded with prior feelings or whatever the case is.

Sarah alludes to the discourse of unfair selection that permeates the training from the first day and how it may take time to unpack these preconceptions. Her talk states that black candidates and trainees are selected based on colour and not on ability and merit. Her constructions begin with the obvious issue of race being the factor in selection that is noticed, but then adds how gender becomes the next contentious issue. This is an example of how white participants make use of the same strategy of “playing the race card” that Palesa referred to earlier. This also shows how the effects of the discourse of unfairness permeate and are permeated by the larger social discourses informing these constructions. Both white and black trainees use the race card when convenient.

I became interested in how the trainers relate to these constructs and if they were shared by both trainee and trainer. Trainers constructed that candidates in the

selection process are aware of the fact that people of colour and males are favoured in the profession and therefore have a better chance of being selected at this HWU. Karien, a trainer, explains below how favouring males and people of colour impacts the selection process, and how this process impacts her own discursive world. She also points out that the criteria for selection of “*girls is extremely high*” by virtue of the numbers of applications received from female candidates annually. She takes the construction further to how this may impact the decision-making processes in suggesting that the trainers are stricter with female candidates. I also began to wonder about the part that femaleness plays within this discursive network of maleness.

Karien: we've got a lot of girls, so the criterion for a girl is extremely high. I say that every year and people say, "Are you more strict with girls than boys?" and I say, "Yes I am" because you need to be perfect if you are a girl, the boys you sort of encourage to try and get in.

Ilse: If you are a candidate and you are either male or you are black, you've got a better chance of being selected?

Karien: Every time it's asked, "Are you more strict?" and every time you say no we're not, so that it doesn't look too bad but you are, if he's a male or she's black, I look different ways.

Once more, trainer participants comment on how linked discourses related to race are embedded in the resistance to the system and discourses of exclusion. Heidi states that “*it's always about race or sexism*”. Gender is also so embedded in the discursive network of this HWU. This HWU seeks out white males. Marise, another trainer, has the following to add regarding the selection process and the discourses of race talk. “*Maybe we select what we, our composition is. Every year we complain that we don't get many men, but we don't have many men*” (Marise). Here Marise is pointing out the fact that there are only two male trainers on the clinical and counselling therapeutic programmes and how this informs the dominant discourse of exclusion. The minority presence of male trainers does not preclude the preference of male candidates in selection. Her construction does not include the racial demographics of the training staff, because the two male trainers are white and whiteness is the invisible default position or position of preference within this institution. This speaks volumes as to the silencing nature of the race discourse within selection and within the trainer's discursive constructions. Race becomes a no-go area and culture becomes the synonym for race, as it is more palatable in

discussions. A case of passing on the hot potato, as it is the case in the large discursive landscape.

Marise: With regards to culture as well, it is easier for me to identify with and to understand an Afrikaans, white candidate than it is to understand a Zulu or a Muslim candidate. It does not mean that I won't select someone of a different culture. It is almost as if I have to go through a more extensive process in order to gain an understanding of them before I can make a judgement... because it takes more effort. It does. And I don't know if we, if our selection process allows for that, I don't know. Because sometimes I would like, for instance, to have a colleague who I can ask, "Ok this Zulu candidate said such and such, how do you understand it or is it, you know, how does it, what does it mean, because I don't know... Sometimes I just don't know... Because of owning the fact that you can say that that black candidate is different from the white candidate, you're feeding into the racist discourse, and by doing that the fear might be that now being racist, whereas you are calling it being aware. So the fact that I see they are different and that I can treat the situation different gives them a better opportunity and we who understand.

Trainer speakers put forward that Masters candidates are largely homogenous in terms of gender and race because of the pool of applicants. "They [trainees] all look the same" (Mpho). Karien says that the trainees "are all young, white and female... but that's what we get to choose from". Therefore they minimize the agency and the call for action on the part of the trainers. Once more this is the discursive landscape of this HWU. It seeks out whiteness, maleness and constructs these as the preferred reality.

Marise: I think the discourse about race is so broad, because if you just think about the applicants that we get, I mean most of them are white and English or Afrikaans speaking people by far. They are the majority, I suppose, well I haven't done the math, but I suppose statistically speaking it makes sense that we would end up selecting more white people than anything else. But then the question would be, why do so few black people apply to our University?

Marise constructs the contextual landscape of this HWU, that is the space, which has come up time and again for several participants, both trainee and trainer, as having an impact on the training programmes. The space has also been shown to have an impact on the selection process and on the pool of applicants. Clara asks "Why do we get so few black applicants, I wonder? Whose to blame for that?"

Marise and Clara asks who takes responsibility for redressing the transformation needs caused by apartheid and points out the tensions trainers are left with when candidates who would be good for the profession do not have the necessary academic records required for postgraduate study due to past inequalities in the education system. She end her explanation with “*it is not anybody’s responsibility*”.

Marise: Who takes responsibility for, I don’t know [we’re] playing catch up in the sense, you know, if, because, when was it, I think it was last year or the year before, when we had a black candidate who applied for clinical, male and he was from a rural area, and he was in many ways an excellent candidate, but his academic record was really poor. And we seriously considered selecting him in any case. And then there was a huge discussion about having done, going through so many processes in the past of having selected people and then they struggle, and they don’t make it and they fail, and it is not good for us, it’s not good for them, it ends up being quite a bad situation all around. So what we ended up doing was not selecting him because he wasn’t ... [pause] wasn’t one of the top candidates based on his academic performance... it is not anybody’s responsibility.

The discussion therefore becomes academic for the trainer participants – students cannot be selected if they will not cope with the academic requirements of the programme. This constitutes race talk in that the assumption is that black students will not cope, in other words the assumption of black failure (Robus & Macleod, 2006). Another reluctance tactic feeds the construction of black failure.

Clara: It becomes difficult because then you are working on a quota system as opposed to which are the better students and who would make the better psychologist here? I then wouldn’t want to go that route where we’re working on a quota system the course is still academic in nature and who’s going to carry the weaker students.

Clara also makes a case for the quota system in saying that the academic requirements of these programmes demand an academically strong trainee, thereby insinuating that black candidates cannot be as academically strong as white candidates. The problem of students dropping out then results in ‘setting up’ a black student for failure. The counter discourse would suggest selecting a perceived ‘weaker’ black trainee to challenge the dominant all white training group discourse, but should that black trainee drop out of the programme the dominant discourse becomes reinforced. Thus participants talk of needing to choose only from

'meritorious' candidates. Discourses of exclusion create the 'object' of meritorious versus failing candidates, black versus white candidates and positions speakers as subjects that confirm that there are only a few meritorious black candidates among those who apply. This may be the case due to historical factors (see chapter 2), but this also prevents the participants from looking further and "casting our net wider" (Rani) to find black candidates of merit.

On a practical level, the problem is that both positions have merit. How can transformation then take place? How can the participants deconstruct the dominant discourse of exclusion? I searched on in the interview text. Rani, a trainer, provides a possible answer.

Rani: ... by casting our net out wider, naturally we would get people with different ideologies, different religions different everything. ...Because the problem with forcing things is, the road to hell is always paved with good intentions and if you force certain things, [pause] we are an academic institution, there academic demands on students. It's got little to do with their ability and more to do with the historical content, fair enough. But by bringing them into this course and putting them with the others who have had that privilege, what you are actually discoursing to them is you are different... it would be a disadvantage to people to squeeze them into academic programmes. And it's got little to do with their ability but I mean to take someone who can't do something because of their disadvantaged backgrounds, and to shove them somewhere and to say well, now go ahead and do it. I think that is blatant oppression ...

The exclusionary discourse is posed as static, rigid and resilient. But Rani's talk exposes some of the guises of oppression (see chapter 6) and reveals how oppression can take on many forms depending on how those in power positions portray them. By her talk, discourse of exclusion is shown to be vulnerable to itself, because the participants can, and do, change over time.

Rani: I mean why is it that we always look at these things so statically? In ten years' time we may be having this discussion about the white students that we have to face even because of merit. Why do we always assume that it's going to be endemic to a black population? Because that is our only frame of reference. We could be sitting here in ten years saying you know, we need diversity in those courses cause it's majority black ...

5.3 Subject position: You're black or you're white.

The discourses of exclusion are described from the position of how they work within the discursive context and how participants resist how they work. When locating the discourses in the participants' talk, the process behind the working of the discourse of exclusion appears to be creating two main subject positions, namely black or white. Blackness and whiteness transcend the literature regarding these constructs (see chapter 3), with the need for belonging for black trainers and trainees and a sense of unbelonging within the new transformative space for white trainers and trainees becoming intricately woven together.

The role that the discursive context of an HWU plays in the experiential lives of both black and white trainers and trainees cannot be negated, by virtue of its space being constructed as being a white, conservative, male and privileged space. Participants are positioned within these conservative spaces by being for or against the conservatism. By being for they are positioned within the in-group that belongs, and being against they become the out-group. The in-group at this HWU is white, often male and conservative. The out-group consists of people of colour, women and all people not fitting into the in-group. *"You either fit in with the status quo or you are out"* (Clara) *"You become an outsider..."* (Mpho) and *"I never did fit in. I am black"* (Koketso). The paradox of belonging and unbelonging presented at this HWU contrasts with the larger societal positioning of belonging and unbelonging. Within the larger society white participants speak of unbelonging to their country (see chapter 2), *"I want to belong again"* (Jan), while black participants speak of a greater sense of belonging since the abolishment of apartheid. The white, conservative and male spaces this HWU makes available provides various ways in which to view discourses process and work towards challenging the institutional culture of this HWU.

By creating the tertiary learning space as a racialised space, whether through deliberate acts of policy or through an intricate discursive web, these spaces create value judgements on and for both trainer and trainee. If the space continues to be racialised not only through the history of higher education but also through socialization, staff composition and the politics of the space itself, then it becomes exclusionary and no longer a transformative space. Herein lies the contradiction that a fertile transformative space of tertiary education exists within a highly racialised and exclusionary space. Subjects then struggle to position themselves in relation to transformative space and exclusionary space simultaneously. Subjects however cannot escape choosing one of the two positions offered. They face a crisis because

the discursive landscape of South Africa is in contradiction to the positions offered within this localized space.

The discourse positioned the participants based on how it operated within the white, conservative and male space around the discursive nature of the university to uphold racially exclusionary practices. The idea of “citadels of privilege” (Schensul & Heller, 2010, p. 103) reveals issues around the university as a conservative, white institution, and about how the contextual space and location of this HWU inform this and other discourses. When Sarah continued her talk, she spoke of the role of the training staff in perpetuating the status quo within these citadels of privilege. She distinguishes between the training staff being either fearful of changing or apathetic to changing a system that is ‘working’. “*Changing the system*” may put those currently in positions of power into positions of less authority, therefore less control and ultimately power.

Sarah: ... the lecturers’ don’t bring these issues...That’s why I’m thinking that there’s maybe just a certain way of how we do things and no one is like challenging it.

Ilse: Lecturers are afraid of change?

[silence]

Sarah: Um. [pause] I don’t know if they’re afraid of change or it’s maybe just how we do things and it’s working for us, there’s no need for change, obviously there’s lack of research in it. Change takes effort...perhaps they like staying blind...perhaps to start such a process is insurmountable...

Ilse: Blind how?

Sarah: It wouldn’t be received very well because there’s another problem... it’s so instilled in us still...still so black/white the whole time, it’s still so sensitive. And it would be fantastic if we could get past that where you could say something and it wouldn’t be seen as, “Did you say black?” and immediately it’s linked to racism.

Resistance to the system is posed as being in the control of those in power within this discursive space. However, those in positions of power have little motivation to resist and change the system, as this will ultimately lead to their loss of power and thus a renegotiation of their power and control.

5.4 Counter discourses.

The construction of white, conservative and male space became a symbolic representation of the discourses of exclusion within this discursive context. Within this very powerful space and within this powerful dominant discourse, I sought to find any and all counter discourses possible. I wanted to venture into the ways people resist these dominant discourses or how they manage to circumvent some of their limitations. Only one counter discourse was found and counter arguments were presented which limited the possibility of people using it to resist the dominant discourse of exclusion. (An implicit counter discourse was noted in Sarah's talk stating "*there's maybe just a certain way of how we do things and no one is like challenging it...*" but little additional support was found in the talk of other participants).

The counter discourse proposed was of "*casting a wider net*" (Rani) as a resistance to the dominant discourse of exclusion. Mpho's talk below shows how the dominant discourse of race is embedded in the discursive context of this HWU and why casting a wider net will catch more colourful fish.

Mpho: I won't say there is, I'm not sure how come I think especially in [HWU], there's only a limited pool to draw from.... I'm not sure how come [HWU] is not attracting a pool of different genders, sexuality or culturally diverse people. Maybe we've got a reputation, I don't know... I think it's a reputation of the institution in general.

Ilse: Its historical white university?

Mpho: It's the perception of the institution.... They don't become so awkward anymore because we're not the majority and the minority. It's everybody and nobody is majority and minority in that context... You become an outsider...

But perhaps the reason why a wider net is not cast is that some trainers do not seek out more colourful fish. The dominant discourse of exclusion is so powerful and offers few positions to participants with even fewer options in terms of resisting the identity categories offered to them. Therefore even the position made available reinforced the status quo. The counter discourse becomes neutralized very quickly. The participants then are left only with the option of manoeuvring between contradictory positions in an effort to escape the limitations of the subject positions offered.

5.5 Conclusion

The discursive context of this HWU can be summarized as being perceived as a conservative, white and male institution where the values and goals of the white majority of trainers and trainees are upheld. There is little space for a construction of resistance to the system, but there are trainees and trainers who actively seek out counter constructions to the dominant discourse of exclusion. These counter discourses allow trainees and trainers different subject positions, some are uncomfortable and others frightening to occupy. But if transformation of the academic institution, and academe in general, is the goal of those in this HWU, then discomfort and resistance might become an ally.

When reading all the above, I was left with the impression that the participants were constantly trying to change the status quo, without succeeding. The idea of the more it changes, the more it stays the same. For example, when the quota system is offered as a transformation solution, then arguments against quotas are raised. If a participant is black and speaks out about othering, s/he is playing the race card. Subject positions offered remain black or white despite the politically correct ideals of a rainbow nation.

In the next chapter, I unpack the findings and discussions of the bigger picture discourses of a country in transition.

Chapter Six

Findings and Discussion: The Bigger Picture Discourses of a Country in Transition

In this chapter I describe the bigger picture discourse of a country in transition as they manifested in the interview text. The bigger picture discourse is unpacked in terms of various constructions, from big stories to local understandings and the guises of oppression, and subject positions made available. My guiding questions in this section were related to how the bigger picture of South Africa, being a country in transition from apartheid to democracy, has impacted on the constructions and subject positions made available. The findings are presented with the objectives of the study in mind, namely to describe the participants' constructions of the discourses and how these discourses are informed by the larger social discourses. The effects of the discourses on the context are explored, and deconstruction and externalization are highlighted in the chapter where I made use of them as a tool of analysis (See chapter 4).

6.1 Construction: From big stories to local understandings

Poststructuralist thinking focuses on the local and the specific (Willig, 2013). Participants also focus their talk on how the local context is constructed. Participants constructed descriptions of how the bigger picture discourse needs to focus on the specific and the locally relevant to South Africa instead of focusing on the universal. This may provide a direction to follow out of the impasse of the training system (mentioned in chapter 7) by providing more local interactions between the trainees and the public sector.

6.1.1 Local versus universal psychology discourse.

Some of the participants constructed views of placing themselves in an African discourse where the notions of whiteness and blackness permeate their meaning making (See chapter 5). The participants speak to how the dominant discourse of universalism of psychology provides a construction of whiteness as default position, but little description of the local context has been made regarding “*African people*” or “*Indian people*”.

Tehia: ...this is how psychology is constructed, this is how this race is constructed or you know more because you're white. There haven't been any real social constructions on African people or you know on Indians...

Julie: Psychology is a universal phenomenon... but it must be adapted for working in black communities... language barriers...cultural issues...

Clara: ...I suppose it where you are doing it [therapy] whether it works or not. Not all therapies work in some communities other than white western communities.

I located the discourse of universalism in the talk and became interested in how this links back to whiteness being the universal default position where people of colour tend to be overlooked within the hegemonic global discourse of race.

My guiding questions here became centred around finding links between the constructions of an African, local discourse and the constructions of the relevance debate (Chapter 2). I was concerned with teasing out the link between the South African context specifically, and the context of psychology praxis in South Africa. The participants illustrated how their working within the South African context is complexified by these debates. *“Working in our context changes things”* (Leanne). Some of the participants focused their talk around the Africanisation of psychology, which has often been called for in literature (Macleod, 2004). *“Therapy needs to be adapted”* (Desiree), *“It’s not a static process”* (Mpho) and *“The context dictates what we do”* (Marise). Participants also spoke of the universal discourses being visible in the South African context. *“As a practice psychology can work in all communities”* (Karien) and *“Psychology doesn’t see boundaries... it’s applicable across the board”* (Clara). Thus speakers positioned themselves in-between a global dominant psychology discourse and an African psychology discourse. Athmika spoke of people consulting African healers in the process of psychological therapy in this context. *“People consult African healers for a range of problems... sometimes before even consulting western doctors”*. Therefore the context prescribes an adapted or altered use of the universal discourse of psychology. The debate may be housed in the fact that the nature of the African psychology discourse has yet to be fully uncovered and explored by people who are knowledgeable on this worldview.

Based on my experience in the training programme where the study was conducted, the African psychology discourse is largely absent within the training context, but is clearly visible in the day to day working of the trainees. I wondered as to why it was largely absent. Was it absent due to lack of knowledge or perhaps interest? Or were there other dominant discourses protecting the universalism discourse? I set out with deconstruction and externalization as tools

in my backpack to chart this territory and explore these various hegemonic discourses' motives for pushing their agenda. I found in my analysis that my talk started setting up the dominant discourses, to which I was showing resistance, as being an externalized agent or perhaps even personified with human characteristics of an enemy. The dominant discourses were male, powerful, rigid and exclusionary in nature. I started exploring the effect that these dominant discourses were having on me. Why was I externalizing them? I became aware of how my therapist identity was impacting on the research process. I was playing chess against an extremely powerful opponent who spoke through all of the participants, as well as me.

Karien: What that means is psychology training cannot stop with one-on-one; we need to be in a variety of activities that you can work with different people in South Africa...

Fay: ... we need to sometimes shift away from the individual psychology thing, shift into collective thinking. Cause that's what you've got to embrace in the country like this, because it's not who you are as an individual, you're here because of the people who make this country.

Participants' talk, such as "*psychology is applicable across the board*" (Clara) – it is universal, confirmed the absence of an African worldview in training and thus the Western psychology discourse is supported within the training situation by stating that training is focused on the "one-to-one". "*We train them in western approaches to therapy*" (Desiree). An African worldview represents a collective orientation to life and specifically to problem solving. The collective versus individual here is once more used as a mechanism to not engage. The universalism of psychology discourse portrays an all or nothing position here with regard to the individual versus the collective ideologies. "Proper", western psychology is done one-on-one and community psychology, which is not "real" psychology, is done collectively. The notions of Foucault's modern power are explicit in this thinking, where the power is taken on and handed over between participants. But the power base remains with the universal discourse of psychology.

There were some perspectives were different between the trainers and the trainees. Karien, a trainer, and Fay, a trainee, are shown to have a difference in opinion regarding this positioning. Fay added her description of the need for a collective positioning in this discourse - "*shift to collective thinking*", while Karien, a

trainer, spoke of the universal nature of psychology – *“the principles still apply”*. I wondered if this might be linked to the ideology of psychology and even the ideology of apartheid that is much more present within the older trainers than the younger trainees. The regimes of truth (Foucault, 1980) for the trainers and trainees are different based on the generational positioning. I applied deconstruction to this interview text to see if a counter discourse or ways of making meaning may be presented. Michelle, a trainee, spoke of how the training context could be a vehicle for engagement with multiculturalism. *“We learn in class... exposure here could be multicultural I guess”* (Michelle). Thus exposure was presented as a possible solution. I found no direct reference made to practical exposure from the trainers in terms of personal development. It appeared the trainers thought practical exposure was relevant, but that it was not within their direct scope of influence on the trainees. This is because practical exposure is given offsite in practical placements and supervised by external psychologists. I speculate the lack of reference is perhaps because external people offer this but discursively perhaps because the trainers do not want to be part of such a discursive landscape. Praxis, working in the here and now, is offered as a counter discourse. *“They [the trainees] have to think on their feet... sometimes the stuff isn’t in the textbook”* (Clara). Clara added that *“therapy is a process that cannot be cleanly deconstructed”*, implying the dynamic and fluid nature of the process of therapy praxis. *“Psychology and indeed therapy is a process... it must be adapted to the context...”* (Desiree). Other participants also spoke of how focusing on process as opposed to content driven approaches may open avenues for further deconstruction of these dominant discourses about universality. *“It’s not a static things...it changes... It grows”* (Mpho). *“We no longer see it as dynamic”* (Marise). In exploring this possibility further, positioning related to exposure provided several escape routes such as class diversity, language issues. All of which making exposure seem not so workable anymore. I continued to explore the interview text with the idea of a process discourse as a counter discourse in mind. I was trying to build on my personal construction of the chess game being played here. My opponent had the upper hand and I was seeking a way to infiltrate his defences. The here and now process discourse seemed to present a slight crack in his defences.

Karien: If everybody is the same you accept the one black student as one of you. Are you in the beginning not acknowledging differences or are you at the end of acceptance where you actually looking at your own culture and the

looking at others and then accepting again?...That's the problem with these things; I don't think you can ever reach the end. You notice she's different and you're ok with it, then you move to when she does something one day like maybe she's late for a test and everyone has to wait, and the someone chirps "Oh typical African time, we have to wait for the black student", then you find yourself going "um yes, I had to wait for her" then you start again and you've got to re-integrate it. That's what it's about identity for me, I think that's a process we never gonna get over, but it's a process and it needs to be unpacked. ... But I'm not sure what I'm supposed to do ... [pause] But is that overstepping the boundaries or not? Ja, but you fall back on old patterns.

The process discourse was presented as a counter discourse, but just as quickly as it was opened, the discourse of safety within the academic context was brought. Karien, a trainer, took the process discourse to the position of agency. She mentioned the effects that the discourse have had on her, *"I'm not sure what I am supposed to do"* and how she was immobilized to act. Her talk described a dancing act, a to and fro dance, which the trainers were engaged in as people of diversity. She described how the discursive landscape was constantly shifting and the trainers and trainees were shifting along with it. *"What should we do?"* (Clara), *"How do we continue... its tricky"* (Mpho); *"I am not too sure how to move forward"* (Leanne). Trainers and trainees constantly renegotiated, re-evaluated and reacted to how discourse manipulated and manoeuvred them. They too were playing chess.

Again drawing from my narrative therapist position and using metaphors (White, 1992), Karien's construction of a dance between content of psychology and the process of therapy, had me thinking about who the dancers were. Not only with regard to who was the lead and who the follower but also to who got to decide on which position they could occupy. This idea led me to the positions of insiders and outsiders, of centre and periphery. The process and content seemed to be competing for dominant positioning in the universal versus local discourse. The effect of this discourse then becomes one of transition, of flux, between content and process. Participants were allowed a counter position made available through the transition process despite being constrained by the limitations presented by the universal discourse.

I was left wondering what now? What are the effects of this process discourse on the trainers and trainees in terms of the idea of South Africa being in transition? My guiding questions here revealed many more questions, such as why does race come into the fray yet again? Is there perhaps agency in race?

6.1.2 The effect of race as agency.

I found it interesting that race mobilised participants within an immobile context. I wondered what function race then played in the immobile context? Was race perhaps offered as the one means of creating movement? If so, has race ironically perhaps become a counter discourse within the universal discourse? A pocket of resistance guised as an ally to the hegemonic discourses? Fay also spoke of how the constructions of multiculturalism, race, ethnicity and the bigger picture were all thrown together into a melting pot. *“Race, sex, gender... it’s all together”* (Precious) She noted that this stew was still not tasty for South Africans but yet they were having it on their plates for dinner. Change might be present in the public arena but *“they still come home to the same foundation stuff”* (Precious). Precious alluded to the dance, again. The ‘doing’ of the dance then becomes a way of change, a way of constructing the new and alternative in the process discourse. Her talk also linked to discourses of post-apartheid and the discourses of resistance to the system illustrating the complex and convoluted nature of the many discourses embedded in each other. They thereby reinforce and sustain one another.

Precious: ... look it happens all over the world that ethnicity is an issue, we know that, but South Africa is on the forefront in terms of how we publicized our laws... The whole multicultural issue is so taboo still in our country and, race, sex, gender... it’s all together... we’ve been told everything’s sorted out but we still discuss the whole thing [ethnicity, race etc.] and we bring our kids up sometimes in that way as well even though at school they go and interact and everything, but then they come home and they still come home to the same foundation stuff.

The talk here spoke to the ever-present discourses of race. Precious alluded to how discourses of race have two faces, a public face and a private face. In public interactions, people engage with one another in ways that do not necessarily openly allude to racism, but behind closed doors, in the homes, the *“same foundation stuff”* is being taught. Another participant, Fay spoke of how the bigger picture discourse denied the effects of the past in its current operation. She states that *“... People sometimes limit themselves because of discourses of the past. But if you try and just stand aside and ask yourself, would it benefit me? You will find the answer is that we do need each other, we do need to stretch, we do need to interact with others”*. Her talk goes to the fundamental human need of belonging to a group, of belonging to each other, which was expressed by all the participants throughout the different discourses. The idea of belonging was one I wished to deconstruct further. *“[W]e do*

need each other” (Fay) and “... *I want to be part of that group*” (Jan). The old prescribed ideas about belonging set people up as belonging to groups only if set characteristics of group membership were present. I wondered if belonging could be thought of in another light, that is belonging in terms of belonging to the process discourse, belonging to the process of change and finding new spaces to belong in as well as new people to belong with. This alternative construction of belonging also resonates with the construction of a country in transition where people are seen as belonging but perhaps are constrained by the previous apartheid discourses as to where, with who and how to belong. Some excerpts that illustrate belonging are: “*We do need to interact with others*” (Fay); “*Interacting across the boundaries can be rewarding... we become part of each other*” (Jan) and “*We are together ...not on a rainbow nation scale but a smaller scale... closer...*” (Mary).

“*It’s not a static process*” (Mpho) illustrating how participants no longer view psychology as dynamic and ever changing. Psychology is no longer a process. There were some trainers and trainees who were considering ideas of throwing out all universalism and seeking an indigenous, locally specific psychology. Participants constructed how the universal discourse made use of global constructions to inform local discourse production and to reinforce certain universal and western discourses. The focus on the universal discourse, perhaps at the expense of the local discourse, was explained as being a result of lack of permission to speak. “[*W*]e *only talk about the things that we’re allowed to talk about*” (Tehia). Promoting the local discourse was not favoured within the dominant universal discourse.

Tehia: ... I don’t think anyone would just go and mention something like that [how psychology may be used differently in different contexts]. Because we only talk about the things that we’re allowed to talk about. Frustrated by her reply I questioned her further “*Ok but now I have opened the discussion, and yet you still are avoiding talking about it?*” to this she laughed and said “*Well [pause] that’s racially... Topic change please*”. Unwillingness to engage in discussions of a sensitive nature seemed to prevent the discussion from happening, even when a platform such as this research had been given and an open invitation extended. Another participant was more willing to open up the conversation. She took accountability and stated that a conversation which does not happen can be ascribed to the dialogue partners who do not wish to have the conversation in the first place. Participants do not want to play chess or only know a few moves in the game. Or perhaps very few positions are made available in this universal discourse.

Precious: ... you should be able to ask such questions... If you can't talk about it, you are too stuck in your own frame of reference and I think maybe it being difficult for you to ask such questions it maybe says something about you.

The discourse of universalism actively tries to prevent the instability from taking hold by minimising the agency of the participants. *"It says something about you"* (Precious). This strategy of minimising agency needed to be teased out further to allow the contrary agency room to develop. But first my opponent raised another construction of the guises of oppression before I could even set out to explore agency.

As a country in transition from apartheid, South Africa has become synonymous with the construction of oppression. However within this study oppression was uncovered to be a sub-discourse as well as a subject position. The sub-discourse was called guises of oppression because oppression was found to be utilised in talk by various participants to position themselves in relation to the bigger picture of South Africa in transition in different ways, for example the subject position of being either the oppressor or the oppressed with all the rights and privileges afforded to both positions. The next section explores the ways in which various participants made use of the guises of oppression discourse and subject position in their favour.

6.2 Construction: Guises of oppression

In this section I present various constructions that relate to how participants make sense of race in relation to their positions in this discourse and within the larger social discourses informing these. It is therefore possible that the resistance to race positions, black or white, can at times trouble the traditional binary, but might also in some cases act in support of it under the guises of oppression. I note the effects that these discourses have on the participants and the subject positions made available. Guiding questions in this section of analysis included exploring how the participants utilized the oppression discourse to enact a subject position of being black or white.

6.3 The construction of a legacy of offending.

There is a socially constructed notion of the legacy of offending which can be found in South Africa, namely the construction of the legacy of offending silences talk. *"The silence of unspeakable things"* (Clara). *" You can't say anything"* (Sarah), *"Its not politically correct to speak of it"* (Clara). This is the effect that the oppression discourse has on participants. Through its silencing it affords participants a respite from emotions.

Sarah: ...people are too scared to touch it. They are so scared because the minute you do anything it is so sensitive to everyone, like you can't say anything. Immediately when you start a sentence related to race, before the first words are out your mouth.

Ilse: you're already apologizing?

[pause]

Sarah: I find white people are being very passive and not talking about race where black people... "White people did this to black people" and "I'm proud to be black because"... and if you had a white person who is proud to be white because you have to be proud of your culture, immediately there I think black cultures are more outspoken about... I wouldn't go as far as saying no one talks about it.

Sarah spoke from an emotional point of view regarding the role of post-apartheid identity politics, ascribing labels such as 'racist' automatically to certain groups and how this offends her. In her talk she was less concerned with the construction of the apartheid legacy of offending from the position of those who were previously oppressed and was more focused on how this positioning was enacted in her personal discursive context. She was concerned with how this discourse affected her.

Her talk continues to state her position as being white, but in so doing discourse immobilized her and her talk started veering towards racist thinking.

Sarah: ...You have this stereotype in your head that black people are like "no ways" and they were very positive about it, very open about it, but you link it with top achievers things like that. You link it with that if you look at their background where you're coming from... "you're a white woman, you're a white women teacher", no respect, won't talk to you, don't listen to you. So you can say knowledge and talking about it...

Sarah's talk moved from resisting a racist position to comments such as "no respect, won't talk to you, don't listen" which feed into the bigger discourse of racism in the country. Resisting a racism positions was demonstrated by other participants as well: Heidi positions herself as tired of apologizing "We have apologised, can we move on now... must we keep focusing on race".

Jan: We are not our parents.

Ben: I see things differently from my folks... its not about colour anymore.

It became clear in the constructions that the apartheid legacy has left South Africans with issues regarding race and therefore regarding identity, considering that race is pivotal in any construction of identity. I term this the politics of regret. White people regret apartheid but are unsure what to do about it. The discursive context constantly throws the politics of regret in the face of white South Africans. Participants spoke of how this is “*inescapable*” (Pieter), “*it can make you stuck*” (Marise) and “*stuck in this position*” (Rani). A call for action was heard, but the intermingled discourses made few subject positions available to heed this call. You are either black or you are white. What I wanted to trouble firstly was that the guises of oppression prevented the participants from having these discussions, and secondly, how discourse is able to maintain such a powerful position with seemingly few ways to challenge it. In my discussion with Marise my question was in frustration “*What then are we allowed to talk about?*”

Marise: [nodding her head] We should be able to talk about it...I suppose an interest in differences and an interest in [um] being fascinated by how different people do things differently, [um] and being interested in other possibilities than what you are familiar with. And also I suppose, a willingness to ask people, because that is sometimes difficult, whether it's from someone from your own culture, or someone from another culture, you don't want to look incompetent or uneducated, or you don't want to come across as being judgemental.

The legacy of offending construction then brings culture to the fore. Culture, which is synonymous with race (see chapter 2), is then offered as a palatable alternative in discussion instead of race.

Marise: I think maybe because it's the asocial, [um] ... the expectation is that as a therapist you would be trained to and able to engage on an asocial level but I think that is exactly what makes it difficult. And also we are very bombarded with messages about being culturally sensitive in the media or in institutions, trying to accommodate, always trying to accommodate people and trying not to offend people... Is that something you can say out loud? That you think the way somebody else does things has negative consequences or that it is not the ideal way of doing it or whatever. Or that's sometimes, I think, what stops you from commenting... And ironically, by commenting you bring about more change, which is exactly what us as therapists we want to do.

Marise ventured further in her discussion, explaining how the therapeutic context actually makes this process of exploration into culture and race easier because there

is the expectation of curiosity, and therefore the willingness to ask and answer, from both parties in the conversation. The therapy process legitimizes questioning. I began to wonder why the oppression discourse immobilises people in the everyday context but it mobilises participants within the therapeutic context.

The legacy of offending prevented trainers, and trainees, from having agency. It immobilized the speakers. *“Sometimes I feel like I can’t move... I no longer want to view it as black and white but... sometimes there nothing else to go on”* (Charl). It conditioned participants to remain silent, constantly repositioning themselves within this discursive landscape but ultimately coming back to the subject positions of black or white.

Marise: ... I think in a way it prevents you from getting past your own presumption about, you know, whatever is going on, because you can’t check it, you can’t ...air your concerns (Ilse: Yes) or your judgements or whatever it might be.

Ilse: Yes, But isn’t it more dangerous?

Marise: Yes, I think it is, because I think it can make you stuck, you know [um] I’m trying to think now um, for instance, if I work with a black woman whose husband has many girlfriends, it is very difficult for me not to be judgemental (Ilse: yes) and not to ask “How can you tolerate this?”, but sometimes you know, it is not an issue. Sometimes that is not the crux of the matter in therapy, if I don’t find a way of raising that in therapy then that’s where I get stuck, you know I sort of, that’s what I keep wanting to respond to and I keep restraining myself from responding to.

Ilse: But her husband having multiple partners may be culturally acceptable but it may still bother her?

[pause and long silence]

Marise: Oh.. [um] I never thought of that.

The position of whiteness taken up by Marise suggested her assumptions. The assumption here was of how a black woman would feel about her husband’s infidelity. When the assumption was challenged the position was rendered no longer available. After a long pause Marise changed track and continued the discussion, but from a safer vantage point, from within an academic discourse. The guises of oppression discourse had had enough of our troubling it and wanted a way out. Marise’s talk revealed how openly and blatantly the change occurs. Her choice of

wording also changed from using black and white to “*culturally sensitive*”. The changing of track allowed Marise to retreat back into safer territory and to avoid having to cross the border into the unknown.

Marise: But let’s discuss it from another angle. When it comes to very culturally specific content, I’m cautious ... [Um] I’m thinking more and more that when it comes to culture, I don’t know if that’s just a very subjective or very personal need for me, but having a way maybe as part of your professional training to explore your own cultural background and where you come from; that I think might be useful starting point.

The subject positions of black and white were obvious in the descriptions above. I wanted to unpack this binary further and uncover what supports and reinforces it within the training context. How do these subject positions of black or white reinforce the dominant discourse of oppression?

6.3.1 Subject positions: Black or white.

In South Africa, the social construction of the legacy of offending has participants set up as black or white. This construction also has white and black participants positioned in very different ways. Currently the positioning is strictly object/subject “I told you” with little room for the development of a two way construction “and you heard”. I use these conversational excerpts to illustrate the object/subject versus a two-way construction of oppression. Oppression and the legacy of offending specifically have participants positioning each other as either an object or a subject within dialogue. There is little in the discourse’s construction that informs a mutual view of an “us”. “*They should do... we are doing...*” (Jan) and “*We done it and we apologized... Can we move on?*” (Heidi). Oppression seems to rely heavily on the idea of collective memory of apartheid and utilizes this as a means of withholding closeness and common ground between participants. It promotes othering instead of similarity. The excerpt below shows how this discourse was informed by history and politics.

Tehia: I think maybe they [trainers] are afraid. I don’t know if it’s afraid or reluctant to go there...

Ilse: Where do you think the whole idea of what we shouldn’t say things that are offensive comes from?

Tehia: Our own values maybe...our history...

Hedging words, such as culturally sensitive and other politically correct forms of speech, hide the true nature of the discourse's operation on a racist level. They also expose the operation of the bigger picture discourse as to how it forces participants to ask for permission to speak. I was troubled by this idea of permission and set out to question why participants position themselves in this discourse in such a manner.

6.4 Construction: Permission to speak.

Discourses related to multiculturalism and the bigger picture discourse are littered with examples linked to who is allowed to speak. “*We can't talk about that*” (Jan); “*It's a no-go area*” (Leanne) and “*It's not politically correct to discuss it but we should*” (Desiree) are some examples. The autonomous position of the speaker is negated by the powerful notions and constructions of post-apartheid South African discourses. A balancing act was noticed between speakers where subtle negotiating of positions could be seen. Speakers could be seen to be requesting permission, from the conversant, to engage in a particular discussion, first checking subtly if such a discussion was approved of.

Ilse: So the discourse expects us to ask permission before we talk...

Clara: Well if you look at the political background I suppose so, you can accept it. So if you're teaching them [trainees] to go to these different areas [of] difference, not only black and white but all sorts of other differences, and get them comfortable talking about it there, then it should, theoretically... And that shouldn't because that's playing back into the discourse again. It's like when you got a community psychologist, for the community psychologist to have any authority in South Africa whatsoever must be black. Why?... I think what we're talking about now is very politically incorrect... That a white person must be able to go in and there shouldn't be a difference if somebody goes in there as...

Ilse: So the discourse says...

Clara: But the discourse says no, you are not an expert on multiculturalism and a black person's discourse on multiculturalism no they're not because it's a black person with other black people.

Ilse: Other Sotho black people, not Zulu or Venda?

Clara: Ja There are basically 11 language groups and language groups often reflect cultural differences. So there are cultural differences but even more so than like a white person going into a black township I mean you've worked

cross culturally so you are cross cultural expert... The discourse then is you don't know what you're talking about.

Ilse: It disqualifies you.

The long excerpt above illustrated the entrenched nature of the permission to speak position that participants have to negotiate and renegotiate. This balancing act I sought to externalize further by looking for the tactics and allies in the negotiation and renegotiation processes. More participants confirmed the discourse's tactics of disqualification, silencing and requesting permission to speak.

Marise: Ja you get shot down.

Ilse: You get shot down?

Marise: Ja and to try keep difference, that maintains the discourse of difference. If only black people can talk about multiculturalism it maintains the discourse of difference because that's what multiculturalism is about.

The positioning available had me concerned regarding alternatives. I set out to deconstruct these further and see if counter discourses could be found. Clara spoke of how insight can be found in a position of "willingness to engage", but only once the speakers believed they may speak and have something to add. The counter discourse is only available once you have the permission to speak. My guiding questions turned to establishing what permission to speak was granted on, and where the permission came from.

Marise: Now you've got permission to talk about your differences and some places then those boundaries come down. You realise you're actually not that different to the next person. But you got and it's with everyone, you have to realise where are they coming from? Where are the subtle difference and you got to be able to talk about those things.

Clara: Your training is your playground for what's happening outside. You bring in this little microcosm... I think if there's a course... And it's labelled "Now we are talking about Difference" I mean we all got permission to do that. And if I get a white person in to do it, I don't immediately think 'oh this is a white person I can relax. I know exactly where they're coming from'. No, I have no clue where they're coming from. And each and every individual you take in you've got to have like...you don't know... you segregating again. [pause]. But the problem is how do we get our way-out stream of thought into academia, into training courses and stuff where we can get authority and legitimacy, because

we are literally fighting the discourse. I mean academia doesn't even need to hold us at arm's length cause the discourses. And to be able to break through...[pause]. I don't know.

Within the oppression construction, Clara is shown to be repositioning herself in the construction above. She was also working toward deconstruction of the dominant discourse. She gained agency in the process of deconstruction and created an avenue of escape within this discursive construction. She also created a space where she *could* speak irrespective of whether or not she *was allowed to* speak. Clara spoke of the absurdity of discourse, of the contradiction within discourse, thereby opening discourse up to challenge. Her talk facilitated agency between herself and me and started to develop a community of resistance.

The participants spoke of engagement and dialogue leading to insight and the creation of pockets of resistance. *"We need to speak more about these things but how..."* (Mpho), *"If we talk, it will improve"* (Desiree), *"Difficult topic to raise though... very emotional"* (Marise) and *"Through exposure we can learn from each other"* (Pieter) are some examples of engagement and dialogue found in the text. However, they remained at a tolerant distance while maintaining the us versus them dyad. This 'doing a bit of both' effect does not promote movement but rather a fence-sitting position. It stops the process of resistance and agency in its tracks before it gains momentum. This is another tactic. The denial is useful to distance the talk from finding counter discourse, as it uses the discomfort of negative emotions as a prevention strategy, which is another tactic of the permission construction. Paradoxically, Clara was also deconstructing the dominant discourse of engagement by creating this pocket of resistance. She externalised the dominant oppression discourse *"we are literally fighting the discourse"*. This enhanced agency in her talk and mobilised her positioning in relation to the permission to speak description. This strategy was found in other talk too. Fay highlighted its emotional effects and discomfort below.

Fay: ... it really makes me very emotional. I have a problem and I think what people can do to each other based on the colour of their skin, based on their cultural things, it really angers me to a point of where I get very emotional about it... So ja definitely it stirs up a lot of different kind of emotions. But others may not feel the same way... But who's right?

The attempt to create distance between the negative emotions elicited and the topic of conversation describes how 'different' people are. *"[O]thers may not feel the same*

way” (Fay). In other words they may not experience discourse in a similar way, but there will be others who do. The use of the difference as tool or tactic of distancing is again highlighted. The talk of how the discourse sets participants up as being right or wrong. Many ideas come to mind regarding the effects of being labelled as right or wrong may have on both groups. The notion of setting up opposing camps came into many descriptions. The setting up of camps is an analogy that was shared by other participants.

Ilse: I’m even thinking the way you and I are talking now. It’s like we are setting up the camps, white camp and then the other camp.

Tehia: I think because there’s a social reality that being built up from our history, from apartheid from everything and even though you try and move away from it when you looking for things.

Two camps were set up in apartheid, a black camp and a white camp. Participants showed how they were positioned in discourse to actively reinforce these camps. “We done it and we apologized... Can we move on? I just don’t think people let go that easy...” (Heidi). But black and white camps are no longer politically correct in the bigger picture of a country in transition discourse. Therefore it is more politically correct to speak of the idea of difference.

Pieter: Aren’t we allowed to celebrate our differences? Is it so bad to celebrate their differences? You know do we want to completely throw away those differences? You want to say me being white is no significance. And being black has no significance. It’s a bad thing to necessarily celebrate and then again if I celebrate it, how am I going to celebrate it?

However, Pieter’s construction reinforces the camps under the guise of difference, in other words his need for the other to remain different from him.

The subject position raised again is that of being right or wrong, which is intricately linked to being black or white. This conundrum, which white, particularly Afrikaans, people face, was described by Pieter’s positioning in discourse as a no win situation. Celebrating his nationhood comes at the cost and the pain of the other. He explained how superficial conversations kept the playing field safe. He reiterated other white participants’ views that discourse of fear of consequences prevents white participants from engaging with participants of colour.

Pieter: We don’t want to hurt people. I think we don’t want to ask questions, because we might be afraid what the answer does to the people we ask the

questions from. So we just stay away because it's easier. We can just do it because it's alright... it does absolutely make us uncomfortable. It makes people uncomfortable if you're in the same room with the same people but you've got different beliefs and different ideas about things. So we'd rather just keep quiet and sort of just 'ons praat bietjie oppervlakkig' [we are speaking superficially], we can just speak there and it's alright, because it's not going to touch anybody and it's alright. But if I say this and I believe this and what is your beliefs they're going to start boxing. [pause] it's different, we don't like different. We like the same.

I ventured further to externalise this distancing that was occurring. Another participant, Leanne exposed the discourse's operation of using sensitivity as a tool of distancing.

Leanne: I think it's because it's a very sensitive subject. And I think with apartheid it, it makes it even more of a sensitive subject. And as a white person you don't want to bring up something because you're seen as racist and as a black person you don't want to bring up something because I think they feel that they would probably be judged, you know? ... I would love to believe that South Africa would be a wonderful rainbow nation but it's not, um, there's a lot of inequalities. ... and tensions between the races. So I think out of politeness nobody brings it up. Ja. Or at least that's why I don't bring it up. Cause I don't wanna impose or step on toes or cause a fight...

Discourses of the guises of oppression had trainers and trainees encapsulated in these entrenched views and allowed for little room for movement. This discourse is quick to speak about race and its consequences but fails to acknowledge the detrimental long-term effects it has on the development the discursive landscape of South Africa. If trainers and trainees remain entrenched, they remain encapsulated. Encapsulation provides them with safety within a context filled with risks and within a history of oppression and privilege. But this encapsulation also limits the options available to us to grow and develop as a nation. If the goal is to have the construct of a South African identity or a multicultural identity, then we will need to journey into the unknown and leave our safety nets behind.

6.4.1 The effect of minimising agency.

Any process of change requires the actors to make use of their position of agency. Within the findings, there are countless examples of how the dominant discourses of

a country in transition had the effect of minimizing the agency participants were allowed to exercise.

Clara: Well the race thing the students were afraid that it's gonna cause a lot of friction. Unconsciously I believe they are scared to even open the conversation...I think they thinking like there's gonna be aggression and whatever and that's what they're afraid of. And I mean it is a violent society that we live in and we come from a violent past and there are these discourses that we dealing with it's just that...

Clara, a trainer, explained how discourse consciously and unconsciously prevents people from engaging by permitting them to taking up non-engaged positions only. Violence discourses are offered as a reasonable excuse, as an escape route that offers a non-engaged position. And so we remain encapsulated despite the discourses' instability. Clara constructed the subtle dancing act that participants go through when discussing these sensitive issues. She also alluded to the safety in retreating to the familiar ways of interacting. In deconstructing, the bigger picture of a country in transition discourse's tactics became visible but I was left wondering whether the tactics of safety and great investment from participants would be a large enough deterrent.

The trainees proposed a difference in perspective between trainee and trainer.

Palesa: For the actual staff [trainers] I don't know if they would be willing to do it. If I look at the staff at [the] university is very this is where you fit in, this is what you are doing. I would say it would have to probably mean bringing in new people who are more diverse and flexible in their ways of doing things... It would be you Ilse Ruane the multicultural lecturer. The staff at [HWU] are very boxed into their places... I don't think it's impossible to do but it would have to be something they want to take on.

Ilse: Are we not setting up two opposing camps?

Palesa: Multiculturalism should be second nature but setting it up would be putting it in opposing fields. It would be difficult on the other lecturers who have things all sorted out in terms of this is me and how I work. They won't want to do something different. It will take work...Unless they all go [laughs]. For me practically it's a nice idea that we would want all the people to be trained with multiculturalism as a base. But also not all students would feel the same way about it... [Umm] and its needs a new staff contingent because you can't expect a student to do it if they aren't mentored to. I think this university is a big boat

and it takes a while to change things but once people catch on I think it will. If they can see that it works they will be able to go with it.

Palesa proposed a metaphor of a boat to externalize the construction. This HWU was a big boat with a crew that needed to be replaced. I wondered whether there were other ways of keeping the boat afloat with the current crew. Big boats are sturdy in the ocean and can withstand many knocks from many waves. Similarly dominant discourses are sturdy and can withstand many counter discourses. If counter discourses can permeate the dominant discourses and challenge them sufficiently to bring about change, then perhaps the current crew in the boat can also be challenged, provided the crew is given support and agency.

The position of agency came up time and time again, and many trainers shared their views on it, cementing the notion that it warranted further dialogue. However, they would not be the ones to carry the torch further.

Rani: We start nurturing that [agency] in the group process and classes. Because yes we may still have five white, Afrikaans students and one [black].... But still we again assuming that they all share the same world view, there's an assumption that a white student who is sitting there is going to be good Christian student. Perhaps five years ago yes, the chances are 90%. But now she may be someone who has a tattoo, you know, they still do what they are meant to do but is questioning things. But we then start looking at them as just blobs. Homogenous groups and what happens? She's not going to state that, you know, that she's actually questioning her religion because her in-group won't allow her to do that because she's going to form "in-group" based on certain principles. And maybe we go in there with those ideologies too. Maybe they start categorizing themselves, we start categorizing them with assumptions. And isn't that where we need to start teaching? If we're going to think of multiculturalism as an agency rather than as a course or a workshop, that's where it starts....We should allow it to develop and we should take agency in trying as much as we can to include, to be as inclusive in our courses and the way we teach things, the way we handle things, the way we categorize things. And students are very perceptive in picking up our dominant discourses.

Categorisation had come up previously and reared its head again. In externalizing discourse again, it found a couple of new scapegoats. Again the hot potato was being passed around.

Heidi: I think there is knowledge available it just needs to be implemented... I don't think it's deemed important enough. The powers that be [referring to some trainers] would probably skip that part in a course and then that would cover it. That would suffice. That doesn't deal with the intricacies and complexities that living with this brings.

Heidi's talk positioned the responsibility for discursive change at the feet of the trainers and held the trainers responsible for engagement or non-engagement. Personal investment or effort did not enter into her construction. Ironically this is the same view the majority of the trainers would put forward "We [trainers] can't do it all for them [trainees]" (Marise) – that the responsibility was someone else's. The result was that again no one carried the torch further. "We are not addressing it at all" (Heidi). Nobody engaged with it. Stalemate reached.

Sarah had a different take on agency and the notion of engagement with tricky topics by going back to the notion that fear prevents such engagement. The stalemate resists any agentive positioning and participants are mobilized to emphasize difference and how difference can be used as a tool to maintain the deadlock.

Sarah: ... Talking about it does help but ... by normalizing you use it as an excuse all the time.... So people are also scared of doing that because by normalizing they see it as you can't constantly go back on that anymore because it's not a big deal anymore.

Ilse: So the other party has to be accountable for their role, and by normalizing they actually have to own their role?

Sarah: That's very important because it comes down to people don't want to take responsibility ... no one wants to take responsibility because I think that everyone feels like no one's doing it anymore so I can do whatever I want.

In the excerpt above the stalemate process is explained. By focusing on everyone else's roles, participants disengaged with the process of agency. Disengagement does not require action or agency.

I found this impasse frustrating and tried to tease out alternate ways of positioning myself within this discourse. I was playing chess again and I had underestimated my opponent. However, I fell back on externalization of the problem, and uncovered some interesting findings such as historical residue.

6.5 Historical residue.

A very interesting finding was the uncovering of the construction of apartheid historical residue and the effects that this residue had on the various participants. Clara states the residue has participants “*tainted forever*” and Desiree says “*no one wants to let go*”. The historical residue seemed to be informing participants of various ages to act, react and become immobilized. This was a perplexing state of mobility, as the various participants could identify that the discourse was setting them up to take on one of these subject positions but they were, to a degree, simultaneously retaining their position of objection to these subject positions. Participants were keenly aware they were being placed in a particular position, one that provided them with discomfort and few options of agency. For example younger participants, trainees, had the following to say: “*Because of the past, I am expected to feel embarrassed*” (Jan), “*I wasn’t even born then*” (Jane), “*My parents believed those things*” (Tehia) and “*I wasn’t part of that*” (Pieter), while older participants, trainers, stated “*We had to do something about it*” (Rani), “*Change needed to occur... we had to be proactive*” (Desiree). However, they were aware of the historical residue discourse’s effects and positioning on them, thereby illustrating their agency and resistance to such positioning.

Another avenue of resistance that was utilised by the participants and myself in the interviews was the process of deconstruction. The participants and I used deconstruction in our conversations as a means to expose the dominant historical discourse and create pockets of resistance.

Ilse: Why do you think they would be too sensitive to ask you how do you feel being the only black student?

Precious: I think maybe it’s, I don’t know if I can link it to something of apartheid, it probably is because I don’t know if there’s a sense of guilt for what happened historically that they are maybe sort of sitting with, and they feel like if they start raising the race issue.

Ilse: So you think that historical discourse is still that strong?

Precious: I really think so. And even though people think that we’ve moved on from that it’s still there and I think it’s still difficult for my generation to deal with. It makes it worse if we don’t even talk about it.... but we’re sitting between two worlds. Apartheid was real, but I never actually lived it, the new South Africa is there but it’s not this rainbow nation, we kind of in the middle, and it’s a very difficult.

Ilse: And what ends up happening is now we don't even talk about it.

Precious: In apartheid we had 'whites only' benches and everyone was allowed to say how disgraceful that is and we spoke about it. [pause] It really is more dangerous because what it says to me is that we are not shifting towards what we want this country to be.

Discourses of oppression were being challenged by historical residue but the discourse was resistant to it and challenged it.

Rani: After seventeen years have we, individually not even academically, as people, as academic South Africans, have we conceptualised things in a different way. And maybe it's got little to do with our teaching. It's got a lot to do with what has been happening out there as well and these are also students who have grown up in homes where dominant discourse within race, whereas the kids that are coming to us now, may not have such, well even if they do, remember that they also have alternatives when they switch on the TV, they see things that are different from what they are hearing at home. Before everything corroborated to your worldview of what was coming from your parents. That was the nature of your country. And I think the thing with society like ours is in order to normalise our society, it's going to take generations.

Here Rani spoke of how change is an organic process, and of how it would take generations for change to happen without pressure or force being placed on the actors. This takes away agency from the participants in that it will happen organically without input, another non-engagement strategy of discourse. For Rani, troubling the discourse was happening regardless of any deliberate efforts. Rani proposed generational positioning as another subject position made available in the oppression discourses. Generational positioning also took Rani and others out of the pressure position to bring about change. Therefore they could remain immobile and did not have to engage.

6.5.1 Generational positioning.

Historical residue was a finding that both excited and saddened me; excited because seeing the discourse in the light of being informed by history provided ways and means to actively oppose historical ideology that informed the development of the discourse in the first place. But the presence thereof also states that the discourse is holding onto the apartheid discourses and all the resulting constructions alongside apartheid, to maintain its power and control of the participants. Clara says how "*remembering also keeps us apart*". Thus few subject positions are made available. I

searched for counter discourse and found a strong, very much alive counter discourse developing within the younger generation of psychologists coming into the field. The participant underneath explained what she meant by historical residue and also gave a hint as to how, in her mind, oppressive discourses could be disrupted by it.

Rani: But they were young children when the people who were talking to them were actually children of those thirty years. Because if they were three when democracy came, their parents were learning through the height of it, being white parents being black parents. And that's the fascinating thing in your thesis is that what you have seen is almost like a historical residue. Something that has been so indoctrinated in people and this is indeed the generation that is so caught in the middle of it. Because everything they are seeing now doesn't corroborate everything they've been told. And that is why they would probably hold most strongly to the race based theory. Because it's their safe...it's comforting to them.

Ilse: It's what they know.

Rani: Whereas the ones who come after them or the ones who came before them kind of, "ok, this is how it's going to be."...And they already starting in the normal way to mix with people from different groups and they see different things on TV ... if there is it's just difference. You know someone's got green eyes, someone's got blue eyes.

The bigger picture discourse and the guises of oppression discourse are being slowly but steadily infiltrated by counter discourses through societal pressure for new subject positions. New positions make room for new realities and ways of constructing meaning that provide further ways of disrupting the dominant discourses.

Fay: ... I know history is there for a reason and we need to learn from that but I'm also very much a person for moving forward... What's happened has happened so what can we do now? We have the capacity to move forward now. And obviously that's why history is there to align and not to repeat certain mistakes, but not to dwell on... let's see how we can build a better future. If we keep looking back all the time, you know a nice analogy to that is if you driving, and you look into your rear view mirror all the time, what's gonna happen? You gonna crash in front. But rather every now and then you look in your rear view mirror, but don't focus, keep your eyes in front.

Fay brought a valuable perspective into the discussion, namely that of moving forward simultaneously with looking back. In analysing this statement, one could say that being a white female makes it easier for her to suggest moving on. Driving is a process of moving forward while being cognizant of what is happening in the rear view mirror. This links to the previous discussion of the process discourse, of how moving forward, and backward, are process comments on the here and now discourse. However, this construction was also found in the constructions of other participants. Tehia, an Indian female, positioned herself with Fay.

Tehia: I think it's about time we start to talk about things like this...because they focus on different things that why they feel uncomfortable whereas if we just focus on similarities and use that. I think you look at even what you asking from a different perspective.... We need to move past some of this.

Vishani called for the opportunity to trouble some of these issues and move forward.

Vishani: It's fine interacting with one another but this would just be on a bigger scale... even though it's uncomfortable for some people because for some people it's very uncomfortable... But we need to... It's very interesting to go to, and it's nice just to hear other people's perspectives.

She talked of the discomfort that comes from an engaged position while Heidi ventured into a construction of how not talking and not asking the 'difficult' and politically incorrect questions closes off the opportunity for discussion.

Heidi: Or we are too respectful, you know we don't question it at all or speak about it. If you want to do that you need to know about these things. To understand someone's worldview, you must ask... I think it is almost a misplaced respect. I think respect is when you talk about something, question it - Just doing it in a respectful manner.

Ilse: And asking questions might demonstrate respect?

Heidi: Because you want to know more, you want to make sure that you understand how this person experiences, how it is like for them, and I mean if you are too respectful to touch it, you make assumptions and you will insult that person based on your assumptions.... Apartheid gave black people a voice and silenced whites... If we are too scared to ask a person about religion, race, about their sexuality we will offend them.

Ilse: Offend them?

Heidi: You try so hard to be politically correct because you don't want to be called a racist or a sexist or whatever... but I mean that causes us to withdraw from each other.

She commented on how not asking places the participants at a disadvantage with each other because there may be an assumption of lack of respect or lack of willingness to engage. This is in contradiction to other speakers, who viewed not asking as a demonstration of respect and the willingness to not cause conflict and unpleasant discussions. Discourse proposes contrary positions, either engagement or non-engagement. Both positions are offered as demonstrating respect for the other. So which position do participants take? The decision itself is confusing in its contradiction. Heidi illustrated the protective function that is needed to safeguard oneself against discourse. Discourses of fear, violence and protection all attempt to legitimize distance and non-engagement. These sub-discourses are reinforced by constructions of offence.

Jan: ... We don't want to go there, because we're afraid we might offend somebody and I think it doesn't come from nowhere it's a rational fear... I think we need to confront our anxieties and our fears and kind of just own up to it... I feel unjustifiably ashamed of being white, why do I feel like that? These are the things that really disturb me...

The legacy of offending comes to the fore again and so does whiteness. Whiteness performs a distancing function. Owning white identity and white privilege affords non-engagement because it supports the hegemonic bigger picture and guises of oppression dominant discourses.

Pieter: South Africa will always be that country that went through the huge struggle... I'll just be the ostrich, and then I'll just be the guy who puts his head in the sand. I'll do my bit every now and then, but not really. It won't probably affect me in my lifetime. I'll be able to get by, which I probably will and that's why people continue their way, because it works for them. You know on some level it works for me, but does it really work?

Pieter commented how lack of willingness and lack of effort stand in the way of troubling discourse. These assumptions can be seen as resistances from discourse to allow change to take place. Pieter also depicted romantic thinking of the post-apartheid discourse. The rainbow nation was romanticized within the new South Africa and has left many participants feeling let down.

Pieter: I think there are too many people white and black that live with a lot of angers, that live with the past continuously and if we could ... erase the past, we can all be happy because we'll look at people differently...

I could not help myself in my interview with Pieter to ask him directly whether the personal investment required to make such a change was the reason he lacked agency and willingness to engage.

Pieter: I think it's going to take a lot of effort. It's going to take a lot of really being there, really going for it. Not just saying we need it, not just doing studies about it, doing courses about it, having a question about it in exams. I think it takes every single individual person by themselves to be able to realize that I need to do this in order to better myself and more importantly in order to better our society in order to better South Africa. It will take work... But I want to be part of that group.

Pieter alluded to the fact that as a South African white Afrikaans male, he wants to belong. Belonging to his culture, community and South Africa are set up by discourse as being unattainable. They are proposed as mutually exclusive, but he positions himself in opposition to this.

Pieter: That sense of belonging, I want to belong again...

6.6 Conclusion

The bigger picture discourses of a country in transition feed into and are reinforced by many of the discourses uncovered so far. These discourses support subject positions of un/belonging for white South Africans and of evolving South African identity, as well as post-apartheid discourses and other discourses of identity such as historical discourses and the clean slate discourse. The overarching impasse of multicultural discourse is again highlighted but tentative unique outcomes are revealed in the checkmate descriptions.

Chapter Seven

Findings and Discussion: Discourses of Multiculturalism

The chapter continues the presentation of the findings of the study. The findings are set out with the objectives of the study in mind. I explore the participants, constructions of multiculturalism in the discursive landscape and describe how the larger social discourses inform these constructions. The effects of the discourses are discussed. In addition, I deconstruct the constructions around multiculturalism presented in the interview texts and how culture and race are signifiers of multiculturalism. It also introduces the constructs of agency and identity, which are further developed in the next chapters, as well as the overlap between the various discourses. In this chapter, various ways in which constructions, and ultimately discourses, of multiculturalism reflect, reproduce and contest existing power relations within the context of discourse production are explored. It explores the manner in which discourses represent similarities with discourses in broader society and in so doing explores their ideological effects (the degree to which discourses are homogenous and contribute to processes of authority and domination, subordination and subjugation). In addition it searches for instances in which these constructions act as a criticism of ideology or stand in opposition to the dominant (the extent to which discourses are heterogeneous and offer alternative readings of the social context).

In this chapter the discourses, namely the impasse of the multiculturalism discourse and the immutability of culture, are described from the position of the constructions informing them.

7.1 The Impasse of the multiculturalism discourse

In this section I discuss a number of descriptions gained from the interview texts that explain the effects of the constructions regarding the impasse of the multiculturalism discourse. The effects can be described as an impasse due to the contestation of differing views of multiculturalism. Some participants viewed multiculturalism as only present in *some* interactions between people, while others saw multiculturalism across the board. For example, “*Multiculturalism is in community settings*” (Leanne) and “*Every action is a cross cultural interaction*” (Clara). This resulted in a deadlock as to when or how to engage with multiculturalism. By discounting an awareness of the fact that participants do exist in a variety of discursive communities where multiculturalism is prominent and the engagement it required is an active way of not dealing with multiculturalism.

Charl: When I think of multiculturalism in South Africa [um], I immediately think of the whole apartheid thing to black and white but I think it's so much more and not just our race but also how you grew up, what type of situation you grew up in and all of the different factors that might come into play. I think it's a lot more than just race or geographical area even.

Ilse: Why do you think that the first thing that we think of when we think of multiculturalism is the race thing?

Charl: I think specifically in South Africa it's used... I think it's always there you're always afraid to say something that might be [um], interpreted as racism or whatever especially at this point from white peoples' side.

Most of the participants appeared to position themselves in opposition to multiculturalism because multiculturalism is regarded as not being politically correct for South Africa, as we have become a 'rainbow nation' where we celebrate our uniqueness and our differences.

In the above excerpt, trainee Charl's talk illustrated participants' automatic response to discourse of multiculturalism being race dependent and historically contextually related to South Africa. Race is shown to be the dominant signifier within this discourse. This also illustrates the embeddedness of the discourses in each other, the impasse of the multicultural discourse and discourses of race talk. The impasse of multiculturalism becomes embedded in the discourses of race and difference on a larger social discourse level. Charl as a trainee positioned himself within a discursive context where race, history, politics and language prevail. He positioned himself within this race dominant discourse as being white. Other trainees also shared this view. "*Being white makes it difficult to talk about it*" (Pieter); "*It's not politically correct to talk about that*" (Jane) and "*I think there's a lot of fear to talking about it*" (Fay).

Trainers viewed this discursive context as intricate and perhaps on a deeper level of interrogation. Trainers showed support of the construction of multiculturalism being rooted in the socio-political and historical context of South Africa, but also explored it in terms of power and privilege. Clara, a trainer, points out how multiculturalism is housed within a socio-political historical discourse (see Chapter 6) in South Africa. She speaks of "*the wider discourses*" and "*the wider social discourses*" and to assume that multiculturalism is a term without power and privilege is naïve.

Clara: I think what we don't emphasize is the wider discourses, the social political system that the person comes from. Because we are very individualistically focused and trained, very western. Because obviously it's a

western framework to begin with... Probably then because of the wider social discourses in the country and because of the political situation that we're at the moment. It's quite an unhappy fit... you can't mention the fact that they're black and you're white?

Multicultural discourses mobilised her to talk of how the training is western focused for a largely non-western population and how this impacts multicultural thinking and practice. She furthermore positioned herself as being white but acknowledged the effect of the privilege and power of her whiteness on the context. This position is absent in Charl's talk from earlier. However, the trainees' position of being black or white is confirmed.

Clara further made mention of how training sites within local communities benefitted the development of multicultural thinking but how that did not necessarily lead to the troubling of the discourse around the impasse of multiculturalism. It became apparent that the term multiculturalism is tightly wound up in other discourses, such as race talk, and that the impasse of the multicultural discourse surrounding it confuses and complicates the constructions. Clara illustrated this underneath because, while speaking of the historical context, the racial context of South Africa became embedded in the discussion.

Clara: I would describe it as, because we are in South Africa, and obviously you're thinking as in multicultural counselling as in Indian, Chinese, different people. Not only black people but Xhosa, Setswana whatever. This is one way of understanding multicultural counselling. The other side of it is within my culture and not a race thing; we just have a heavy race discourse in South Africa. Multicultural counselling is not only across race but also within race. Within my own race. Then there is also religion, which I suppose is a form of culture. So within my race, just because I am a white person, that person might have very different religious beliefs... It's basically cross cultural – any kind of difference coming from their background, social setting, their ideas and belief systems.

The talk of Clara, a trainer, spoke of how culture enters into the fray yet again. Many trainers reiterated that discourses of multiculturalism are race dependent and race entrenched in South Africa by stating:

Rani: And the reason we never had to address it is because there were very few black therapists. Many black clients but very few black therapists. So by virtue of that psychology and its history here, it gave you a multicultural

perspective that was race based... but what is our next category? Do we then go according to tribe? ... You know, where's that quantification? The qualification would be that it doesn't matter when a white client is in front of a white therapist because that was the status quo. Nobody questions that even the Afrikaans and English divide... they could be from completely different religions, they could have different versions of sexuality but multiculturalism never came in there because the race was right... we are training more and more black therapists... So when a black therapist is sitting in front of a black client, what is the version of multiculturalism there? Now we never had to address that issue because, if we had to look from the outside in, there is no multiculturalism in there, they're both black.

Rani, also a trainer, referred to the quandary that psychologists in South Africa are placed in. If multiculturalism is not race dependent in South Africa, what is it then? Multiculturalism might be the crux of the rainbow nation construction, but the impasse is reached because of its embeddedness in race. Race is the convenient discourse. Losing the race category would require finding a replacement category. For example, "After race, it was multiculturalism... what's next" (Heidi). Ultimately the process remains the same, as participants continue looking for another category when one is abandoned. This illustrates the presence of additional discourses of categorization and classification that are present even when race is removed. When looking for a new category of difference, participants would be engaging with one another. Rani complexified the issue and showed how she was struggling to move beyond the binaries posed by the dominant discourse of the impasse of multiculturalism.

Rani: But isn't it because they [trainer referring to trainees] have no other template for what multiculturalism is or how to 'practice' multiculturalism. [Um], so if we don't communicate to them that multiculturalism goes beyond race... It's everything that's outside of a box ... a black individual can have a cultural nuances and their idea of multiculturalism in relation to them would be different coming from someone who's white but then they go back to race because that's what it's defined, but maybe we indirectly by not addressing it on a larger level... we're not saying, "You know what, think out of the box. Multiculturalism includes the culture of the body, embodiment is a cultural concept and that is multicultural". But in itself, that's adhering to a different culture but then they have a hard time taking that and saying but, to who's culture does it belong? White culture? Black culture? Green culture because that's their reference point.

The impasse of multiculturalism discourse restricts engagement and rather provides other excuses used and offers discourses of difference and classification even when race is abandoned.

The convenience of the race discourse is that it affords people excuses to not engage or not place personal investment and agency into developing alternate ways of interacting and thinking. Therefore it maintains the status quo, as impasse of multiculturalism discourse promotes the deadlock. The maintenance of the current status quo is something this participant was aware of. She deconstructed and showed how this might become a pocket of resistance in the future, where the subtle nuances and complexities of this thinking may be built into a counter discourse of resistance. Resistance discourses become invisible in the larger race discourses in South Africa. This speaker was deconstructing the dominant discourses of multiculturalism by bringing the context of resistance into the training realm and not only into the theoretical context of the profession. Theory is becoming praxis. She repositioned herself in the discursive context and alluded to how these alternatives may be made visible in the profession and training as well as in the theoretical underpinnings of the profession.

In further troubling the impasse of multiculturalism discourse, participants posed the following construction that multiculturalism may not be a good fit for South Africa and hence should not be invested in too heavily. For example, *“How is it going to look here?... Our multiculturalism should be different”* (Desiree). Another strategy of non-engagement. And so the standoff continues.

Rani: ... I mean, who's to say that if they say that the therapist is like a white person, that it isn't because they've never conceived of a black person as a professional. It is really about that or is it really about the fact that where they are coming from and those disparities are just inherent in our context. So I think we must be careful not to take things that are just natural transition of accommodating and having a black therapist for the first time. Things that will eventually by themselves become as normal as society where we all have judgements and opinions and those judgements and opinions are not necessarily bad or good they're just judgements and opinions.

I started looking for the light at the end of the tunnel. Rani positioned herself differently in this excerpt. She moved to mobilise herself and emphasized that multiculturalism might be a poor fit in South Africa, thereby having the effect of

immobilizing trainers and trainees. And of how we cannot move beyond our entrenched views of multiculturalism.

Rani: I think we can't do the multicultural kind of ideology they do in Europe... They all look alike, they all speak the same language. Yes they have big immigrant populations and that's gonna take them on a different road. But by virtue, [giggle] our kids are starting out looking around and thinking, oh, how nice. They look in mirrors and they see difference because they all look different, they all speak differently and ultimately, if their identity forms around South Africa, then what is multiculturalism in this country?

A view of multiculturalism that is contextually related to and bound within an American narrative cannot be used in South Africa. Her talk posed a counter discourse. Rani states “*we can redefine everything*”. Another participant stated “*we need to do it our way*” (Clara). A counter discourse which would state that a redefinition of multiculturalism is possible within the construct of multiculturalism itself. In redefining multiculturalism, different subject positions become possible, such as being South African as opposed to being black or white, because participants are afforded alternate views and ways of relating to the impasse of multiculturalism discourse.

Trainees were also at the mercy of the impasse of multiculturalism discourse.

Sarah: Some would say multiculturalism is something that you have to take into account because it's called community psychology so you would be able to go into communities and do it. If you see it as counselling psychology, if you just looking at the term depending not so much because you can approach it by saying most people from different cultures might not necessarily come for actual counselling so might not necessarily get those types of people. It's always good to know but you might not specialize in it. But if you use the term 'community', you need to be able to have that background...

In the excerpt above Sarah touched on the tensions between a trainee's frame of reference and the position they have taken up regarding multiculturalism. On the one hand, she alluded to resistance to the dominant positions by stating her opposition to views that multiculturalism was in the realm of community psychology and therefore not something she needed to concern herself with. But then she receded in stating it was “*good to know*” whether this was something you were going to be working with in the future or not. Participants illustrated how difficult it is to discuss multiculturalism intellectually because they used the terms community psychology and

multiculturalism reciprocally for each other. For example: “*Not to sure I will use it in practice one day*” (Jan). “*It is not that present where I stay*” (Mary). “*I won’t be working in communities*” (Jane). The South African discourse concerning community setting needs to be troubled, as these settings are constructed and translated as being black communities. Within this traditional South African discourse, the community setting is on the periphery and refers to township settings and rural black areas. Trainees leave the centre and go out into townships on the periphery, and black community settings, to do their practical work. The dominant focus of practical placement being within poorer, previously disadvantaged communities further set up the impasse. The contradiction sets up binaries of the desire to work within these settings in the transformation process of the country on the one hand versus the process of setting up opposites on the other. The setting up of opposites means that trainees are shown the differences between them and ‘others’, black and white. This is the very purpose of the exercise, but the impasse reinforces the discourses of race and difference within this discursive realm of these contacts. Sarah said “*you need to have that background*”, illustrating how she viewed herself as different and not from that background, almost in a superior manner.

Other trainees confirmed this talk of how they are positioned by using discourse showing reluctance to call interactions multicultural, as multicultural interaction is something that happens within community settings only.

Jane: Multiculturalism doesn’t really come into play where we will work one day... I won’t be working in communities.

Leanne: I don’t see it where I live... It comes down to relevance really.

This positioning also allowed participants to deny needing to engage with difference. For the participants multiculturalism is then something that happens within black communities. Not living or working in a community means a non-investment in learning how different communities operate.

Mary: we kind of minimize it. I don’t know, it’s cause each client or patient that comes through does bring their whole set of religion, their set of upbringing and their rules of interactions, their patterns of interaction. Everybody comes with that no matter what, that you need to find out and work with and kind of explore and everything.

Ilse: Aren’t you doing that as a therapist anyway and not only in community settings?

Mary: Maybe cause then it's easier to think this is why there's conflict or [um] and communication is such a huge part of the therapy so if there is a language barrier it does sort of bring a whole lot of different things so...

In the excerpt above Mary held firm to the position that the impasse afforded her. Even when questioned on it, she brought another excuse, this time language barriers, into the fray. If she cannot speak the language then she has permission not to engage. She therefore maintained the impasse and the distance it granted.

Many a time during the interviews, the impasse of multiculturalism discourse affected participants by allowing the trainees less agency. For example, *"Not sure what I can do about it?"* (Sarah). The discourse put forward excuses to hide behind issues such as the language barriers – *"communication is a huge part of therapy"* (Sarah) - mentioned above or how difference permeated the very nature and thread of therapy and the helping profession itself. For example: *"We cant speak the language"* (Jane), *"It's impossible,... we come from different worlds"* (Pieter), and *"Our cultures are just too different"* (Jan). They speak of the escape routes provided and participants were very happy to take them. I began to wonder as an academic how to challenge trainees to take a stand against these escape routes in order to develop counter discourses.

Rani: Changing course content... is also very comforting for us because we know how to do that and we do it well. Maybe this has something to do with, maybe we should take the whole question that multiculturalism is not a construct, it's a process.

This construction of an academic escape route is limiting, as it promotes course changes and academic knowledge as an outlet of the 'discomfort', but this is yet another escape route as it fails to recognize the process of escapism and denial behind the discourse. *"Not a construct, it's a process"*. Again, the counter discourse of process is presented as a discourse that is well known in therapy and in training. However, this process discourse is marginal in multiculturalism. The impasse of multiculturalism discourse offers two positions, either being on the inside or being on the outside. In the subject positions of for or against multiculturalism, the contradiction is that both positions provide the opposite of the binary and thus reinforce the impasse. The only possibility is then deconstruction and development of counter discourses, such as the process discourse. Participants proposed agency as a workable counter discourse.

I set out to deconstruct the idea of agency. When asked how to institute agency in trainees, Rani responded through troubling the ideas of agency and multiculturalism themselves. It was also interesting to note that Rani was the only trainer who spoke of agency thus she is quoted extensively. I speculate that perhaps it is linked to her subject position as being Indian, thus not white and not black. Therefore she may speak more openly. By viewing multiculturalism as agency, a shifting discursive landscape may be created.

Rani: We start nurturing that in the group process and classes. Because yes we may still have five white, Afrikaans students and one [black student]... But still we're again assuming that they all share the same world view, there's an assumption that a white student who is sitting there is going to be good Christian student. Perhaps five years ago... But now she may be someone who has a tattoo... But we then start looking at them as just blobs. Homogenous groups and what happens? And maybe we go in there with those ideologies too. Maybe they start categorising themselves, we start categorising them with assumptions. And isn't that where we need to start teaching? If we're going to think of multiculturalism as an agency rather than as a course or a workshop, that's where it starts.

Rani, in her description, not only challenged me but she openly challenged discourses that render multiculturalism's impasse. She threw many concepts into the fray that are used by discourse to distance participants from engagement with the discourses. For example Rani's construction of trainees being "homogenous... blobs" versus different as people. This illustrated that discourses around multiculturalism are perhaps on shifting ground. And yet the subject positions available remain few and far between with challenging these positions very tricky to achieve. Deconstructing the dominant discourse created the possibility of new ways of relating to the impasse discourse. However the impasse of multiculturalism discourse brings the circle round again and reinforces its legitimacy through the under- or overstatement of multiculturalism. By making two subject positions available, over- or understatement, the impasse is yet again supported.

7.1.1 Constructions of under- or overstated multiculturalism.

Participants presented contradictory views of the two constructions, namely under- or overstated multiculturalism in training, made available to them. Participants illustrated how they were positioned differently within the impasse discourse of trainer and trainee positions.

Clara: ... we do emphasise the difference but I don't think it's emphasised enough. It should be in your counselling skills because every interaction can be seen as a cross-cultural interaction. I tend to see everything as a cross-cultural interaction. But it's also that I don't think we realise how people's histories, their political histories and the discourses from which we come from, how that affects the counselling situation as well... Therefore it's a sensitivity towards people being different and their concepts, the way they see things as being different. The way they see things from different spectrums might influence the counselling situation. They might be talking about one thing and I am talking about the same things but we are coming from completely different backgrounds. There are all sorts of nuances. You have to be on your toes all of the time to pick up on the difference.

Clara, a trainer, positioned herself in saying that every action was a cross-cultural interaction and that more attention needed to be paid to viewing them as such. Using discursive psychology specifically I viewed this as a tactic of discourse. Karien used the tactic

Karien: everything we do is multicultural because if you work with any person there will be diversity anyway. Everybody falls in a specific category or is different. So I don't know what is counselling and what is multicultural counselling although in our country we have different perspectives because we have the racial divide. These are the things we live with... we don't want to make too much of it.

Trainees also used the tactic of distancing. *"Differences like... [umm]... language barriers make it...well impossible...I can't help if I can't speak to the client"* (Leanne). The difference discourse came into action again. *"It's much more emphasised, the nuances are then different. And I think unless you have a background of some of the different cultures you might miss some of the stuff. But I have never been exposed to that myself..."* (Leanne). Leanne, a trainee, stated that a background in 'difference' with regards to cultures is needed to deal with multicultural interactions, something she has had little personal experience of despite having been born in South Africa. This is an ironic statement illustrating the disempowerment that the impasse discourse presents to individuals. As a South African it is rather difficult to grasp that Leanne has not had personal experiences with people of diversity. Furthermore, the description from Clara that every action was a cross-cultural action and Karien's argument that we were doing it anyway are also arguments for not dealing with

structural imbalances such as skewed demographics in trainers and trainees. Therefore the positions available reinforced the impasse discourse.

Discourses of difference permeate the above three excerpts. The excerpts illustrate how keenly aware the participants were of difference. Even in the absence of obvious differences, some differences were sought out. Trainers viewed differences in the following way: Karien started out by saying she thought trainers may be “*making too much of the diversity issues*” and then contradicted herself by acknowledging the numerous differences in perspectives. Other examples are “*They are all different, I suppose*” (Julie) and “*We know that there are differences*” (Karien). By negating the diversity issue, their talk allowed them not to engage with critical issues of difference. The discourse of the impasse of multiculturalism had participants confused and pulled in opposite directions, constantly needing to renegotiate their position. Trainees, such as Leanne openly stated “*I have never been exposed to that myself*”, showing how difference is completely negated.

Karien: I wonder if it's not there to make people aware of it. If you work, especially in a western world, you will often work in your own culture but we got used to not working only in our culture. We know that there's differences. That is a term to make people aware that people are different. I mean you can never work on your own because there's too many divides.

Karien's talk seemed informed by an overstated multicultural discourse that positioned her as not having to move much because processes, such as culture and race, are static constructions. “*There are too many divides*”. She did however seem to be uncomfortable with this, as though her position was not a certain one and that she may have preferred an alternate position. The impasse discourse however holds culture as monolithic and static, while participants may have experienced it as being more fluid and less delineated in reality.

Under- and overstated effects of the impasse discourse are also constructed. Discussing the discourse's operation is an overstated effect on a multicultural viewpoint, which brings the opposite element into the mix, namely understated effects, such as “*nobody is doing it... nobody's even aware... nobody even wants to*” (Clara). Some trainers had a different view on how this dominant impasse discourse is impacting on training. They believe multiculturalism is understated in training.

Clara: At this stage if nobody's doing it and nobody's even aware of it and nobody even wants to breach... You know I'm looking at the stage in development... at the stage we're not comfortable enough to talk about the

trainers/students, whoever it is, then maybe it does have to be a big discourse because of the developmental stage that we're at. ... Perhaps we are expecting too much...

Desiree: Not enough attention is given to multiculturalism in training cause it's difficult to conceptualise and its uncomfortable... students are unaware of how and when to utilize it.

Rani: Maybe they don't use it because they don't really know what it is?... Maybe we don't provide enough space for class discussion regarding it to happen?... maybe we are afraid...

Participants seemed to be positioned in these opposing effects of discourse, over- and understated effects, but they also made a distinction between constructions of insiders and outsiders/us versus them subject positions.

7.1.2 Subject position: Insiders and outsiders.

The positioning available within the impasse discourse in South Africa is along the lines of us versus them or insiders and outsiders. The first example of discourse is illustrated in Rani's discussion of the American versus the South African ideology of multiculturalism.

Rani: I think the course still very much runs on older concepts of what multiculturalism is and what American multiculturalism is but American politics has never been dominated by race per se, identity was always American. You know American was stuck somewhere there but South African news is different and I think we've got to be very careful with that to go back to race base kind of therapy...

This seemed to be offered up as a safe starting point for a discussion of us versus them. The academic discourse may have provided an escape for this participant, a means of not having to engage with the discourse directly. The operation of the academic discourse of non-engagement then provided a safe distance between the participant and the issue under debate. Insider and outsider subject positions were put forward as a means to renegotiate the terrain of multiculturalism in South Africa and transformation in the helping profession of psychology. This might be seen as a ploy for non-engagement with the issue at hand.

Ilse: Why we are trying to adopt the term, the ideas and the process the whatever, the practices of Multiculturalism in the first place?

Julie: That's what we have to question. Maybe we assume because we have different kinds of races that Multiculturalism is a necessary term here.

[silence]

Ilse: We are going to impose it on Africa and see how it fits and where it doesn't fit?

Julie: And where did they come with Multiculturalism? They came from the fact that they didn't have laws that oppressed people, they just did. The indigenous people on like reserves and things, so for them multiculturalism is a huge thing because they're dealing with their own guilt factor but there's nothing in law that says they actually did what they did. You know so their basis, their historical basis is very different from ours. And who's discoursing on multiculturalism there? Who's the dominant researchers and, let's go back to race, I mean, it's majority of the white population of a certain class you know. Not the ones in the reservations. Who is debating multiculturalism in this country? Everybody.

In our discussion, Julie called for a redefinition of multicultural counselling for the South African context and she pointed out that South Africa faces different multicultural issues constantly calling for redefinition. As a strategy, redefinition can become a means of remaining static and not changing. While busy with redefining constructs, less engagement occurs. It also, paradoxically, means less agency can be exercised. Julie pointed out that the context in which the various discourses grew was fundamentally different and those in position of power were different. My initial response was yes and no. The discourse has not changed much over time, agency remains limited and options skewed in favour of those in power. Julie's talk also referred to the power based positions of those doing the debating. These 'others' are described as being the powerful and dominant, and are given authority over the topic. However, they are also the ones reinforcing the dominant views, both historically and currently. This relates to Foucault's view of power. For Foucault, power is not the property of the people in the relation but belongs to the relation itself. Embedded in the discussion of power is the trainer's versus the trainee's perspective on these issues. Trainers perhaps have a more academic level of engagement with the concepts, whereas trainees have a deeper level of practical understanding due to their current practical experiential exposure in the field.

The second example of the us versus them positioning is given by Marise, another trainer.

Marise: ... we start with just an awareness of your own culture, and then an awareness that what you view as a very basic kind of way to view the world and a very basic way of engaging with the world or doing things. [Um] and an awareness that it's different from how other people live or from what other people are used to... But I think it is also very idealistic because we work with so many different people ... to work with. And also, [um] even if you can somehow manage to educate yourself in terms of all the different cultural groups which you might encounter, which is unrealistic, but even if you could. [um] You would end up with a very stereotyped idea of how people work in every culture, which is also an abstract idea and is very general...[pause]... And also I suppose, a willingness to ask people... you don't want to look incompetent or uneducated, or you don't want to come across as being judgemental. [Ilse: mmm] But sometimes you just really don't understand or you assume that asking a question would be offensive to someone. I think that's sometimes difficult part.

Marise talked of insiders and outsiders or us and them directly referring to different people. The word 'culture' got thrown into the description as a means of moving a safe distance away from describing race.

Participants talked of how multiculturalism and the idea of difference in people in South Africa is part and parcel of South Africa's legacy of offending and part of the apartheid legacy. For example "[it] would be offensive" (Marise), "I don't want to offend anyone" (Jan) and "It's not politically correct to talk like that" (Clara). The impasse discourse provided positioning that required permission to speak. Participants were cautioned as to what can and cannot be said and described being held ransom by fears of negative reaction. The constructs of offence permeated many participants' descriptions. In externalising the offence construction, these constructs also were successfully used as escape mechanisms. It was a safer position for the speaker and reflected little consideration for the listener.

Precious, a black trainee, provided the third example of outsiders and insiders but from a more 'useful' position.

Precious: ... it's quite limiting when you're in just one group cause you think the same way, do the same things. What adventure is there in that? How do I stretch the way I think if you're with the same people all the time... it brings a balance into your life. You can't just sit in a clique little group where it's 'us' and 'them'. How're you ever going to know about them if you only stick to us? Have

us as your support, that's fine, but you need to be able to say my identity is not only about the 'us'. My identity is just me, it's who I am and I can fit and I can go into. I'm not limited.

She explained how viewing people as us versus them may also be a positive learning experience and how one should not limit oneself to one type of interaction. Precious included the discourse of identity (see chapter 9) in her discussion of us and them, thereby illustrating that for her, her identity is informed by the discourse of us and them.

The insider and outside/us versus them discourse gave the participants three subject positions; firstly, the context in which multiculturalism was born is foreign to South Africa and therefore cannot be adopted by or adapted for our context, resulting in non-engagement; secondly, we are too diverse to be working with all people in South Africa, resulting in non-engagement; thirdly the dyad of us versus them can be to your benefit and development if you come at it from a different angle, resulting in engagement, but only if it is to the speaker's benefit. The discourse tries very hard to put forward a negative view of multiculturalism and to use the us versus them to show up how ineffective such a concept is for South Africa.

However, the discourse opens a small door for participants to engage with multiculturalism from a different angle. This angle may not be available to and for all the participants, because the entry position is hidden in a volume of reasonings why not to grapple for the concept. It is like looking for a needle in a haystack. Those who want to find the needle may have to search awhile, but the needle can be found. Finding the needle requires a certain type of person, as not everyone is willing to get hay stuck to their clothes and to get their hair in a mess. The implication for such a view of agency is that much is left behind. The theoretical background and training of alternative views in the profession of psychology do exist in training programmes, such as psychometric assessment dealing with culturally appropriate instruments and the inclusion of the Xhosa DSM criteria in the psychopathology modules, but are, interestingly enough, completely forgotten about within this form of agency. The position of resistance at which I stand found this conundrum regarding agency both riveting and concerning. Trainers work very hard in training programmes to provide trainees with the tools to cope with an array of situations and client problems. Trainees are thus presented with both theoretical and practical knowledge which facilitates the process of learning to deal with the uncertain nature of the therapy process and to adapt the tool bag accordingly. But within this limiting view of agency all counter positions of resistances are removed. No repositioning was found, no

counter moves were uncovered. As a trainer, I then started thinking along the lines of process and content again. In these powerful discourses the content is being gobbled up by the bigger and more powerful process monster. What then will be the tools with which to oppose and fight off the monster? Or are there none? Are trainers and trainees lost in the process? Lulled into a false sense of security of process?

The last uncovered subject position proposed by the impasse discourse, described in the following section, is that of being lost in the transformation process.

7.1.3 Effect of transformation being institutionalised.

In grappling with the three options raised above and especially the idea that the participants might be trying to incorporate a foreign concept, the following question came up. Is the process discourse contradictory with regard to multiculturalism or does it have us lost in the transformation process, as a strategy of in-action? The state of in-action stresses the ambiguity that is experienced as a result of such positioning. It paradoxically may also refer to the state of in action whereby the in action becomes a strategy of disengagement.

I looked to the participants who had descriptive constructions leading to multiculturalism from the position of the three options given. The constructions were interesting in that their talk started out by illustrating that multiculturalism was not seen as an option and almost actively taking an oppositional stance to it. The constructions continued and led into how diversity and historical discourse prevented such actions (in-action) or positioning but ultimately the constructions ended with how useful such concepts could be if applied differently or approached differently and put into action (in action).

Rani: It's a dynamic thing, it's living, it's alive. It's not something dead. Apartheid was a static, repressive thing. Forcing us all to Ubuntu each other, it's going to be exactly the same thing. I mean it's just looking at it why because the one has a positive connotation to it that we assume that it's going to be wonderful. No, and where would that come from? It comes from the fact that multiculturalism should be embraced. What is it that should be embraced?

Mpho: It's all constantly changing... we need to teach them that.

Desiree: How do we transfer that to the students.

The talk illustrated how the paradox of being in-action and being in action. The description is developed further. These trainers surmised that the inaction felt by trainers may not necessarily be filtered down to the trainee participants. The trainers'

inaction may lead to action on the part of the trainees, provided a fertile ground is laid.

Rani: because a lot of that is also our history, as trainers, have come through systems where we disagreed with certain things but we were forced to do certain things. And now we're thinking, these people, these students should know it now because they are in such a fortunate position blah blah blah and the frustration comes from that why aren't they seeing it beyond race? What we can do is basically do what we do, increase what is multiculturalism on a practical level. Increase our intake of different people in the course, different, unfortunately different races, I mean if we have to come back to that, different sexualities, different ... Hopefully that would become a natural thing that more people would apply as more access is given to the country. When more people [of diversity] apply, there's a more dynamic group that comes through. That's where they learn.

Clara: We need more 'others' in the class.

The talk linked the transformation discourse to historical discourses and post-apartheid discourses (discussed in chapter 6). All these discourses inform and are informed by each other. They support and provide a self-sustaining encapsulated context for one another. I sought to break through this self-sustaining infrastructure and my guiding questions were linked to the process of deconstructing these dominant discourses. Through much probing and endurance, the transformation discourse tentatively opened the door again for the idea of coming in at another angle.

Rani: Almost, in a sense, throw a pebble in that water. Don't sit back and say yes, that's what happened in apartheid time. Those pebbles cause ripples that allow them to come through with it on their own, because that's the whole point. And once we get more dynamic groups that apply and that get together be aware that within their [indistinct]... are the pockets of learning. That we got to go beyond our own versions of things and be able to almost nurture those things within the courses because that's what will make them a good therapist. Telling them to sit in front of a client of a different race or a different culture, different religion and tell them you must come across as tolerant and this is your job as a psychologist. The whole idea is to almost institute a change that's almost not on the, it's not just an intellectual change.

It was captivating to see the construction of one participant going through all the three options provided by other participants. I wondered if this was a coincidence or if other participants had a similar thread. I ventured on to explore this discursive landscape. Rani's talk also alluded to her repositioning in the transformation discourse, using words such as "an intellectual change". She was actively seeking out a counter discourse, albeit a very tentatively developing one.

The discourse of transformation also had Jan moving backwards and forwards between the options.

Jan: I think we are well on the way in terms of that [transformation] and I think academic institutions have all subscribed to the idea of that multicultural settings. That we need to train people to be competent and ready for that. Not just in their professional interaction also in their personal interaction. I think it has been a bit of a jump to certain people's minds of those that have perhaps been established in their minds and that the adjustment to the new South Africa there is such a thing as, it is difficult and I think people that have acknowledged the adjustment is difficult... Still the influence of the past is there and sometimes so subtle. We don't realize that it's influenced your way of thinking and your way of interacting with people. But I think there is a growing appreciation for having people that are multiculturally competent... Having transformation, goals, targets and things like that slowly but surely is beginning to get part of our daily lives. I think academic institutions are the same. They would come to see more research, coming not just from the white elite but coming from black students and across the racial spectrum.

Jan's talk was situated in numerous discourses, such as the transformation discourse and the impasse of multiculturalism, and also illustrated how these discourses operate to maintain the power relations of the white elite. His talk spoke of changes taking place in the institutional system where black students would do more research. The position from which his talk operated was that black students previously had not done research. This might be true but the construction was informed by the historical discourse that permeated the opportunities for black students to attend universities and do research. This effect of the historical discourse was not engaged with. One may speculate as to why, possibly the fear of consequences linking to apartheid discussions, but the effect was that black students once more became entrenched in the subject position of the absence of meritorious black students and trainees.

Desiree appeared to be offered a less confused subject position compared to the other participants. Desiree is a trainer and sees theories as adaptable depending on contexts. She spoke of multiculturalism being viewed as a theory but ultimately the theory needed to be applied. In a similar fashion to how other psychological theories are applied in practice, so does multiculturalism need to be applied in the South African context. It is at the level of application that the personal comes into the impersonal/ill-fitting view of multiculturalism in the South African context.

Desiree: I think that's a start because I think that the theories are not the authorities, the theories are just theory... And theories change, they're a dynamic and they change through time and through socio-cultural perspectives. It's a place to start, but it's not like reading a Bible that you can't move from there... its information and its valuable information and certainly a good place to start. But it doesn't mean you have to stick there. It's not like following a maths formula.

Desiree's view of learning from the therapy situation is shared by Clara who said *"therapy isn't politically correct. Therapy is never politically correct. We ask insensitive but necessary questions. Maybe we should start doing that in our country"*. These participants showed ways of resisting the dominant discourses' ideas of using multiculturalism in a rigid and static manner. The dominant discourse limits the ways of constructing race and multiculturalism. It constrains the participants in prescribed ways of relating and being informed by discourse. Only when the participants engaged with counter discourses did these constraints become less visible and more flexible, once more illustrating how the in-action that discourse imposes can lead to action. Both Desiree, *"it's not like a maths formula"*, and Clara, *"therapy is not politically correct"*, implied moving from an intellectual space to praxis, similar to Rani's previous talk of *"an intellectual change"*. These three trainers spoke of how praxis being action oriented may lead to structural changes within the training. These structural changes will have a ripple effect and lead to changes at the process level. Thus structural changes may assist the process constructions in developing a stronger voice. In moving from intellectual to praxis positioning relates to the idea of an integrated training in multiculturalism (see chapter 2), which is spoken about in literature and by the participants as being the desired 'ideal'.

The second subgrouping under discourses of multiculturalism is the immutability of culture. Culture has been introduced by the participants in the discussions above concerning the impasse of multiculturalism. In this section however, the immutability of culture is further described in terms of the constructions of the participants, the

effects and the subject positions offered, namely culture bound in oppression, discomfort with 'otherness' and negotiated culture. These constructions are linked to the social discourses that inform them.

7.2 The Immutability of culture discourse

Within the discussion regarding the immutability of culture, I uncovered three prominent constructions, namely culture bound in oppression, discomfort with 'otherness' and negotiated culture. Culture can be seen as adding spice to life. Spices may be experienced as adding flavour to dishes or acting as an irritant. South Africa has a wide range of cultures that inform and are informed by discourse. It would be impossible to uncover all the constructions around a singular South African culture because culture is a fluid construct.

7.2.1 Constructions of culture bound in oppression.

Racism is "hiding under the guise of 'culture'" (Gaudio & Bialostok, 2005, p. 52). An example from the study is, "*different culture... different background*" (Jane). The use of culture as a synonym for race leapt into the dominant societal discourse during the apartheid era. The use of culture as a synonym for everyday racism pervaded the white middle-class discourses about cultural difference and social inequality globally. In South Africa the construct of culture and culture discourse was embedded in artificial tribal discourses that aided the government at the time in justifying homelands and townships. This was part of the ideology of apartheid, of segregation of people. Even in the current political climate, the construct of culture is so loaded that many use culture as a synonym for race while others refuse to engage with the construct at all.

Jane: One of my prac's [practical placements]...the majority of the women are African ladies... I just find that some of them there's the language barrier and then other times you also don't know what culture they're coming from and I think it's kind of hard to admit but you kind of come from a 'your culture is the superior culture' and they must speak English and they must kind of step up to where you are and it's so wrong that you're kind of frustrated but in the meantime it's like 'shame' [emphasis on word], they must also be frustrated because we're not speaking their language but we expect them to speak our language.

In the excerpt above Jane started her discussion regarding culture in an unguarded and perhaps more honest manner. She constructed the dominant discourse of difference as being white culture and let it slip that the dominant white culture

positions individuals in opposition to cultures of difference or to 'other' cultures. This historical South African discourse further made value judgements such as "*your culture is the superior culture*". Jane mentioned that the realization had dawned on her that the historical discourse was positioning her in a position of power and dominance and she retracted by saying "*shame*". The emotion displayed was pity, which ironically yet again placed her in the position of having power over someone else. The conversation moved along, continuing the construction of pity and shame in her description of the practical demands placed on her and her irritation therewith. For Jane cultural spice has become an irritant. Her talk often made use of the word 'different' to illustrate her distinction from the culture of the other thereby creating distance between 'her culture' and 'other cultures'.

Jane: ... it's so comfortable working with someone who's like you if you know what I mean, culturally they're working with someone who comes from a different background, different everything, it really places a different dynamic between you and the client. Even if it's not spoken verbally, it's there. So I think it definitely does and I think in South Africa specifically I often find like there's a lot of our African population are still really poor and struggling and I find that hard. So emotionally I find it you know, when you're sitting with a client and they come from a different background and culture I'm like 'please don't let this come with "I don't have money, I don't have food" and that.

Jane's talk was a fear of the consequences of interacting with cultures that she viewed as different to her own. She feared the requests for further engagement that may result from interacting with others. She illustrated that she would engage but that it needed to be on her terms and she wanted to exercise the control over the interaction. Thus the power positions remained with her as was the case in apartheid.

Jane: ... Just realizing that it can be in every interaction even if it's not in you're a-social setting you know, it's out there. But it's putting yourself out there you would be totally different. But we assume we're the same so we don't even ask the different culture. You live in different places, you've got different families of origin, you function differently, and you've got different rituals, everything's different actually but we compartmentalize people. All white women must be in the one, all Afrikaans in another, even within those little groups, we're not homogenous. So why're we trying to bracket people? It's actually quite unfortunate.

Jane tried to describe the alternate position but fell back on the position offered previously. She fell back on the word 'different' and used it again to negotiate a safer distance. In the last portion of the excerpt Jane dealt with the contradiction imposed with a subtle resistance to her previous position. Interestingly enough here she spoke only of white and Afrikaans people. There is no acknowledgment of the presence of subjects of colour in the discussion of difference. I was left wondering how she positioned herself in understanding difference. I also wondered how I was being positioned by her construction, Was she back-tracking quickly after feeling that she was being painted into a corner? I felt irritated by this effect that the difference discourse had on Jane as well as by the effect it had on me. I resisted the dominant difference discourse of culture being an irritant and was left searching for a counter discourse or a participant who experienced culture as a spice-adding flavour. But I was left wanting. I was also left speculating as to what gave me the permission to view culture as a spice, an enriching element. I speculated that white privilege does not place white participants in a position where we can easily think of culture as adding spice to a dish. For the dish that has already been prepared. The opposite side is then if I was at the bottom of the scale due to my cultural position in terms of for example wealth and opportunity or being discriminated against in a small group of whites students, culture may not then be experienced as spice that adds value but rather as an irritant or a poison.

Culture, especially the word 'culture', has become synonymous with any- and everything related to race in South Africa. Therefore culture has, generally speaking, become an irritant. Not one participant spoke of culture as a positive, flavour-adding ingredient to the recipe of South African multiculturalism. Culture is so encapsulated in the South African historical context that culture is irritating or insulting. I wondered how the difference discourse was able to construct multiculturalism as divorced of positive culture and married to sameness in culture. Such a position on multiculturalism presents a double bind. Or was discourse using the culture hype to mask the issue of 'otherness' that is fundamentally uncomfortable in difference dominant discourse?

Another observation was that culture is largely defined in terms of ethnicity. There were very few, if any, references to other forms of culture such as gay culture, youth culture, disabled culture and so forth. I began to wonder if this meant that the participants were predominantly homogenous. Being a more homogenous group of participants may mean that the avenues for resistance open to marginal groups in terms of resisting dominant discourses were absent. Marginal groups would have

had experiences with other cultures, such as gay culture or youth culture, that would have informed the discourse of culture bound in oppression. Culture thus becomes marginal within the discipline of psychology (Cole, 1998). However, the lack of voice related to marginal participants or marginal experiences might also reinforce the discourse related to the power relationships within this discursive context, where homogenous group ideas and constructions are promoted at the expense of different experiences. For example, the lack of constructions regarding gender and sexuality stand out in their obvious marginality.

These constructions of 'otherness' led to the next section describing discomfort with 'otherness'.

7.2.2 Constructions of discomfort with 'otherness'.

'Otherness' is presented as being all consuming in South Africa. Culture is experiencing other people thus experiencing otherness as Jane states "*different cultures... different everything*". My guiding question here was how the experiencing of culture and otherness informs the dominant discourse.

Discourses related to 'otherness' were easy to find.

Pieter: I think you need to be aware of your own position, your own culture... Then you need to be open to other cultures, need to be willing to accept cultures and cultural practices and cultural ways of thinking and cultural ways of being for what they are... Different cultures have different meanings... those cultures, those sets of beliefs and those ideals that they adhere to have meaning for them.

Pieter depicted his discomfort with 'otherness'. He spoke of how dominant ideas of culture in South Africa viewed him and how he viewed 'others'. The construction of 'otherness' succeeded in placing distance between himself and others, which perhaps is the strategy of the discourse in the first place.

In further externalizing the culture discourse, I set out to expose this discourse's strategies or tactics of creating distance. My guiding questions here aimed at externalizing the culture discourse and seeking resistance and counter discourses regarding culture which to develop. Pieter explored the construction of others within his own thinking and how otherness might not need to be uncomfortable. In this excerpt, both Pieter and I co-created a position of opposition to dominant discourses' views of otherness being uncomfortable and therefore distance creating. But the discourse of otherness remained, despite conscious efforts to engage. I began

wondering whether troubling this discourse required a crossing over into an ‘other’ territory. I started questioning what it would mean to no longer remain on the periphery and to move into the centre of ‘other’ culture. I also began speculating about the power that such a crossing over holds over the dialogue participants.

Pieter: I think it's definitely a process and we might experience it differently... Within if I would look at different sort of cultural groups that I'm a part of, I wouldn't agree with all of those. Formulations or their culture or what they believe, there may be some things I believe in that makes me sort of a part of that group or part of that culture. But I am not saying that I agree with all of them where some that is the same culture as me, you know may agree with all of them or disagree with some that I do agree with so.

Pieter's talk linked this discourse to the historical discourse that utilizes the fear of consequences and the fear of the unknown to reinforce less interaction with otherness. Another participant, Fay, confirmed that the strategy of distancing people is maintained by the fear of the unknown which the concept of ‘otherness’ provides.

Fay: What's known maybe, so it's not threatening in a sense. I hear a lot of my friends feel threatened by what's happening but it's not foreign to me. I also have a belief that if you keep people down too long they can rise up and that's a good because what we had before wasn't a good thing. You can't keep people down and you progress at the expense of a majority of the nation, it doesn't work.

She presents a counter discourse and explains that there is an inherent flaw in continuing to think that otherness is of concern or to be feared by saying

Fay: I see danger in it because you don't grow actually, if you stick to what you know. You need to always broaden your horizon and interact with others that are different. I think it feels comfortable to interact with people that you are familiar with because it's what you know. But you don't really learn from that.

Perhaps these counter discourses described by Pieter and Fay are alluding to how groups of people in South Africa have grown in isolation due to apartheid. This has resulted in discourse setting cultures up in opposing camps, another us versus them discourse. Culture is geographically located, in townships as well as spatially located in the culture discourse. For example if we subscribe to the view of culture being groups of people, then townships represent a black culture. Culture discourses were also shown to rely on categories. Cultures are groups of certain people, such as black people, gay people, and “others”. The process of culture was not part of the

conversation; culture conversation relied solely on the construct of culture as content, the who (groups of people, as in black and white groups or cultures) as opposed to the how or the what (social constructions of culture). This again is interesting in the process discourse, where constructs are needed to be seen as fluid and dynamic. Culture in the theoretical sense is a fluid construct but on the practical level culture is monolithic and static. You either are part of a particular cultural group, thus you belong, or you are not. I wondered why there needs to be a distinction between white versus black cultures, or our culture versus their culture. And why the organic development of South African cultures to a large extent has not happened in contrast to other countries such as Brazil where a hybrid culture has developed (Madeira & Veloso, 2012). Frustrated, my questions remained as to why culture goes back to race. I ventured into finding counter discourses about culture.

7.2.3 The alternative construction of a negotiated culture.

I started thinking then along the lines of a negotiated culture. Different cultures afford people different behavioural repertoires to enact. In South Africa people find that these cultures and repertoires are overlapping, conflicting and mutual all at the same time. Thus we are constantly negotiating our cultures and could have different subject positions at different times and in different contexts. In negotiating culture we are faced with the historical discourse of culture bound in oppression and the notion of 'otherness'.

The progression of our talk led to the inclusion of the historical context of South Africa and of how this context avoided and prevented groups of people from exploring one another. It illustrated how cultural discourse became bound in oppression in the South African context and the context of South African universities where the dominant culture plays out.

Pieter: I don't necessarily think it was done in the past. I mean sort of the history of South Africa has a lot of psychological influences and you know we obviously through sort of our political past we didn't train for that opportunity. I think now it's important, because I think our practices extend beyond one culture. I think the country interactions apart from psychology extend beyond one culture and if you're going to be a, it's a personal opinion, but if you live in your own shoe box you're going to struggle and I think those are often the people that you know, those are the people that leave or that are dissatisfied with the country and that they aren't willing to integrate, that aren't willing to accept, they aren't willing to give a little bit of extra time to something is not

their own... Limited knowledge. Ignorance. It's easy to talk of someone and that's all you know and that's how you treat them.

The historical context dictates that culture remains bound in oppression but Pieter tried to oppose the constraints of thinking of people in a static manner. He proposed the idea of negotiating culture and a culture that is less static. The construction of negotiated culture was only found in the talk of Pieter but was alluded to in the talk of others in isolated statements such as “*we need to develop our version of culture*” (Desiree) and “*what is our culture? Perhaps its time to look into that*” (Clara).

7.3 Conclusion

Multiculturalism is constructed as a rather tricky concept. Participants positioned themselves differently in the two described discourses, impasse of multiculturalism and the immutability of culture. Trainers chose to position themselves on the basis of a trainer-trainees positioning, an authority positioning, while trainees positioned themselves mainly along racial lines. The trainee positioning was either black or white based on the dominance of the race discourse. Although trainers and trainees were positioned differently in these constructions, the dominant positions remained black and white, us and others. Throughout the constructions thus far, race and race constructions have come to the fore. Race is the dominant signifier for multiculturalism. Therefore it is necessary to construct the discourses around race in South Africa. The discourses are littered with constructions of the gains and losses regarding race. In all honesty, I was hoping not to have to construct a discourse on race as I had naively believed educated trainers and trainees had moved beyond race but in the data race was always evident. The acknowledgment of the presence of race in each and every grouping illustrated the need to trouble these dominant discourses concerning race further. Otherwise counter discourses cannot be found and the dominant discourse cannot be challenged. The discourses of race are described in the following chapter.

Chapter Eight

Findings and Discussion: Discourses of Race and Identity

This chapter is presented in two distinct parts, namely discourses of race and discourses of identity. In this chapter I describe the discourses of race and identity, post-apartheid discourse/s, the clean-slate discourse and the historical discourse. This chapter starts off by exploring the discourses of race talk. Discourses of race were found to be embedded in many of the discourses uncovered. The chapter expands the race talk discourse under the subject positions of gains and losses, whiteness and blackness, and the colour-blind stance. The discourses of identity are described in terms of an evolving South African identity and generational trends. A key finding of this study is that generational trends played a vital role in the positions subjects took up within the various discourses. The constructions and discourses are related back to the larger social discourses informing them and the effects the discourses had on the participants and the context.

8.1 Constructions of race as gains and losses and black and white

Race was constructed by many participants as a metaphorical game of gains and losses.

Pieter: ... there's a lot riding on that [race] in the sense that, it could open up things that are hurtful... but to not own too much of that, but also to open it up and see where it goes for that person. It feels like a see-saw action between the two.

Ilse: Yes it's a constant negotiation, it's a balancing act.

Pieter: Ja [Yes] at the same time the stepping out is also important... the stepping out allows you to go to a place for both that person and myself. Because by stepping out I'm also going to get action to that so it's going to be of value to me. What I say will also be of value to that person, so there is that side to it as well.

In this excerpt, Pieter talked of how the subject positions of black or white are made available through the gains and losses constructions, which requires individual investment, risk and effort. It spoke of the discourse of race having the effect of feelings of loss in terms of loss of self, loss of identity, while the gains are limited to subject positions that are deemed 'safe' and having minimal risk.

In reading the excerpt above I was tempted to ask why does the race discourse set it up in this way? Why is it a gains versus losses approach when we are discussing

race? The answer is perhaps also found in Pieter's construction that the historical discourse controls this delicate balancing act. Those speakers who are in power positions are afforded the privilege to exercise their rights to determine which way the pendulum swings. This balancing act is a power negotiation and requires a willingness to be put in a place of discomfort and uncertainty, and whether or not to hand power to others. However, this subtle negotiation is a personal investment, which places each subject in a position of either empowerment and risk or helplessness and fear as Jane alluded to.

Ilse: Why is it not spoken about [referring to race]?

Jane: I think it can be seen as taboo... it's also you're scared of where it's gonna lead, that it's gonna bring out all this animosity and anger and racism or it can be seen as racism just bringing it up... I'd be scared to bring it up.

Ilse: Why not?

Jane: because I would find there's nothing I can do about it.

Ilse: What then would be the value of having such a conversation with your client?

Jane: ... in a social world like, everyone's keeping quiet ... there's this undercurrent of animosity and racism still going on between different cultures but then like in an a-social setting like in a therapeutic setting, that's when you should be able to bring it out and there can actually be a lot of [pause]... you don't know what that person and maybe that's exactly why they need to speak the unspoken.

Jane further spoke of how the race talk discourse rendered her powerless in everyday interaction, but within a therapeutic interaction or setting she was able to take up an alternate position by virtue of already being in a position of authority and thus power. *"In therapy you can directly ask a client if your thinking is part of their worldview, but you can't do it in everyday conversations"* (Clara). The safety of the therapy setting could be explained by the following discourse in therapy, one of many therapy discourses, which states that the therapist is the authority and therefore the power lies with her. The therapist has the permission to question such concepts. Race talk discourses are shown to be embedded in discourses of fear and are intricately positioned within power relationships. *"It's safer not to discuss race"* (Jan). Safety then becomes a defence needed when engaging with the other.

Jane: I think on one hand I feel like we're not gonna get anywhere... we're not going to meet, we're not gonna see eye to eye, it's always gonna be two different opinions two different stances, two different backgrounds, it's not gonna solve anything.

Ilse: Why does it need to meet?

Jane: I think it does need to meet in some way because else it's going to be like what we have in the social setting.

Ilse: And what is that?

Jane: That different people don't mix.

As the conversation with Jane progressed she continued to speak of how she was positioned as powerless. She was powerless in the discourses around race. Her construction was almost defeatist in that her talk spoke of requiring closure and finality with regard to race. Her talk also spoke to a need for the idea of race to be seen as more fluid and in constant state of flux. She fell back on old and entrenched discourses of *"different people don't mix"* to end the conversation. Historical discourses were exposed once more as having a reinforcing impact on the discourses of difference. Jane referred here to what Precious called the *"foundation stuff"* that speakers fall back on in private conversations regarding race (see chapter 2 and 6.1.2).

Historical discourses are firmly housed within the dominant race discourse. Here Jane was allowed to speak of how the race discourse is linked to historical discourses of South Africa. The links are made regarding difference. A lack of agency among people of visible difference in skin colour is made to embrace diversity. Perhaps this is due to race discourses allowing people the opportunity to fall back on the convenience of the apartheid legacy discourse and historicity of South Africa. *"Race is convenient"* (Rani). The race discourse is convenient, as it can be used whenever needed to not engage with a topic or with people of difference. Jane fell back on the initial reasoning, if one can call it that, for apartheid in the first place that being *"different people don't mix"* (Jane). In effect this discourse then silenced the possibility of changing the status quo. I began wondering whether the perspective of the trainees, such as Jane, would be different from that of the trainers. I ventured further into the interview texts of the trainers and trainees to see if such a differences in perspectives could be found.

This powerless subject position was confirmed by Clara, a trainer, who referred to the “discourses of silence around unspeakable things”. To be silent is to have no voice, to be powerless.

Clara: The discourse is still telling us you can't speak about it. We can't talk about this, we can't address this... you're not gonna make any in-roads... There's this discourse of silence around these unspeakable things.

Ilse: Which is exactly what we had in apartheid.

Clara: Ja. [pause] The discourse of silence on unspeakable things. Now we've made the issue of race an unspeakable thing... You see everybody gets stressed every time we speak about this and this is the thing that somehow we've actually got to break through that.

Clara further pointed to how this silencing discourse does so under the guise of protection. If we choose rather not to speak about race and other unspeakable things then we are safe, protected and have less “stress”. As a trainer, Clara was focused on the process discourse and described the problem from such a point of view. The result was that the race discourse took the process underground.

Clara: We've come so far since '94 [first democratic election] in terms of our political discourse, that we're no longer apartheid this that, race isn't such an issue. Whereas in apartheid you know we had the 'whites only' benches... And by having that 'whites only' bench, it was so explicit that you could still talk about it... But now the discourse has gone totally underground. But it's more dangerous than what it was in the apartheid system... [silence] [Sigh]... it's obviously still there. I mean people can't breach it if they can't talk about it, they don't feel comfortable talking about it. Then it's still there.

Clara's talk positioned race talk as becoming an underground movement. In teasing out this construction further for myself my guiding questions became about why race needed to go underground. This may largely be attributed to the fact that participants no longer had dialogues concerning race as race is no longer a politically correct topic of conversation. The apartheid legacy has in effect silenced race talk in open and productive spaces. Race talk happens in secluded and protected spaces, such as around the Sunday braai (barbeque), but in the public arena the conversation is more politically correct.

I was troubled by the constructions of race as either a gain or a loss. I wondered if there were times when race could be viewed simultaneously as both, or differently

altogether. Assigning race a binary position became a socially constructed process that had little value in terms of developing pockets of resistance and took effort to maintain. Why did race discourse want race in a binary? What was the function? And who was maintaining the binary? I also wondered why subjects actively reinforced this binary when its reinforcement required so much effort.

Some of my questions above remained unanswered. However, others were teased into further complexity. The first answer came in the form of race as a social identity marker. The construction of race as a social identity marker was found in many of the interview texts. By drawing on this construction, participants questioned why race was considered a significant marker of identity and as informing the structure of social life. Within this race talk discourse, race, as a construction as a social marker, was regarded as having been assigned disproportionate meaning in larger hegemonic discourses of race in society. Designating individuals as black or white, and the subsequent positioning of individuals within racial discourses, has become a socially constructed process which some of the participants considered to be unnecessary while others considered it a necessity. Some participants questioned the usefulness of the categories black and white, as literature does (Erasmus, 2010), while others advocated the theoretical rejection of race (Brown, 2009).

"I am more than white and male" (Pieter). Pieter implied that he felt constrained by the categories imposed by dominant race discourse. He felt compelled to act and feel in certain ways because of his racial positioning. His position as a white male in South Africa is predetermined, something which he is offended by. *"So I am white...what exactly should I do to change that..."* (Jan). Discourses of identity using race as a social marker had these participants angry but also rendered them immobile to change, as skin colour is not changeable. Precious and Mpho had a different perspective on race as a social marker. Mpho stated with pride *"I am my black skin"*. *"I am happy to be black... it wasn't always so..."* (Mpho). White participants, to a large degree, spoke of annoyance with structured racial identities, categories and practices, and how they wanted to be able to move out of previous 'black' and 'white' positionings which were dominant in the apartheid era. Black participants spoke of how racial positioning may also be a subject position of pride and authority. For example, Precious said *"My identity is in my black body. I am proud of it"* and Mpho said *"black skin and everything"*. Paradoxically, these subject positions may differ in the larger society where whiteness is at times viewed as the discursive power position while at other times blackness is in power. These constructions had me embarking on a side street in the race journey. They guided my

search into the ideas of whiteness and blackness. Ideas which have been around for a long time but which needed to be further unpacked in a post-apartheid South African context within this HWU.

8.1.1 Discourses of whiteness and blackness.

Whiteness and blackness as constructs within the race discourse positions subjects as either being white or black. White, based on historical position of privilege, or black, having appropriated identifiers for marginalized positions within society (Rautenbach, 2012). Within the constructions of race, the discourses of whiteness and blackness inevitably came to the fore, perhaps in contradiction to the literature mentioned above. The interview text yielded examples where participants considered the presence of silencing discourses regarding whiteness and blackness. Silencing was largely spoken about by white participants, while the issue of whiteness and blackness was more openly discussed by participants of colour. Some participants who are white viewed their whiteness as a source of embarrassment in the new South Africa, while participants of colour viewed whiteness as affording positions of power, privilege and opportunity to people who are white. *“Apartheid is over, we said sorry... I am not feeling guilty anymore... can we please move on...”* (Leanne). White participants also did not see their white privilege. This invisibility of whiteness is found in literature globally (See chapter 2). Tehia stated *“I think we just assume that because we generalize about white people but I don’t think we really know...”* She explained further that

... every white people is the same as they were in apartheid and it’s like with some white is embarrassed by being white and Afrikaans and I think that a very sad thing... not to say that apartheid wasn’t wrong it was very wrong but it got to a stage where your telling people to be embarrassed by who you are because I won’t want anyone to be embarrassed.

Ironically Tehia, as a trainee of colour, apologised for discursive effects that apartheid had on white people. Thereby even in her speaking, the past oppressor was still awarded sympathy and a position of privilege and protection against discourses of oppression. This links to whiteness literature discussed in chapter 2, where whiteness as the default position becomes privileged in discourse. Mary, speaking from a white person’s perspective, says *“...ja that even they have a history of dealing with also me as a white person, and that maybe comes in their up-bringing so... they handle me as their parents handled my parents”*. Mary spoke here of how

race discourses are prevalent and unconscious. Clara supported this view of Mary's and stated that "sometimes I think we don't even realise it... but its always there".

Participants also demonstrated how they tried to move away from these predetermined positions and reposition themselves in the race discourse. In the following excerpt Palesa explained how it's not about being white or black and then illustrated the contradiction that the discourse placed on us.

Palesa: At the end it's not about us being white or black. It's about having an understanding. I have to compromise so that we can move forward...

Ilse: Linking to what you said previously, why would a white lecturer have more impact on black students?

Palesa: I think it's because the power still is with the white lecturer.

Ilse: How so?

Palesa: Hahaha [laughs] I guess it is about black and white. Not that much has changed....

Interesting ploys of the race discourse were revealed as to how the position of whiteness granted power and authority on a topic. This discourse retained whiteness as the preferred position.

Palesa: ... for me the students at [HWU] would need a white lecturer to teach multicultural training. Why I say that – they would relate more. If I am black teaching multiculturalism they expect me to teach it and it's not that all black people are multicultural. Some are confused and have this western way, they are coconuts and all these things. For white students having a white lecturer would mean they may be willing to open up to this view. And black students will hold this view in higher regard if it's taught by a white lecturer.

Ilse: So you see the white lecturer bridging a gap for the white students to learn multiculturalism and black students affording it more authority?

Palesa: Yes... I would rather have to that way than pretending to bring a black person in who is not going to have an impact on them.

So who gets to speak with authority on the topic of multiculturalism? How is multiculturalism constructed within a race-dominated discourse? Multiculturalism has different meanings for different speakers. In troubling the construct of multiculturalism, the idea of what it meant to be multicultural also came to the fore. I was immediately greeted in the interview text with ideas of multiculturalism being

black or white - “*We still have black versus white*” (Palesa) -, or the idea that some people are multicultural and others are not. These constructions were linked to concepts of responsibility, agency and accountability. The agency and responsibility of challenging the ‘not my responsibility’ position is placed on the white lecturer. For example, the irony of the positioning implied that white participants needed to be taught multiculturalism by a white lecturer for it to be legitimate but black participants were multicultural by virtue of their ethnicity. Again my guiding question was what it meant to be multicultural. Why does multiculturalism only mean black and white within this discursive context?

Discourses of multiculturalism had blackness positioned as inferior, requiring some participants to work harder to be noticed. When asked to unpack the position the discourse around blackness granted her, Palesa had the following to say. Similar to the discourses of women having to work harder in a man’s world, the black participants described needing to work harder in a white world.

Palesa: For us young black women, you always have to do more than the other person. You always have to work harder than the other person. Emotionally it becomes draining... you always have to prove yourself. There is always this thing of because you are black you are not necessarily good enough... So you always have to strive to do more, be better. Because we were bombarded with freedom... We didn’t necessarily have time to view this thing and understand it but then needing to carry it somehow and move on with it. It sometimes can become a lot for us.

Fay: We have to work against their [white trainers and trainees] assumptions

The process of moving away from positions of blackness and whiteness is tricky but it was explored by some of the trainees. Below, two trainees explain how the narrative of racism needs to be further developed. They spoke of the “*honeymoon phase being over*” and a time for work being at hand.

Palesa: We still have white versus black. I think South Africa is at the point where the honeymoon phase needs to be over and let’s get on with the practical reality of things. Let’s get working. There are still racial divisions, we still feel divided, it’s one of the realities of life...

Precious: We should go forward... we need to deal with the realities because if we are not careful our society will become more divided.

I started wondering about the function of discourses of blackness and whiteness within the study context. How did they operate and why?

Marise: And it's a bit concerning to notice in South Africa that the push is now starting to replicate apartheid but just with different people in power, we are now starting to see in literature that there's a strong pull for training black therapists to serve black clients only. No whites can serve those black clients. Which means people who want to work in communities will not happen because we're the wrong demographic. Which is sad cause it's the same narrative that came from the past, we're still discriminating...

The discourse of blackness and whiteness seemed to hide and protect the underlying discourse of racism and oppression.

Therefore there seems to be a struggle with transitioning from an apartheid discursive context to post-apartheid thinking. Participants recounted the impact of transitioning between these discursive spaces and the resulting different cultural contexts. In conservative spaces in Afrikaner culture, some white participants found themselves in discursive contexts marked by racialised ideology of apartheid. *"My parents still speak like that... they are old school"* (Pieter). In participants' accounts, this oppressive ideology was associated with constructing rigid lines of difference and assigning people to categories based on those lines of difference. For example *"Different people don't mix"* (Leanne) and *"We still have black versus white"* (Palesa). In such contexts, notions of identity that fell outside of the heteronormative apartheid agenda were depicted as other. It is in relation to this political discourse that participants considered strictly defined categories of identity to be oppressive. Counter discourses regarding identity thus proposed seeing identity as a changing and dynamic construction. However, similar identities were viewed as being a bigger threat to the individual. Therefore the individual had to try to distinguish him-/herself from them to avoid having to integrate the negative aspects which group identification brings to their identity. This construct of similar identities links to ideas in literature on in-group identities (Hall, 1998). In trying to distinguish him-/herself, the individual demarcates in-group boundaries. Discourse in effect creates a split group as a strategy to protect one's own identity in relation the other intergroup identities. Discourse provides 'others' as a tool as they exist in the group completely in order to protect the positive identity construction. This position of third person reasoning allows for everyone's version of reality to be authentic despite group membership. *"I wasn't even born at the time"* (Jan). Thus even in identifying with a group, people tend to want to differentiate. *"My forefathers were responsible for apartheid... I had*

nothing to do with it... but I must feel ashamed?" (Jan). If socially constructed boundaries of race can be stepped out of while maintaining one's identification with the in-group, discourse can then be troubled to allow the development of counter discourses. Participants opposed defined categories of identity and their reluctance or preference to privilege their race as primary to identity, is then to a large extent informed by their political positioning. In post-apartheid South Africa, participants consider rigid boundaries along socially constructed differences, such as race, as oppressive or liberating depending on who is doing the speaking. Race is also seen on a continuum of oppressive or liberating, depending on where the participant wants to feel belonging and group membership.

The construction of identifying with or positioning against the in-group was eagerly described by various participants.

Ben: I am white... but English speaking.

Jan: I had nothing to do with it [apartheid]... I want to belong to ...Afrikaans.

Those participants who strived for acknowledgement of their unique identities outside of the in-group demonstrated what may be seen as defensive positioning. The concept here is that if you do not deny the in-group, who are you? Retaining the group identity but demarcating a niche within this group identity became a difficult juggling act for some participants. By creating tension, the discourse confused participants who chose to distance themselves from in-group identity. De-identifying oneself with the in-group left few ways of creating meaning as an insider and an outsider at the same time, thus the tension. The distance and closeness dance that discourse imposed forced the construction of stereotypical identities of black and white. And the development of a self-stereotype, because people need to belong. Participants then constructed a relationship and position against the negative element of the intergroup identity as a means of resisting it. *'I am a white but not that type of white'*. I was left wondering what this process of de-identifying did. Among many resulting questions, the only plausible answer was that it provided an identity-protective function. The subject could not identify with the elements of the bad, negative group and strived to retain only the positive group membership elements. This protective function extended to the constructions around being colour-blind. Being colour-blind afforded the subject protection from viewing the other as 'other' on the basis of not having noticed the others difference in the first place.

8.1.2 Construction: The colour-blind subject

During the analysis, there were several positions that tried to ignore the presence of the race talk discourse. The most prominent was the position of being colour-blind. Of interest was that only trainees spoke to this construction. Trainers' voices were absent in this description.

Precious: Oh you never noticed I am black... it's ridiculous, it's lying. When you choose to be blind... but I am not allowed to even be offended.

Ilse: I would be so offended, but I am allowed to be offended?

Precious: Yes you are because you are white.

The historical discourse plays out every day in allowing certain people to acknowledge their feelings and to act on them while others need to hide theirs and pretend they are fine.

Precious: ... The first thing you noticed when you walked into this group is that there's one black person, ok there's 3 males and 4 females, the first thing you notice about a person is external dynamics.... I am the only black student so I found that in the beginning I don't know if it's being too sensitive, but it would be difficult for them to talk about that I'm the only black person in class, and then one of the other students said like, "Wow, I didn't even notice that she's black" and I was like OH PLEASE!! [Laughs]... I was like I stick out like a sore black thumb and I don't know why we can't discuss it. So I don't know if they were thinking that I'm offended talking about people or mentioning the black culture because I'm there, I just found them to be extra sensitive. They were like tip-toeing around me...

Colour-blind discourses had Precious positioning herself as the outsider within the training from the beginning of the year. They also had her experiencing emotions of frustration and irritation towards the 'others'. "And by their actions they were further putting me as the outsider, when everyone already noticed how different to the group I was" (Precious). Precious' talk is related to how her outsider identity was created and maintained by race talk discourse and the colour-blind positioning of others. Very little agency is given to her as to how she is viewed by others due to the historical post-apartheid discourse. Discourse did however allow other participants to shift positioning slightly in relation to being colour-blind. Not noticing race is a very comfortable subject position if you are positioned in the default white position. The white default position permits the subject to ignore the colour of the other because

the subject's own whiteness being invisible is the norm (see chapter 2). Other participants stated their "shock".

Vishani: I think when I initially started it was a bit of a shock, because... I cannot be the only non-white person...

Ilse: Being the only person of colour in that group can't be easy.

Vishani: It's not, I don't know... I was like oh my I'm the only coloured female in this group and it's going to have, and I wondered at that moment if it was going to have an impact or not. ... Luckily for me I didn't encounter anything of that sort in terms of group I think we got. They didn't see the colour so it just scattered, everybody just flowed. The other thing with me is I'm the only Muslim in the group... So mine was it was that top of that kind of sense as well. In the beginning it was also very difficult to explain ...

Discourse finally revealed how the shifted position was obtained. The position was only given on the condition that another victim is brought into the mix. Religion then became the focus point and being colour-blind receded into the background. In effect discourse neutralized the effect of race by using religion, a more acceptable enemy. It became easier for the subject to make the race discourse visible by translating it into another identity marker. For example here it was religion. But I would not leave the discourse's position unexposed and probed further.

Ilse: I wonder if you didn't have the religion to bring to the group I wonder where the conversations would have ended up.

Vishani: I don't know... I did expect to see someone of another colour in the group... And actually now that you mention it not a single person has actually asked me anything about my race or being... Religion being the easier thing to talk about, but not a single person has ever asked or ever actually mentioned oh you're actually the only coloured person in here.... We are so well conditioned in South Africa that we don't even discuss those things...

In further deconstructing and externalizing the race discourse, I experienced race discourse's ploys as being tiring and creating a context where participants had to work even harder to disrupt this dominant race talk discourse. But I pressed on to find out why discourse did not want participants constructing counter discourse regarding being colour-blind and race itself.

Vishani: We don't talk about race... It is the silent [indistinct] I think it's... because everybody bases it on what happened I think in apartheid... It was

always black versus white and that's what it was. And now everybody's like you know we're not going to talk about it, because then they are going to call me racist. Because if I say something about a black person you know I'm a racist, but at least we say something... Okay [we] are attaching race to it. So does this become a race issue eventually?

Ben: I never noticed she was black.

Julie: colour often doesn't factor into it.

I was left dissatisfied after my questions regarding race and the colour-blind stance. I started to venture into questioning the construction of subject positions of black and white and how the race discourse used these as tools in identity creation in the post-apartheid South African discursive context.

8.2 Discourses of identity

In this section I describe the discourses of identity in terms of the constructions race and identity, evolving South African identity and generational trends, discourses, post-apartheid discourses, clean-slate discourse, and historical discourses; and the subject position of black or white made available.

8.2.1 Race and identity

I journeyed into the idea of race informing the discourses of identity. This was an informed choice based on the large volume of interview text that constantly pointed to race constructions and race talk discourses. By focusing on the discourses drawn on by participants when making sense of multiculturalism in relation to their identity, I hoped to expose the workings of the post-apartheid, historical and clean slate discourse. While many participants constructed multiculturalism as not being central to their identity, the discursive context in which they managed their identity was one in which multiculturalism was present. The primary signifier that was mentioned was race. Race signifiers are privileged as representing something about who participants are as individuals and how they act within varying discursive contexts. This is a highly essentialist view of what represents a person and their identity (Burr, 2003), where persons are considered to have a certain set of characteristics based on their in-group identity (Hall, 1997). For example 'I am a white South African' does not tell much about my identity except for the colour of my skin. However, discursively my whiteness is linked to the socio-historical and political context of South Africa, which includes constructions of privilege and oppression (see chapter 2).

The fixing of identity around a particular construct, such as race, is noticed as something being worthy of comment. Some participants constructed interactions that were often reduced to their racial category through statements such as “*She’s late. It’s Africa[n] time*” (Mary). Such references become categorical statements of and about race, and therefore identity, which confirm stereotypical characteristics associated with the individuals in question.

Many participants referred to such fixing of their identity according to their race. For example Precious stated “*My identity is my black body*”. Another trainee, Mary, described this as others discursively reducing her identity to her racial category through references to “*the white students are on time, while the black students are always late*”. In that way, her identity as race becomes primary and all other references are then filtered through the lens of her racial category. Therefore the discourse of multiculturalism as identity is constructed as having a filter through which the self can be constructed. It is important to note that there were also other influences on the participants’ identity constructions, such as other contexts; however, the study can only tap into the constructions they shared with me in the interview context.

My guiding question in the analysis of the next section was to explore how participants positioned themselves in relation to the discourses of identity that reduced identity to race. In the discussion that follows I describe how participants either accepted race as being seen as primary to their identity or resisted the classification of race as primary to identity construction. I also link to the previous descriptions (see chapter 2) the social and political constructions and discourses of post-apartheid South Africa that informed participants’ surrender to such fixing of identity.

Participants either accepted or resisted a discourse of racial categorization as being primary to their identity and being central to their construction of who they were. Interestingly enough identity discourse has this binary of acceptance or resistance set up along racial lines. White participants showed their resistance by speaking of other signifiers of identity that they were more comfortable with in describing their identity such as “*I am a Muslim*” (Vishani), or “*I don’t see colour for I am a cultural being*” (Clara), while black participants spoke proudly of how their blackness informs their identity construction, thereby showing their acceptance, for example “*I am my black skin*” (Palesa). The addition of Vishani, a coloured woman, to the ‘white’ constructed group is an illustration of the power of the group’s construction. The group constructed Vishani in terms of her religion and not in terms of her race. For

the purposes of the race discourse, Vishani was constructed as a pseudo-white. Vishani “*They wouldn’t ask questions about the race. And it’s always about religion*”. This construction warranted a closer look.

Many of the participants spoke of how race as a construct of identity is avoided by certain speakers in conversation. Vishani provided an example of how active this avoidance of discussing race is. In this case, the participants spoke about the issue of religion as being the differing factor between them. Them being white versus coloured speakers. One of Vishani’s classmates had the following to say about Vishani and the discussion about religion.

Tanya: I think it’s been interesting that we can talk to her about it [religion] and it’s about she’s also been willing to share with us. It’s not something that she’s been holding back or saying no it’s not something that she enjoys and she’s explained the food to us... I find it interesting and so nice cause we all gave her the space to do it.

Ilse: Ok, but why did you never ask her how it feels to be coloured?

Tanya: Ja... [pause] it never came up.

In Tanya’s talk the race discourse positioned her as a gatekeeper to the powerhouse of whiteness. “*We allowed her the space to do it*”. Tanya also gave an example of how the discussions about race “*never came up*”, thereby illustrating the role the race discourse plays in keeping race a definite and powerful construct in interactions - the elephant in the room. These descriptive constructions linked directly to how the participants set about constructing an identity where race was not a factor. Ironically this is a truly South African approach to race, as South Africans supposedly no longer see race as an identity signifier since democratization because we are all part of the rainbow nation (discussed previously in chapter 2).

Participants constructed that the issue of racial categorization was becoming a civic discussion and not a political project, because whites or being white essentially hold other constructions such as being bad and oppressive, while constructions of black hold perceptions of power within the current political discursive context in the country. The tension between acceptance and resistance placed a burden on the participants to take up particular binary positions only. For the most part people of colour, black and coloured participants, were coming from the perspective that difference is valuable and needs to be acknowledged while their white counterparts were leaning towards how difference, particularly race, was not relevant or noteworthy in discussions of race and identity. One may speculate that this is out of fear of the

consequences such a discussion may hold, considering South Africa's apartheid legacy. Therefore some white South Africans adopted a politically correct position for white South Africans, whereas the politically correct position for others may be different, as illustrated below.

Mary: I think that maybe, especially in the past... it was race you know that certain white people have this view and black people have that view and Indians have this view. I don't know if it's the way I've grown up or if it's the state of the world at the moment that everything is becoming more 'en-meshed' that you can't actually look at a person and say, "Oh they're gonna have this idea" and I think it's also almost a danger to think that if you look at this kind of community you're gonna get this kind of person. Cause even working with people that demographically look like me, they're gonna have such different opinions ...

White South Africans appear to take up their position of civic responsibility to deny race and racism, while in the current socio-political context, blackness is perceived as holding power within the larger context. Paradoxically blackness does not hold power within all contexts, for example within the discursive context of a HWU where blackness may be perceived, by white participants, as holding power but black participants may view it differently as previously described. There are many politically correct positions made available by the dominant race discourses in various contexts. The construct of politically correct and the power of blackness or whiteness are keenly situated within many different and competing discourses.

Another strategy used by the identity discourses is illustrated in the excerpt from Mary. She showed how society has constructed a description of difference being so 'everyday' that it is overlooked. This presented as a disguised discourse of identity, one stating we do not notice your race because we are all so different. Therefore your race does not have an impact on our cognitions. This is a strategy of discourse to avoid having to engage with race. However, in so doing, the race discourse is still holding up difference as being the preferred position to hold, thereby illustrating the presence of the difference discourse uncovered previously (see chapter 7). Precious complicated this stance that society discursively put forward and questioned how she could be the same as other black people.

Precious: I think a lot of times the literature is written from one perspective and that culture is often synonymous with ethnicity that all white people are the same, all black people are the same all coloured people are the same, and I

think a lot of times the differences within the cultures are often forgotten about.

Am I the same as every other black person you know?

Precious interestingly enough was also the only black participant who used her 'white' name⁴ despite her verbal statements acknowledging uniqueness and blackness.

In trying to trouble this further I went in search of other elements of identity, because in these descriptive constructions the self is construed as consisting of numerous elements of identity. Social constructionism informs that multiple categories of identity (Gergen, 2008) contribute to what identity and thus to what multiculturalism is. In my search aspects of race were either under- or overstated, depending on the minority or majority status of the participants within the country. This overlapping nature of identity and the socio-historical and political context within which race in South Africa is embedded contributed to what Precious described as a sense of belonging in her own country, to her nation. The discourse of belonging (see chapter 6) was elaborated on by many of the participants. Precious stated "*We live in bubbles. Connections between people exist but we are essentially separate from each other...we see others but have a barrier between us*". This metaphor provides a visual image of how we see others yet retain our distance. The boundaries are fragile because the bubble may burst.

Finally, participants drew on a construction of multiculturalism as a preference to minimize the contribution that race makes to identity. Pieter stated that "*I am more than white*". They did not consider race to be void of meaning, but constructed their race as one of the many elements to identity. Within this construction, multiculturalism was given less emphasis. It was regarded as significant but not something that should change your views of others. A very striking start to one of the interviews was when Fay stated the following:

Fay: I think also our group is well mixed, you don't really have race but we have age difference in there, we have different nationalities in there.

Ilse: No person of colour. [pause] Is it multicultural?

Fay: Yes, we've got quite a multicultural group

⁴ The practice of giving black children 'white' names links to religion and the apartheid context. The early missionaries often baptized their converts with 'white' religious names. Furthermore, in South Africa during the apartheid years, black South Africans were given 'white' names by their white employers, because traditional black names were supposedly too difficult to pronounce.

The question was raised how a group can be viewed as multicultural if there are no people of colour in the group. To this she responded positively that there were no members of difference, such as in terms of race, but the group was still multicultural. Fay demonstrated how she positioned herself in the discursive landscape and chose to avoid the issue of colour and consequently race altogether. My position in the discussion was also interesting, expecting her to realize the group could not be multicultural if there was no person of colour in the group as well as thinking automatically that multiculturalism was synonymous with race, as did most of the participants.

The discourse of race as identity placed participants in a position where race was primary to identity. This required some of the participants to constantly having to portray other elements of identity, other than race only, to construct their identity. Participants described how they were constantly weighing up what they could and could not share in conversation about themselves in relation to their racial identity. *"I can't say that the other [meaning black] people. It wouldn't be received well"* (Marise). This identity 'work' was enacted in different ways. Participants referred to actively working against the racial construction of identity in order for people to construct a meaning around who they were without drawing on the racial constructions as a reference point, such as Pieter's statement that *"I am more than white"*. Other examples found in the interview texts were *"I am Muslim"* (Vishani), *"... I am a culturally being"* (Clara). This however is very tricky because race is evident visually in each and every interaction by virtue of the colour of our skins. Thus participants had to work very hard to move away from constructions that were racially bound by providing other identity signifiers. For example, Rani presented her identity as *"I am South African"*. Rani's strategy was to downplay her racial identity by presenting herself as a South African in the hope that this may overshadow the obvious race element of her identity. She described how discourse made her overcompensate to ensure that others remembered her for having other attributes, other than race. This de-emphasising of race was seen by many participants as contributing to a discursive context in which race becomes less important in the construction of identity. It functioned as an act of resistance to a context marked by acceptance of the racial construction of black, white or coloured as types of identity. In this way it contributed to transforming the discursive context to one where race was given less importance. Rani referred to this when, speaking about different categories of racial identity, she stated *"hopefully one day we can let go of the categories"*. Discourse does not reflect the thoughts, attitudes and identities of individual selves but rather a

shared social resource that constructs identity, as individuals lay claim to various social or shared identities.

The discussion so far illustrates how some participants resisted race as a construction of identity while others accepted it. Using or not using race as an identity construction becomes yet another form of discourse imprisonment. Each has a set of discursive act effects that keep people apart and perform a distancing function. Identifying oneself as free from racial constructions of identity does not necessarily free up subject positions in the dominant discourse. Instead, discourse poses a contradiction. Participants regard it as trading one fixed position for another that denies the political background of South Africa and denies the vital nature of race as an element of identity.

There is not yet a clearly defined construction of what a South African identity means. It may then be easier to assume a more flexible identity, where race can sometimes be chosen to be an element of identity while at other times not. Racial identity becomes then rule-bound and a more flexible version is constructed as open and less strictly defined. *“I am my black skin”* (Precious) versus *“I am South African”* (Rani) and *“I am more than white... I am me”* (Pieter). Here the more flexible identity functions as resistance to the fixing of one’s identity around associations of race.

The next discourse relates to how race is treated in relation to identity in South Africa and the implications thereof for the findings of this study, specifically in terms of post-apartheid discourse/s.

8.2.2 Post-apartheid discourse/s.

Post-apartheid South Africa has left us with a nation struggling to find a common South African identity. This is a central finding of the study, which presented overwhelmingly multiple, complex, contradictory as well as confusing constructions of identity in a post-apartheid South Africa. In an essentialist view identity can be fixed, structured and even branded. For example the brand South Africa: “Alive with possibility” (Murai, 2011) reflects the positive connotation that was accorded to South Africa upon the demise of apartheid and the election of the first democratic president. However, within the realm of social constructionism, identity is fluid and multiple (Gergen, 1985). Participants struggled with the concept of a ‘South African identity’. What is a South African identity? Who gets to have one? The resulting identity politics make it very difficult for ordinary people to negotiate this terrain. Before venturing into constructions around South African identity politics and the politics of regret, we need to get an idea of the South African historical discourse as gained

through the constructions of the participants. A history of oppression and privilege along socially constructed lines of difference in South Africa has contributed to participants' rejection or enthusiasm regarding racial categories.

Clara, a trainer, proposed that ideology and race-based thinking are the biggest culprits in the prevention of our forming a South African identity and finding common ground when she states *"we start with colour and all it's associations"*. In South Africa, race and political discourses around its construction remain influential in reinforcing strict boundaries around identity. Participants were critical of fixing identity in terms of race, but were aware of how the discursive context in many ways demands that race is paramount in any identity construction, whether it is a construction of national identity or of individual identity. Participants put forward the idea of a negotiated identity and negotiated culture. One manner in which identity is negotiated is through race as a social marker of identity. Rani stated that *"it's our starting point... race is convenient... Your skin colour determines where we begin our discussion..."* Navigating between different discursive contexts sensitized participants to how and who gets to speak about race, culture and identity. Participants spoke of difficulty in managing this journey.

Marise: [silence]... I don't know I've been struggling a lot with trying to figure out or understand my experience with my own cultural identity as you know being an Afrikaans person, and coming from apartheid and having been privileged and all of that. And all kinds of feeling of guilt that I don't even understand that I don't know where it comes from, that I feel very often as if I'm supposed to keep apologizing, I'm supposed to keep accommodating, anything that is not Afrikaans [silence].

... I think it is impossible not to be aware of the fact that I'm white and other people are black and Indian and coloured and whatever else, and speak different languages and have different ideas and different values. But I don't feel, most of the time I don't feel like I'm allowed to comment or to question these [silence].

Marise spoke of how the post-apartheid discourse silenced some participants and imposed various feelings such as guilt and embarrassment, and immobilized participants by expecting them to continue acting in prescribed ways. There was also an element of acceptance that Afrikaner people should experience feelings of guilt and shame regarding the history of South Africa, but participants voiced how these feelings were not only uncomfortable but also

sometimes felt imposed on them. White participants spoke of how dominant discourses have them imprisoned in prescribed constructions of their identity.

Marise: ...you know how can I be an Afrikaans person in the new South Africa living a fulfilling live and making a valuable contribution, you know, is it possible? How is it possible?

These constructions led to the question how these ideals are subtly or not so subtly reinforced in modern day South Africa's discursive context (discursive effect). For example, that all white South Africans should behave and feel in a certain way is a prescribed script that minimizes agency and disempowers the participants. Post-apartheid discourse further had these participants questioning their value and roles within South Africa.

These views permeate into the training and therapy context as well. Discourses related to post-apartheid create tensions in the subject positions made available because they bring to the fore all issues concerning the individual, for example emotional issues such as discomfort or fear. Some of these issues were uncomfortable for participants to discuss.

Marise: ...And maybe that is spilling over into the training that the students are seeing that and obviously we don't have it figured out, and for them that confusion is spilling over, that they can see that this whole multicultural issue is that scary, because it is, because we can't even... we don't have the answers for it. And we are uncomfortable discussing it.

Ilse: Why do you imagine we are uncomfortable discussing it?

Marise: Because it's about ourselves.... And we have been through training... some may not be willing to uncover these aspects about themselves [silence] ... Or where we actually just [silence and deep breath] I don't know I suppose we are afraid ... We are still quite immature.

Afrikaans participants further alluded to the difficult and inherited positioning that post-apartheid South Africa has left Afrikaans speaking people in. For example Pieter stated that *"I want to belong again"*. The difficulty of finding worth and value in their contribution to South Africa becomes a very tricky issue because of the role that discourse has allowed Afrikaans speaking participants to take up. Marise's talk constructed a view of Afrikaans participants feeling undervalued and worthless. A counter discourse was also gleaned in that she viewed 'us' as *"quite immature"*. The developmental idea here is that growth and evolution come with maturity.

In contrast to other white Afrikaans participants such as Marise, Charl spoke of how identifying with his Afrikaner culture was paramount to identity. The distinction between participants such as Marise and others like Charl might be related to generational trends (discussed in 8.2.5). Being younger, post-apartheid discourse allowed participants like Charl more available positions and constructions to create. However, the older generation, who were more 'actively' benefitting from apartheid, struggled with constructions that aimed to embarrass their Afrikaner-ness and white race. Younger participants may therefore have been more 'free' to occupy positions where their culture and race were questioned less than those of older participants. In South Africa, the terms for these generational trends are 'Post-apartheid strugglers' and 'born-frees'.

Charl: ... I can be honest and different in that way. Um, I see myself as quite a typical South African or Afrikaans white male that is very ironic cause like I've seen now that it's not always the same. My father views his Afrikaner culture differently. But I've always seen myself like that... Ja when it comes to cultural diversity people are different to me and it's probably the same to everyone I imagine.

My questioning which followed was aimed at opening the space and teasing out the issue of his father's culture versus his culture.

Charl: Ja, I didn't do anything to go either for or against any those issues and um, I don't have to take responsibility for that or be um, how can I say... I don't have to apologise for who I am. Cause I didn't do anything wrong. So I think it basically comes down to that... I have new players, I've got new people involved, a new scene which is very different from what everyone else in our country is trying to do.

Prescribed constructions of identity became the starting point for analysing the changes in the dominant identity discourse. The most striking sub-discourse uncovered was the clean slate discourse. The new South Africa brought with it a fresh start, a clean slate. All the wrongs of the past, and of apartheid, had magically disappeared. Participants were faced with a discursive positioning which supported the clean slate discourse, but also with the position simultaneously offered by the post-apartheid and historical discourses. Some participants were very quick to create distance between themselves and apartheid, especially those who had benefitted from it. As Jan stated "during that time of our history I wasn't even born yet". It's almost like a 'clean-slate' discourse, in that after 1994's first democratic election, we

were all equal and started with a clean slate. History had been wiped away. A very convenient construction, as it allows distance to be created without the expectation that the distance needs to be overcome. The previous 'evil' has already been overcome, so now we can continue unchallenged. Discourse is so contradictory that it allowed Charl to create this distance, to protect the fragile post-apartheid identity, as a means of retaining his culture and race without the negative implications thereof. *"I don't have to apologise for who I am... I didn't do anything wrong..."*. I tried again to trouble the discourse by posing further questions. The clean-slate discourse immediately closed the discussion and constructed reasons for the initial development of apartheid.

Charl: ... I think the idea of apartheid wasn't necessarily wrong. The whole reasoning behind it, the fact that we don't have to mix... The fact that we had better resources and things like that made it unfair but the reason behind it wasn't necessarily unfair, let's nail them type of situation... going forward, it's happened and we can decide how we go from here... A lot of people are obviously benefiting from this situation as well, that makes it difficult cause if you're benefiting from it, why would you change it?

This survival mode that the post-apartheid discourse enacted told me that resistance to such discourses was building. Participants spoke of some people who may have benefitted from the process of apartheid, but again those people are placed at a safe distance from themselves. Here Charl alluded to how discourse promoted the apartheid ideology because *"if you're benefitting from it, why would you change it?"* This links to the post-apartheid discourse where pockets of people still exist, both black and white, who directly benefit from using this discourse to their advantage.

Other participants troubled this discourse by proposing alternatives. Here Precious spoke of how the post-apartheid discourse tried to pull her into self-doubt and reduce her to a struggling post-apartheid young black woman, but she resisted this positioning and is trying actively to find her own.

... It's [speaking about the discourse] really so powerful and you find yourself pulled into it constantly ... I really felt like in order for me to survive, I just needed to pull myself out and do what I need to do... So I started doubting myself like am I too sensitive now? But no. [laughs] I am more than that...

The positioning seemed to inform the action various participants felt they could make use of. The post-apartheid discourse also made use of politics of transformation and redress to cement constructions of difference and to oppose connections between

people. "... *in this selection of masters students, let's select maybe more of a diverse group so then you have... but then again like are you selecting according to colour and language ability or according to who's going to be right in this field?*" (Jane). Jane spoke as a young South African applying for Masters, her talk spoke of ignorance of historical discourse as well as of contradiction. The talk spoke to her ignorance of the historical discourse and to peoples' in general ignorance of the historical discourse.

Jane: but if it comes down to language, no matter how good a therapist you are, maybe you're not as good as you would be just because that individual can't follow you or they can't express themselves, how they're really feeling in the English language whereas they can express it in their own language. So language I think may be differently but culturally I think it shouldn't matter.

She started out by stating that there was no need for transformation within the profession of psychology by training more diverse therapists, and then her talk contradicted itself by speaking of how language was in fact vital in the therapeutic process. Jane also made a distinction between language and culture as if these concepts could be removed from one another.

It became apparent to me that participants were given few positions to occupy within the discourse of post-apartheid South Africa. It proposed a binary to participants but while doing so contradicted itself. The discourse expected participants to pledge allegiance to either a white or black camp, thereby widening the divides, but contradictorily also expected participants to be immune to the effects of race on the discursive level. This might be one reason why it is so difficult to effect change, as these positionings are immobilizing.

A description of the post-apartheid discourses cannot be made without the inclusion of a description of the historical discourse that was also uncovered.

8.2.3 Historical discourse.

Foucault argued that to understand discourse we need to be aware of its histories and make explicit the functions that these discourses play within society. Foucault (1972, 1977) stressed that we construct ourselves in terms of the dominant discourses and commented on how this invariably impacts on the identity of self.

The historical discourse allowed white and black participants to use apartheid to their benefit when it suited them and to disengage completely from it when the blame game was being played.

Jane: And I don't know if the answer is making everyone learn an African language. It's kind of like in apartheid, making everyone speak Afrikaans was to speak an African language. I think it might just cause more animosity between them, and resentment than anything else...It yet again sets up the whole 'black-white' stronger and then we're just repeating everything. We have to move on now.

Jane's construction around the use of language and multilingualism presented the similarities of the apartheid context and post-apartheid discursive contexts.

The historical discourse then allowed Jane little room to move because it tripped her up no matter which way she turned and caused her to contradict herself. Post-apartheid historical discourse has white people defending their positions at every turn and sometimes not proactively positioning themselves outside of their defensive position. Defensive positioning has become the most 'natural' result of interactions.

Jan: We can't do things like that and expect people to trust each other again or to have meaningful interactions to one another. Let's rather say, listen you know, like affirmative action was a very good idea, it needed to rectify inequalities and the economic fears... create a mentorship program where [black] executives could be trained up and shadow somebody that's perhaps a white person in a managerial level and until they develop competency and sense of comfort with that job and then after 5 or 10 years you groom them and then they take over. We don't want white faces, we just want them out. ... I think it is a more sustained thing.

This defensive positioning or rationalisation of positioning was illustrated in Jan's discussion of affirmative action and management positions. Here Jan discussed how discourse still constructs a picture of black South Africans being less knowledgeable and less able to fill managerial positions. The discourse stated here that black people cannot do certain jobs without white management. He concluded his discussion by bringing in economic terms to validate his statements, in other words substantiating that this way would be more sustaining.

Discourses of universalism (see chapter 6) used Jan's talk to construct a picture of South Africa within a global context and how similarities existed between South Africa and other countries. Focus on the bigger picture discourse allows participants not to engage. It brings in the universal discourse of how the South Africa situation is the same as all over the world.

Jan: The same thing is threatened to happen in the U.K. As well they've got also reversal happening, because in the earlier years they were actually, their whole economy was actually based on immigration. They appreciated diversity but politically now immigration is a hot potato... It's almost like you're reading up on apartheid all over again. ...Its universal discourses and its happening in different places and different stages of time... Just by standing around a braai and promoting prejudice and stuff like that isn't helpful because it contributes to the bigger discourse at the end of the day.

Dominant historical discourse of disengagement forces participants to disengage, "doing my own thing", to withdraw when in certain contexts and to only be open when contexts are safe.

Jan: It's really so powerful and you find yourself pulled into it constantly because I also found in my group there was generally a tendency, I experienced it as complaining, that everybody else sort of fell into that discourse, everybody started complaining so I was like is what is going on here? And what happened to me instead of confronting them I pulled myself away so I was doing my own thing cause I felt in a way they were pulling me down.

An alternate way of relating to this historical discourse of disengagement would be to challenge everyone's positioning with regards to the politics of regret. But by placing oneself in a new position, one is placing oneself in a marginalized position and also reducing known, comfortable and stereotypical ways of relating to discourses of race and difference.

Precious: ... I really felt like in order for me to survive, I just needed to pull myself out and do what I needed to do... And they'd say to me that it seems I'm not as affected by certain things as they are, so I'd say to them no, I'm trying to make the best of my situation and be the best that I can... I didn't feel like I can go to somebody and say, "Hey, this is how I feel" because it felt like they were all headed in one direction and I was headed in the opposite direction. I think I also, because they became so sensitized about talking of race thing that I also became sensitized that maybe I do say something they going to say, "The black student is saying this and this and this".

Although Precious was silenced in the present discourses of disengagement, she was simultaneously desperate for engagement. She stated that "being the best I can" might provide a way out of the impasse. This illustrated how she had internalized the

discourse, in terms of having to improve oneself rather than exposing or facing the structural inequalities presented in this engagement discourse. This is a very similar position to that of women in male dominated organisations. The discourses of disengagement promote the discourse of individuality, which is very prominent in psychology to begin with. Therefore it is understandable that trainers and trainees fell back on individualism and self-improvement in this discourse. These discursive effects link to Foucault's (1980) modern power, where discourses create self-policing and individualization for participants, and how these processes isolate people within their contexts.

Historical discourses further complexify the information participants receive.

Rani: ... it's because it's been defined that way in this country and we train people that way. That if someone is different from you they're only different... they are different because they come from a different race group. And if the race doesn't cut it ... then you go onto race based culture which is, ok, maybe they are English or maybe they're Afrikaans or maybe they are Dutch, and uh, but when you get a black person sitting in front of you immediately it's race it doesn't matter if they're eshoto, tshapedi, tshwana or whatever. But that's fascinating because if it's a black therapist sitting in front of a black client, how do they define multiculturalism or do they also go on race based therapy principles as white people do?

The contradiction of the historical discourse becomes absurd and impossible to navigate and thus isolates participants and psychologists in general. It seemed to constantly come around in a full circle. If I was confused, how then must the participants have felt who had to navigate such a discursive landscape? It goes a distance to explain why some participants opted for disengagement and isolation. However disengagement also restricts agency.

Rani: And be aware of all the other, but be aware of the differences that come in and the impositions of their own ideologies that come in but for me multiculturalism... is our immediate reaction is race based... But what's happening now with the youth who have a South African identity, what does multiculturalism begin to mean?

Rani spoke of how identity in South Africa required agency from participants in the South African society. She spoke of how instilling agency and practicing agency may provide a way forward in this otherwise powerless discursive territory.

Rani: It's [race] convenient ...

Ilse: we are still busy forming what a South African identity which then means what is South African psychology?

Rani: Ja, but that doesn't stop us from engaging to this. Maybe we'll never reach that point. Or maybe we will in a long time from now but I think the whole point is, it's in this dynamics, we're actually in a very dynamic context at the moment and perhaps what's most important is the unique contributions that everyone can make... adds to the movement towards defining... But, I think we're going beyond theory. I think we're talking about the 'how' of it because if we do the research practitioner mode we want.... Research is not just doing the research, it's also thinking about it... We study in Western psychology where our debate imposed that.

Ilse: And our political historical context was different to theirs.

Rani: Exactly...But we haven't consolidated it, no one's written it down because maybe they are too scared... because not even the [psychology journal] are not allowed to use those terms black and white, because it's not politically correct. But so there is this lack of knowledge from the South African identity. So we're trying to make a hybrid without any information and the information we have got from overseas is actually two steps behind.

She spoke passionately about developing a South African identity and South African future that is no longer in the grips of American, European and Australian discourses. She also spoke of her fears of creating a hybrid South African identity which directly would, again, be following American or European trends. Rani suggested we use our agency and develop our own unique position and resistance to European and America positions to deal with the developing South African identity. Rani's counter discourse of appreciation of the uniqueness of the South African context and its people opposed the previously offered discourse of universality.

The constructions around post-apartheid had me filled with questions regarding an evolving South African identity. In the following section I teased the evolving identity further and was confronted with even more questions.

8.2.4 Construction: Evolving South African identity.

The construction of a South African identity in a process of evolution was found in the interview texts. Many South Africans do not have a concrete idea of what a South Africa identity encapsulates and perhaps this is owing to the fact the our previous South African identity was developed along racial and discriminatory lines. In the

study, my participants gave many descriptive constructions of past and future possible South African identities.

Rani: Embracing a majority black discourse and that's the fascinating thing about this country too is that the dominant discourse is the minority whereas overseas it's the other way around. And what happens when it's turned on its head? What happens when our affirmative action has to be bring in students that are not black because our classes are 99% black. We don't wanna get there because that again is defined as race. Hopefully by then we'll just be well whatever the proportion of the country is retrained.

Rani spoke of distant future possibilities existing for, perhaps, radical change in the country. She cautioned that the discourse would remain the same, only the players would change. Karien said “*maybe we are thinking too far ahead...*”. Perhaps the problem with dreaming of such distant possibilities is working out how we would be positioned by discourse and what role we would be given to play. I found myself asking how I could trouble the existing post-apartheid discourses enough to allow for alternative constructions and positions to come to the fore. This was a question which the answer to continued to elude me, so I ventured on in my analysis of the fundamental idea behind social constructionism, that of the construction of identity over time. For many of the participants, constructions were given as to how as South Africans we are struggling to find a South African identity. Based on the socio-historical context of South Africa (discussed in chapter 2), it was not too surprising that most of these views were shared by white participants, with only two black participants commenting briefly on the development of a South African identity.

Marise: ... academically we can facilitate opportunities for students to take stock of where they come from themselves and think about it because we don't in a normal doing of life. We take it for granted where we came from and our upbringing and so on. It's so easy to project it on to others, and on our children and kind of assume that they have had the same upbringing or whatever challenges and I think there's a lot of strength that can be gleaned from each other, because people say this thing that white people had an easy ride, you know that their lives are perfect if the word perfect exists. But they'll be surprised to learn what challenges and obstacles you had to overcome...

Here Marise spoke of where she came from, of her upbringing impacting on her identity. She constructed a picture of how white South Africans were raised in a particular context, with a particular set of values etc. These values and rules of

engagement are then passed on to children but the children are faced with a different context where these rules may no longer apply. The basis of identity formation for older South Africans is an uncomfortable fit in the new South Africa. This may lead to generational trends (discussed in 8.2.5) where parents and children have difficulty in 'meeting' with regard to the discursive landscape of South Africa but also within the context of 'a country which no longer exists', in a changed South Africa.

Another conversation regarding identity, as was the case with each conversation about multiculturalism and culture, turned to issues of race.

Jan: ...They [referring to black people] just have this idealist picture... if only I was white my life would have been perfect and now there are white people thinking like that. If only I was black I would have a job, if only I was black I would have gotten that bursary.

Jan went into a detailed description⁵ of how the situation came into being historically before apartheid, but what I highlighted from his construction was how the role that power, and the position it affords, was constructed in his narrative.

... the Afrikaner as a people [we] rebelled from a oppressive regime [of the British]. They threatened to take away their culture and their language and so on. ... once his got hold of power he said now I will insure that this never happens to us again...We were without our country for how many centuries now we've got our land back, now we've got our power back. We will have control, we will not let others dictate us of how we should live.

Ironically, Jan's construction could be used by any black participant too, with one slight change in the use of the white versus black actors during apartheid. Discourse fails to allow white and black participants to see the similarities in the struggle for power which both parties have gone through and currently engage in. Jan's construction continued:

Ilse: It's not so much for a fight of freedom as it's about fight for identity.

Jan: Yes and preserving identity as well because we get threatened by whether it's people that is different than us or they bring other ideas [entre explanation of apartheid structure and goals etc.]...so let's blame the English.

Here it can be seen that the discourses related to identity are so fragile that even when we tried to discuss and open them up, they were shut down by making Jan

⁵ Jan is referring to the Anglo-Boer war, in which the Afrikaner population fought against the domination and imperial rule of Britain. After the war, South Africa became a republic.

take up a defensive position where he needed to explain why apartheid happened, and ended with him finding someone else, other than the Afrikaans community of his heritage, to blame for the past mistakes. South African historical discourse presses forward to find someone to blame, someone to hold accountable because no one is willing to accept the position or privilege gained from their historic positioning. But the discourse of identity kept taking more turns towards the construction of an evolving identity

Ilse: It is very individual people struggling with their identities, because as you say your identity is still being formed and redeveloped and reintegrated basically you are re-altering your whole life story.

Jan: It is more difficult because your identities are in the state of flux that you don't have the stability to feel confident to kind of risk more. You're already risking yourself, and then you're risking more extending a hand to others that might be hostile towards you and that is difficult... And having no fear for my own safety or so on. We are not quite there yet but at least... Obviously you need to be careful and don't go and look for trouble but we are starting to network with people. Previously it was just these pockets of isolated that had no interactions with each other and because of those unknown factors this overriding fear of I don't know how you are going to treat me. If we need to converse or interact with each other. I think that fear is slowly subsiding and I think we should take advantage of that. But I think if we want to change the country I think academic institutions needs to take the lead in that. It needs to be deconstructed here and taken forward.

The overlapping nature of discourse is illustrated where identity discourses are embedded within discourses of violence and fear. Violence and fear discourses have permeated the South African context for generations and the effects are visible in the sometimes fragmented and fragile identities of South Africans. Violence and fear also promote non-engagement.

Ilse: It is interesting how people and the past repeat itself. We're starting a new process here, but are the discourses we currently creating better than the old ones or are they just different but yet as oppressive?

Jan: The truth is that we would like to see ourselves learning from experience, but sometimes the reality seems to indicate quite the contrary. I think once we acknowledge our limitations and our weaknesses or where we've ended. I think that's the beginning where we can start to have a conversation, but the problem

is there's lot defensiveness as well. Like I didn't benefit from apartheid. Perhaps not personally, but the system in which I belong benefitted from it and to acknowledge the pain that people that were the targets of apartheid ... Not to justify apartheid but to understand where it came from and what the goals and objectives was but the practice was quite different from the theory and that's where the whole thing fell apart because it was unsustainable.

Ilse: I'm also hearing you say you take responsibility?

Jan: Exactly, I think it is important. People are now taking on baggage that's not theirs... can only speak of myself, having a desire to have an identity, to know who I am ... I have a real problem, because I know that I come from somewhere and that I have a cultural heritage and I think also I shouldn't be ashamed of being a Afrikaner ... I think I should be ashamed of it. I don't think people should be ashamed of being middle aged and being an Afrikaner.... They're not being allowed that space anymore.

Ilse: What's the discourse saying again?

Jan: So the discourse is now telling people what their own self worth.

Ilse: Self-worth again is measured by the colour of your skin?

Jan: Exactly the same as before... we are falling into the same traps of judging people based on skin colour and changing just for the sake of change not because it makes things better or at least improve lives. We're just changing the system for the sake of changing.

Jan spoke of how the current discourse impeded him and his fellow white Afrikaners. Jan illustrated how we still have the same discourse doing the same dividing. He was stating the same discourse from the past that oppressed and impeded the development and growth of the indigenous populations of South Africa. This is another metaphorical example of how the discourse is viewed as having evil intent and has turned around and is now seeking out new victims and ways to yet again prevent communal exchange between people of varying diversity. I wondered whether there were more gentle discourses that may offer some kind of sanctuary against this/these harsh dividing one(s). I tried to co-create a space where such a discourse, if present, could be revealed. The discourse of appreciation slowly became visible in the constructions of the participants but was hidden within complex descriptions. I set out to highlight this when it became present and decided to underline it in this document to further bring it into the light. In this process of looking

for counter discourses, I began noticing a few escape attempts. Jan and I tried to co-create a construction of hope for what it means to be South African given the past and current socio-political and historical context.

Jan: I think it starts with understanding not with agreement or disapproval or anything. It means that just understand that we are a culturally diverse country and because of that we have got unique challenges that places [in the world]... You can't just artificially throw people together and expect them to work together and to have common goals and things like that. It takes kind of an awareness of each other and appreciation, because once we have us versus them and trying to be politically correct, I think those are forces that have good ideals but its application fails.

After our discussion, I still felt we had not come much closer to discerning what it meant to be South African. And perhaps that is the discourse's effect, preventing actors on the societal stage from being able to constructively make a clear and definitive picture in their minds as to what being South African means. The most obvious means of doing this is by setting people up against one another. By pointing out the differences where people are trying to bridge them. Discourse of identity operates by placing the participants in competition with each other. It creates spaces where participants become immobile because at each turn they are prevented from engaging with one another and with the construction of identity. However, I also noticed the appreciation discourse coming into play again, subtly gaining in strength but fragile in its construction. Therefore, in my analysis, I decided to move on to other participants' constructions regarding identity and seek out this gentle discourse of appreciation.

In the interview with Rani underneath, she spoke again of the appreciation discourse by looking past how South African identity is race-based, and constructed the picture of her appreciation for the difficulty South Africans would experienced should we no longer be allowed to use race based thinking in our identity constructions. For black participants, Precious and Mpho, the attempt to not use race as a feature of identity was ridiculous and warranted little interrogation on the matter as can be seen from their brief replies. For them, race was a crucial element to identity, while white participants felt it should not have a place in the discussion of identity. The identity politic becoming black identity is constructed around race, while white identity resists whiteness in identity construction.

Rani: ... I think I am trying to understand it from a South African identity and not from a race-based identity is something that I'm not so sure we address in the course.

Precious: My identity is in my black body. I am proud of it.

Mpho: This is me... black skin and everything...

Mary: Really... race doesn't need to be brought up in every discussion. We are people not colours... who we are has nothing to do with our colour...

Perhaps the discourse is puzzling to different people in terms of how 'race' may be used. For white participants, speaking about race has become a taboo, to such an extent that many participants stated that being white is viewed as a negative, an embarrassment, while black participants viewed their blackness with pride and as bestowing opportunities. One of the distinctive features of whiteness (Tuckwell, 2002) as the default position is that it is invisible to its owners. The participant's identities are being defined to a large extent by the discursive landscape of post-apartheid South Africa. They seem to have become slaves to racialised discourses and I was troubled by the lack of ways to escape this. I then started thinking around the different experiences and descriptive constructions of the various participants in relation to their ages. The different ages seemed to have slightly different constructions, which maybe allowed for some troubling of the discourse. Therefore I went back to the text and analysis, looking specifically for generational trends or descriptions.

8.2.5 Construction: Generational trends.

The descriptive constructions of the participants have given evidence of the idea of generational trends informing discourse. Perhaps as a way of escaping the dominant discourse, different generations have set up different ways of interacting and of informing and being informed by discourse.

Pieter: ... I do think our youth are, certain sections of our youth that I've been involved with are a lot more open, are a lot more willing to engage in maybe a different type of discourse. There will still be a privilege, but they're a lot more willing to accept, they're a lot more willing to engage to take time to go and sit. You know you see it often now. You know black kids and white kids interact. Black girl going with a white guy and it's more accepting now than it was you know. But in saying that it's more accepting, maybe it's just because we see it,

is it accepted? Do I still look up and go look at that group of friends or look at that black guy?

What is striking in the construction of generational trends with Pieter is that these trends are stratified along racial lines. The pattern becomes clear throughout each construction regarding multiculturalism. Race and racial thinking to a great extent dictate the speaker's frame of mind. Pieter spoke openly of silencing discourses regarding multiracial couples. He questioned whether the acceptance of such couples was real or more a fear of saying anything against it because of the nature of the socio-political discourse of South Africa. Occurrences like multiracial couples are still noticed because South African historical discourses frame such couples as being different and not within societal norms.

Jan: ... I think the family is the place where you can make big changes like that, where you can impact a lot of people through impacting one person. Just impacting just your daughter just your son. You can make a very big difference because hopefully one day they will interact with a few other people in the way you taught them.

Ilse: And your daughter comes home with a black boyfriend?

Jan: [silence] You know, I'm ok with it, I'm fine with it. It's not a problem. But ultimately I'm still thinking certain things. Not necessarily she's not allowed to date this guy or why does she do this? How dare she, but just it's a bit strange. Just that thought of it's not normal, it's not what you expected, and that's weird...It's difficult to accept. It's difficult to move in a new way of living.

I was left asking why an alternate discourse is so difficult to accept. What makes it difficult to think out of the box? Alternate discourses are few and far between with regard to race thinking in the context where the research was conducted, namely a HWU, but this may be very different elsewhere. Historical narratives strongly influence any and all thinking around this and dominant discourses are so difficult to leave behind. Pieter and Jan were held to be naïve by discourse of race-based identity with regard to the impact of dominant post-apartheid thinking on their construction, which still gave scope to the fact that they found it “weird” and “difficult to accept”. Charl, however described how the post-apartheid context had had little effect on his thinking or constructions until he was questioned on it. Perhaps Charl illustrated that alternate discourses do exist but are overshadowed by dominant discourse. The race discourse keeps the system closed and does not allow diversity or difference to be spoken about. A very haunting reminder of apartheid itself.

Charl: it's easy not to have to worry about having these discussions if you did come from a background that wasn't really impacted on by social discourses or apartheid or whatever.

Ilse: Can any South African honestly say that their constructions weren't impacted on by apartheid?

Charl: [laughter...] Um, I think for me personally it makes me curious about how it's different for other people um, I don't see it as different I just...[long silence]... Obviously it's different, I see it as something we can learn from them. Anybody is used to difference is used to anything else in how it's different cause like I said it's so normal for me the situation I grew up in and I find it interesting to learn about other situations and other cultures and how people made that work. And how other people maybe preferred those situations.

Despite trying to oppose discourse or position himself uniquely, Charl found it increasingly difficult to discuss the issue of 'difference', as did several participants, due to the silencing discourse. I ventured further into this with Charl and much was gained by both of us regarding the effect of the dominant discourse on him, and perhaps others, such as being polite, respectful and politically correct in his talk.

Ilse: Would you say that being polite or respectful restrains you?

Charl: I definitely think it restrains me. There are some times where when you talk to like especially older people that your opinion doesn't really count, that your talk is censored... and that's frustrating for me, personally very much so. [Um], ja I definitely think that's an obstacle and I would like to believe that the generation that I am part of that's sort of moving away. I don't think that much, [um] it's not [um], disrespectful, it's just that everyone has an opinion and is entitled to that opinion and that's the difference and it feels like our generation is more like so hopefully it's moving out. Just because of your age your opinion doesn't count I think that's not fair. I am not carrying the baggage from the past, which I think maybe older generations are still doing it. Which is why the discourses play out, which is why we constantly have to talk about these things.

Ilse: [Hmm] so my age and you guys younger, we don't really have a need to engage with these issues anymore?

Charl: I think there are two sides... I think in that sense for some people not talking about it just pointing out how ridiculous it is. So I'm hoping that we're moving towards a point where if we want to talk about it it's not something we

have to be afraid of and that you can talk about. Not talking about it is basically just pointing out that it's not the same anymore. And I think the past generations as well, they're obviously still clinging onto those views and things. And just the way they talk in social situations it still comes down to us a bit so it will still take some time to get that completely out of society. But I think I'm quite excited about the direction that South Africa is going in terms that we're sort of making progress, it's just going a bit slow.

Participants were restricted in agency by discourse. The ways of interacting are predetermined and censored. Many concerns regarding these restricted positions were voiced by the participants.

Jane: And I'm not fully convinced it's a good thing that we actually are putting these things on the back burner cause that's how things got... By putting things on the back burner we're allowing them to disappear and allowing them to become subservient again which means they gonna count discourse something strong again and it's gonna pop up somewhere else cause history repeats itself so we can do apartheid in a different faction. We're doing the same again. We still are a racist nation... we do it between the races, we do it between the cultures.

Jane pointed to how dominant discourses allow certain views to continue, they prevent participants from speaking up. They reduce the agency and actions available to participants.

Sarah: The people higher up that actually, if there is no "Still do wall, we are sorry for apartheid", we apologise to you is at a higher level than in their 40's 50's and yes they're ok, and it's the 'me generation', the young generation that's wants no responsibility for nothing and it doesn't go up. They don't see the people that should be apologized to are my parents or someone else. It wasn't me, I wasn't part of it, and they're just me me me me. It's terrible... we have for example ... a lot of black teachers... and they had to get their degrees in apartheid or in the beginning when things were just changing. And they have had to sit with being the only black person at the University at that stage and they made it through. They pushed through. They worked with it, they are there.

Sarah linked to what Jane had said and further explained how the agency of the youth has been removed. In a sense that without the apartheid struggle, what are we? The construction links back to the post-apartheid South African identity crisis.

The contradiction of discourse also comes in here in that the generational trends reveal more opportunities and options of action available to younger South Africans, but the younger participants do not always recognize these. Or perhaps they do and are immobilized by discourse to react to them. The apartheid discourse allowed reactive positioning from the participants but the post-apartheid discourse seems to be inhibiting action. It seems to be preventing participants from taking up positions from which they can promote change and disrupt the status quo. Sarah very strongly denied her position in post-apartheid South Africa, as did most of the participants, who were seduced by discourse and therefore failed to acknowledge the privileges being white during apartheid afforded them - the white default position, which allowed invisibility. She fell back on favoured white constructions of how hard working black people were rewarded in the apartheid context, hinting at the fact that those not in positions of privilege after apartheid had only themselves to blame.

Jan speaks of past historical discourses that play out in people's lives.

Jan: Well it is different and in the sense I'm actually a bit biased ...it's interesting how our legacy has and history affected our thought and the way we engage with each other...Because during that time of our history I wasn't even born yet. ... I feel that after three centuries we've got a right to be called Africans, but this discourse happening outside that says that they don't consider white people as being African and as being endemic to the country. I struggle with those feelings because I feel that we've got a right to exist, I feel that yes there has been massive mistakes and massive problems that apartheid did create and that people just by belonging to the group has kind of pulled you in with everything else. ... because as a white Afrikaner male I'm having a struggle to form my identity in terms of socially and culturally. I've got no idea where I am ... where do I fit in, because I feel if I don't fit I'm unwanted. ... But there is this legacy that is honestly imposed on us and we don't actually want to own it ... I shouldn't make excuses for my existence and my fellow white Africans... We also made some huge contributions to the development of this country so why should we feel ashamed. I think what's happening in current public discourse that everything that is white and male is equated to being evil or having an agenda or things to being racist or so on.

What is very apparent in his talk is how discourse promoted his lack of understanding as to why we were sitting where we were in post-apartheid South Africa. Discourse of race and identity had Jan so tied up in justifying and defending his position that I was wondering why discourse did this.

Jan: I think just as black people felt marginalized during the past in apartheid the same is happening now... White people are being marginalized and I'm kind of saying it has become popular to be white as if you've got a choice of what skin colour you have. ... I just think we are getting a bit of an unfair deal in terms of that... It's not apartheid any more, how long are you going to blame apartheid.

This race and identity discourse continued to inform the construction of whites being oppressed in the new discursive context of South Africa, and I could not help but link this construction back to similar constructions which black people may have had in the apartheid era and may perhaps still own today. Apartheid constructions such as blacks are economically oppressed and whites are affluent and privileged, especially economically, remain unchanged. Apartheid discourses seem to have continued and perhaps even gained in strength but with new social actors. Black and white role reversals are evident particularly in the constructions of older participants. Younger participants seem less likely to make the links between apartheid and post-apartheid discourses. I tried to further engage with this discourse and it reverted back to constructions around race and racism. I also wondered, from Jan's construction below, whether he realized discourse was silencing him when he was discussing 'they' and how 'they' fall back on stereotypes. It becomes a discussion about the other and not about me. The us and them dyad re-emerges.

Jan: ... if our goal is non-racialism, why are we implementing racial ideologies and why are we following them because we're just repeating apartheid mistakes in a different context and we are just rehashing them... but the problem is if we don't address the discourses it's so easy for them and they grow up to fall back into the same stereotypes and then we sit with exactly the same problem.

Precious, a black participant, viewed the impact of dominant discourse on her situation in very similar ways to Jan's. She also felt silenced by race and identity discourses as well as marginalized.

Precious: I was thinking to myself, let's say a stereotypical comment happened and I would later say to myself he didn't mean it like that and then it would happen again and it is something that sort of goes on and on and I think it's difficult for one person to stand up but if it was a group thing it would have helped a lot.

Race and identity discourses had Precious silenced in certain contexts but she continued to describe how in other contexts she did have a voice. She described how the tertiary institutional context did not allow her a voice. She further elaborated that this may be due to the generational trends in the university. "*I'm challenging myself with to stand up. Cause otherwise it holds back my ability...*" (Precious). She continued to say

I think that's the generation thing we were talking about. Time is changing but the problem ... [pause] and you as a new person, specifically a young woman coming in, to bring about changes is very difficult. We literally have to wait for these people to retire before we can get rid of them and bring about change. So it's sad that we are waiting for the old to move out. And I think it's difficult because you can't question these people, it's like they are the gurus so questioning is like a "no-no".

Ilse: hmm tricky.

[silence]

Precious: Yes, but it's hard when it's in our situation to do that. Because of who's in authority and I suppose the discourse still tells me to listen to the white bosses [uncomfortable laughter].

Precious' construction had me disappointed. Historical discourse still promoted apartheid ideological thinking at this HWU. I wondered how this post-apartheid residue (discussed in chapter 6.2.3) was informing discourse and I actively set out to expose it. The discursive context of the HWU mirrors society where the apartheid discourse runs alongside the post-apartheid discourse and makes use of descriptions across racial lines.

While speaking of the generational trends within the discourses of psychology training at this HWU, many participants spoke of how the current adolescents and young adults are struggling with the concept and construct of South Africa and of their South African identity in a post-apartheid South Africa. By virtue of their age, these students and participants did not directly 'live' through apartheid. They are not openly familiar with the challenges and the oppression of the previous system. Therefore these participants often spoke with ignorance of the prevailing situation and constructed discourse.

Mpho: The participant trainers who were more aware of the possible discursal effects on the youth, regarded their situation with an acknowledgment of the

tension and pressure their positioning places them in. But I think we've neglected the current.. the students that we train because we expect them to be able to know all this stuff, get rid of your ex-baggage, you're a new generation, you didn't live in apartheid. But they are so fragile.

Other participants had the following take on the situation of how multiculturalism and identity are informed by generational trends.

Rani: And they will still conceptualise the world... I wish there was more that the trainers could help them with or navigate this... They are South Africans going out as South African therapists and yes they will always, I mean residues are still very much there because they also have family and parents and things who have race based feuds, but the dominant view would be "Ag, we're South African" you know we do, the current lot are the ones we're talking about, their identity as professional psychologists are just quite...I think what they would do is navigate through these things again going back to intellectual categories.

Rani's talk links back to the historical residue spoken about earlier.

Rani: they are [the historical residue] you look at them and you think 'wow' the rainbow children. They are the rainbow they were born into the, if you think they were all between 1 and 5, they were born into a democracy but the influence on them. The country was telling them you are free. Be it a black student or a white student, you are free to think, embrace, to be a South African. But everyone around them was telling them, "You are black, you are white" because those were the people...they underestimate the impact of it all.

The talk goes back to the "foundation stuff" Precious spoke about whereby younger participants no longer experience the same South Africa their parents did. They treat others and are treated in a manner that upholds the ideals of liberation and freedom, but return to their homes where the older discourse of oppression still prevails.

Rani: But the fact that you found...

Ilse: ... the forgotten generation.

Rani: ... You have found that, because people were like born into a free country but at different times, their parents not having. Discourses have been bad... It's almost like 'get over it'... Because perhaps, on an unconscious level you picked up that with these groups that have been coming through in the last few years. [pause] Stuck in the middle.

The generational trends description might be pointing to the state of freedom being a construct and not yet an experience. The talk continues but now focuses on the older generation. Her talk speaks to the construction of the generational elements within the construct of multiculturalism and race itself. Perhaps the older generation of participants can in fact learn from the younger generation how to abandon racial thinking and ideology. The pervasiveness and power of the apartheid discourse is shown to be present still in the older generation of South Africans.

Rani: ... Perhaps we are the ones having this issue with it because we have to let go of race and maybe we can't because it's our identity. Our identities are still forming; I mean most people in their forties have such a strong identity to their country. Our identity is what? White? Indian? Black? I mean what are those terms "they colours", that's what they are. Ja. And with them come cultural practices.

In concluding the construction of generational trends, Rani's description of the discursive contexts which the different age groups react from provides insights into how a process of change can be initiated.

Rani: But remember we [indistinct] ... very much in the historical context of our own training. They don't have that background. They just have life as a background at the moment and what do we do? We take them, and we shove them in to these neat little boxes... And like someone said, they gonna have to take the rest of their life to unlearn everything they've learnt... cause no one is an expert in multiculturalism in this country because it's still being defined... it's updated every single moment of the day.

Participants were cautious to use the appreciation discourse. Unless we see people as people and not as categories, we will not be moving towards creating alternate ways of producing meaning and identity.

Rani: ... until you are seen as a South Africa researcher, and not as a white researcher, those are the kind of discourses you are going to get back from someone and the interesting thing is, who are you offending? Are you offending another white individual or are you offending a black academic? And then again unfortunately we come back to colour because those academics have also been schooled in the same apartheid time as we have... and then how do you comes the fact that we live separately, we went to different schools, different education qualities. But hopefully it's not gonna happen. The young ones who are coming now will probably look at us and say; "What are you talking about?"

You know? We all like the same music, for them that's multiculturalism. We go home we speak our home languages.

Change is at hand - "*it's updated every single moment of the day*" (Rani). Her talk speaks of appreciation that the trainees are different from the trainers, they grew up differently, they see the world differently. Here the idea of difference is viewed as having a positive connotation. By virtue of being different they, the trainees and the youth, can effect change, although perhaps the trainers, and older generation of South Africans in general, are keeping them connected to the past discourses that are limiting change.

The excerpts illustrate how generation trends and thinking of identity discourse from a generational perspective can lead to insights regarding how participants envisage themselves as South African.

8.3 Conclusion

Discourses of identity permeate the discursive territory of multiculturalism. Race litters the terrain and participants tried to construct identity is a contradictory, rigid and messy landscape. But the hope for change (and for appreciation) is shown to lie with the younger generation, who were raised in a post-apartheid climate and have therefore experienced a lesser degree of reinforcement of apartheid discourses than the older generation have.

Chapter Nine

Research Commentary

In this chapter I set out to summarise the discourses and relate these back to the literature and theory used in the study. I situate the study within the research field and reflect further on the study within the larger research field informing my study. I further present the value and challenges of the study, as well as recommendations for future research in the area of multicultural training at tertiary training institutions in the South African context.

9.1 Summary of the findings

In this section I first provide a summary of the findings of the study. The findings are then related back to the literature and theoretical position of social constructionism.

9.1.1 Discourses of exclusion.

Participants described how this HWU is constructed as being a white, conservative, often male and privileged space. The constructions of the institutional culture of this HWU were shown to feed into the subject positions offered in this discourse of exclusion, namely black or white, with agency being a concept that was regarded as a hot potato more than as a possibility to take forward.

The construction of a conservative, white, male and privileged space was raised mainly by the trainees. In the study participants showed how the discourse of exclusion made use of the conservative space to not engage. The construction sets whiteness as the 'norm'. The construction of white privileged space of tertiary institutions is well-documented in literature and relates to the institutional culture of universities (Cole, 1998; Kezar & Eckel, 2002). American authors Brunσμα, Brown and Placier (2013) referred to

the 'walls of whiteness' that make it difficult to teach ... race and racism and make it difficult for students at historically white... universities... to wrestle with these important issues. Most white students enter ... surrounded by these walls – protecting them from attacks on white supremacy – that have multiple layers and therefore are even more difficult to penetrate (p. 717).

They went further to say that "education does not threaten those walls. Instead... often bolsters them through curricular and extracurricular experiences, residential and disciplinary isolation, institutional symbols, cultural reproduction, and everyday practices such as grading and classroom interactions" (p. 717). Thus the tertiary education landscape becomes a racialised space. The conservative space

construction is also supported by the presence of actual white bodies in the trainer and trainees cohort, as most of the trainers and trainees are white. Most trainers and trainees are women despite the discursive landscape being male dominated.

Discursively it is also important to be cognizant of the historical trajectory of the development of universities in South Africa. Universities were traditionally for the white elite (see chapter 2) with few, often no, people of colour entering these citadels of privilege (Schensul & Heller, 2010). Education was reserved for white males, knowledge was created by white males and the production of knowledge was censored by the power that be of the time (see chapter 2). A construction linked to this larger social and historical discourse is that participants spoke of the absence of meritorious black students or trainees. The discourse of absence of meritorious black students is echoed in literature. Robus and Macleod (2006) speak of 'white excellence and black failure'. These authors describe how race talk has emerged in the post-apartheid institutional context of university training. The issue of 'competence' was raised and how the competence discourse comes into play. They note that "this hegemony is still in play as 'white institutions' are positioned as rescuing 'black' [students]" (p. 11). The discourse of white excellence and black failure being rescued by white excellence is evident in their study. The remedy for discourse of black failure is offered in the forms of individual student 'effort', undoing 'blackness' and the rescuing of the white space.

What is of particular importance to me, as a researcher, trainer and therapist, is the construction of this HWU's space and what this means in a wider sense.

Our sense of space and sense of self are mutually constitutive. As much as we try to shape our worlds to fit in with our identities, our environments also shape us, challenge us, and constrain us. We attempt to find comfort zones in which it is possible for us to be 'ourselves' (Ballard, 2004, p. 55).

Therefore such a space makes a comfortable position available to those who conform to the status quo. Ballard (2004) pointed to the construct of space being vital in the process of identity formation and also in the process of 'comfort' in living environments. If the HWU is a space for discomfort, and promotes that identity is shaped around notions of othering, it becomes possible to question the current institutional environment's construction as a space and location of learning and knowledge creation, especially if its constructed as a racialised space.

The discourse of exclusion is posed as static, rigid and resilient with the only counter discourse of casting a wider net proposed. This counter discourse had two

participants speak of it and was closed up almost as fast as it was opened up due to the tactics of the discourse of exclusion. The next section summarises the discourses of the bigger picture of a country in transition.

9.1.2 The bigger picture discourse of a country in transition.

This discourse is constructed from notions of big stories to local understandings. The ideas fostered here are how global, big stories make local news and their effect/impact on the discursive landscape in this HWU and in South Africa in general. The constructions directly reinforce the universal versus local discourses in psychology, where western-is-better is promoted as opposed to a less favoured view of local constructions. There is evidence in literature of psychologists seeking to promote the local, indigenous knowledges (Bakker et al. 2007; Makau, 2003) and Africanisation of psychology (Macleod, 2002). However, these voices are at a lower volume than the dominant voice of universalism of psychology. There are psychologists who prefer using universal techniques instead of taking into account the cultural effects within a context (Makau, 2003). It is not a new idea to marry the two, by making use of western universal techniques and approaches but adapting them to the unique, local context. This would yield results for both the clients and the psychologists seeking to assist them (Ruane, 2010). But marrying the two without the transparent knowledge of the informing discourse within society concerning issues around multiculturalism would have little value in terms of servicing these communities nor any hope of creating counter discourses.

The subject positions made available in the bigger picture discourse of a country in transition are racialised, that is to say either black or white. Racialised positioning, black or white, is shown in the study to be riddled with negative constructions.

The second discourse described is the guises of oppression. The guises of oppression become a stage from which constructions of the legacy of offending, permission to speak and historical residue are to be enacted. The self-sustaining nature of the guises of oppression makes use of the legacy of offending and permission to speak to snowball the construction of oppression within modern day South Africa. By keeping the legacy of offending and permission to speak alive, the guises of oppression are sustained.

Historical residue was a very interesting finding for me. The construction of historical residue in the interview texts had an almost metaphorical symbolism. Apartheid has been abolished, the window has been washed clean but a greasy film is left on the window, which makes it difficult for all the participants to see through it. The residue

could be washed off with a bit of a stronger soap and some manual labour. But not all participants were interested in spending the additional time and effort on polishing the window and so the residue remains.

Once more, in the guises of oppression discourse, the participants were given their black or white subject position from which to tackle these constructions, as well as a position of minimized agency. The guises of oppression discourse also made use of generational positioning in positioning participants of different ages along the continuum of oppression. They were positioned as oppressor or oppressed, apartheid benefactors or born frees. These subject positions became confusing when looking at the oppression discourse and the historical residue. Participants were actively trying to promote a 'feel-good' (Mills, 2008) history of South Africa, and South Africans in general deny any and all form of previous support for apartheid. In the words of Steyn (2012), "It has become a standing joke that since democracy in South Africa one cannot find anyone who supported apartheid" (p. 8). Steyn went on to say how white South Africans distance themselves from apartheid by statements such as "it was not their generation that was responsible for apartheid, but that of their parents" (p. 8) and that "it was not as bad for black people during apartheid as it is for white South Africans in post-apartheid South Africa" (p. 8). However, she explained that the racial apartheid could not have been sustained without people being in support, both active and passive cooperation, of it. The white population in South Africa benefitted from

using separate entrances, enjoying white only transport, beaches, restaurants and cinemas, paying subminimum wages to black employees employed only for menial labour, educating only white children in the school their children also attended, enjoying the security of curfews, serving in the army and, of course, participating in discourses that justified the status quo (p. 8).

This helped create a 'feel-good' history for white South Africans by creating a more comfortable and favourable presence for whites (Steyn & Foster, 2008). Steyn (2012) commented that by imparting this reality to their children, white South Africans assisted in enabling subject positions for their children that were characterised by ignorance.

Given that the study was looking into the constructions of multiculturalism in the therapeutic training context, the discourses of multiculturalism inevitably came to the fore.

9.1.3 Discourses of multiculturalism.

In this section two discourses of multiculturalism are presented, namely the impasse of multiculturalism and the immutability of culture.

The first discourse, the impasse of multiculturalism discourse, is presented from the perspective of the constructions yielded in the interview texts. Participants spoke of the under- and overstated nature of multiculturalism and the constructions of insiders and outsiders within this discursive context. The under- and overstated as well as the insiders and outsiders constructions were posed and seen to be ways in which participants could remain distant and not engage with multiculturalism.

I started reflecting on the discursive landscape of multiculturalism. In this discursive landscape multiculturalism is further complexified by the dominance of the racial positioning and the problems within multicultural ideology itself. Critically speaking multicultural ideology seems to be obsessed with maintaining the boundaries between people to retain their individualism, perhaps at the expense of a large cultural belongingness (Hall, 1993). It tries to actively promote the distinction between people instead of the commonalities. It could be then argued that it promotes segregation and distancing at the expense of a group collective identity (Madeira & Veloso, 2012). In South Africa the crux of multiculturalism might be seen in the construct of the rainbow nation. The 'rainbow nation' is a term coined by Nobel Peace Prize winner Archbishop Desmond Tutu that aims to capture the extraordinary diversity of races, tribes, creeds, languages and landscapes that characterise modern South Africa. South Africa has eleven official languages: English, Afrikaans and nine ethnic tongues, of which Zulu and Xhosa are the most widely spoken. But with the recognition of group rights of 11 language groups and the collective cultural identity of these various groups, one could critically ask who sets the agenda for discussion around multiculturalism in South Africa? Who gets to belong to the rainbow nation or does one become a member by default? Multiculturalism, and specifically the idea of a rainbow nation, may thus be seen as a process that was hijacked by those in positions of power to promote national cohesion, the all-colourful rainbow, and therefore is a short lived, non-sustainable ideology. Whether in agreement with or in opposition to multiculturalism, the positionality results in an impasse. Even while debating support for or resistance to multiculturalism, both positions result in non-engagement.

Multiculturalism has further been criticized as forming a hybrid society where differences are erased (Madeira & Veloso, 2012). The idea of separate societies

sounds a little too close to home considering South Africa's apartheid legacy and therefore perhaps a change in ideology is needed. The question in South Africa is whether this is actually possible. Ideological change demands dialogue between groups on a basis of equality and fairness between the groups. The cultural matrix of South Africa has participants debating ideas of what it means to be 'African' and what our 'national identity' is (Macleod, 2002). In the end these are constructs which change over time. Trying to make multiculturalism 'work' in South Africa may subsequently become a direct contradiction to the development of a national identity of oneness. Multiculturalism would then become a living museum of South African identity because a more global view of South African identity is impossible to achieve. The search for cultural belongingness (Hall, 1993) becomes embedded in constructs of identity. The construct of identity is further compounded by the constructs of citizenship versus nationality (Hall, 1993). Hall (1993) noted the fear of difference and diversity within multiculturalism. He quotes Gilroy in saying "it constructs and defends an image of ...culture, homogenous in its whiteness yet precarious and perpetually vulnerable to attack from enemies within and without (Gilroy as cited in Hall, 1993, p. 49-50). Participants spoke of developing a national identity. Gilroy went further to explain the danger in national versus cultural identity "which attempts to secure their identity by adopting closed versions of culture and community with the different problems that arise from trying to live with difference" (p. 361). Therefore there is a tension between the ideas of national identity and cultural identity. Apartheid South Africa may be defined as being a bicultural society. Having two dominant cultures, minority and majority cultures. Majority and minority status in South Africa is awarded based on oppression and marginalization not on population numbers. Post-apartheid South Africa perhaps suggests ideas of acculturation as being a solution whereby we desire to move from marginalization to integration.

The immutability of culture discourse, the second discourse, was informed by constructions of culture bound in oppression and discomfort with 'otherness'. Culture appears to have become a code for a range of other terms and issues, carrying multiple implicit associations. In contemporary South Africa, culture is employed by many different groupings with different rhetorical objectives, including those of dominance, assertion, resistance and subversion (Eagle, 2005). Also, the agendas in conversations are served by the term culture. "Not only is culture a slippery and multifaceted construct, but the politics inherent in assertions and discussions about culture are also particularly loaded" (Eagle, 2005, p. 46).

The relationship between culture and individuals' orientation towards life is undeniable. For psychologists, much of a client's behaviour is structured around their cultural or ethnic group affiliation. The same applies to the counsellors/psychologists. Both practitioner and client are influenced by beliefs that define worldviews and establish norms. Many studies and articles have addressed issues around cultural inequities and biased service provision to particular racial/ethnic groups, as well as culturally encapsulated counselling (Eagle, 2005; Ponterotto & Benesch, 1988; Sue, 1981; Whitehead, 2003). Furthermore, knowledge of issues of culture, and race, need to be stressed as cultural, and racial, issues cannot be viewed in isolation from factors such as socio-economic status, historical and political factors which are pertinent in a country such as South Africa. Since democratisation in 1994, large numbers of people find themselves in transition, culturally, economically and otherwise. Therefore the relatively static divisions of the past are dissolving, making it even more important to be sensitive (Ruane, 2006).

Through the process of deconstruction, a counter discourse of a negotiated culture came to the fore but was soon assimilated back into the dominant culture.

In the next section the discourse of race and identity are further reflected on.

9.1.4 Discourses of race and identity

The discourses of race and identity will be described in two sections, namely the discourses of race and the discourses of identity.

The discourses of race were littered with race talk. Race was constructed as gains and losses with whiteness being the dominant and invisible 'norm'. Talking about race is challenging and interesting in contemporary South Africa (Rautenbach, 2012). "It is entangled in the project of nation building, deeply entrenched in politics, written in policies, continues to mediate everyday interactions, and questions how we define our humanity in this geographic location" (Rautenbach, 2012, p. 1). Brown (2009) argued that "race is an ideological construct whose use for social scientific analysis serves only to reinforce its legitimacy" (p. 4). Alexander (2007) spoke of the "issue of admonitions relating to the production of racialised identities by institutions such as the state and academy" (p. 92). There have been calls for the erasure of the term from academic discourse (Erasmus, 2010; Erwin, 2010; Rautenbach, 2012) and the failure to conduct research into the area of race preserves the status quo and hampers progress towards understanding and addressing inequalities in social institutions. A number of authors commented on the potential of resisting racial categories to trouble the traditional binary by the refusal to orientate to one race or

another (Erasmus, 2010). Removing racial categorization confounds the binary by resisting the choice between oppositional categories. At the same time, a post-structuralist approach warns that it is not possible to entirely escape binary logic, since any term that attempts to disrupt a dominant binary would necessarily draw on the binary in defining itself as resistant (Derrida, 1976). Racism then relies on racial categorization and resulting binaries for its meaning, even in an attempt of transgressing these binaries (Erasmus, 2010).

In this study, it becomes apparent that the white trainers and trainees may think racism does not affect them because they are not people of colour. Thus they do not see “whiteness” at work as a racial identity. They also do not see the system of advantage at work that is based on racial positioning. McIntosh (1988) referred to this as interlocking oppressions. These are active forms and embedded forms of oppression that as a member of the dominant group one is taught not to see. “I did not see myself as racist because I was taught to recognize racism only in individual acts of meanness by members of my group, never in invisible system conferring unsought racial dominance on my group from birth” (McIntosh, 1988, p. 6). As stated by Duncan (1993) “dominant groups [...], by virtue of their control over existing ideological or discursive apparatuses, have the power to ensure that the meanings which they give to social phenomena [...] are the ones that gain dominance and widespread acceptance” (p. 56).

It may be fair to say that blatant expressions of superiority are rare in everyday multicultural interaction in South Africa. However, these expressions may have been replaced by a more subtle form of racism - modern racism (Hook, 2004). Modern racism is defined as concealing prejudice in public, only expressing it when safe to do so, for example in one’s home. Modern racism was found in the interview texts of the study and was found to be normative (See 6.1.2).

When reflecting back on my writing up of race and racism, I came across Foucault’s three systems of exclusion. Foucault (cited in Young, 1981) speaks of the three systems of exclusion, which create discourse namely the forbidden speech, the divisions of madness and the will to truth. He also speaks of the ordering or procedures for controlling the construction of discourse as being the commentary, the author, and the speaking subjects. In the presentation of race and racism, my goal as the author, was to explore the commentary (constructions and resulting discourses) from the perspective of subject with the possible pseudo-objectivity. I state it as pseudo-objectivity because from the theoretical point of departure of social constructionism, we know the limited degree to which objectivity could be applied

given the socially constructed nature of reality. The reason behind this position of pseudo-objectivity, was to not provide my personal influence too explicitly onto the data and literature of race and racism. Perhaps this is also links to the systems of exclusion mentioned earlier in the creation of a discourse. The fact that I am a white South African, might account for the tendency to be very hesitant of dealing with issues of race and racism because of South Africa's past of apartheid. I writing up the section on race and racism, I was cognisant of the care and hesitation I experienced. Therefore it made it 'safer' to hold a more objective stance when discussing these constructs. Thus in hindsight, I link here to Foucault's comments on the "societies of discourse" (cited in Young, 1981, p. 63). Foucault states that the "act of writing as it is institutionalized today ... takes place in a 'society of discourse' which is ... certainly constraining" (p. 63). Perhaps this is where the discourses of race and racism became obscured by the system of exclusion, which unconsciously and consciously 'forbids' my being more deferential to the literature and writing about race and racism from a position which would offer more explicit acknowledgment of the various orders of discourse. Upon further reflection, it connects to narrative practices of inquiring into peoples' preferred narratives (White, 1995; Winslade, 2009) as well as to Deleuze's work on multiplicity and the search for multiple meanings and creation of possibilities that "enlarge our lives" (May, 2005, p. 7). For Deleuze (Deleuze & Parnet, 2002), power constrains the choices people have in creating counter narratives. The answer to change then rests in resisting the line of power as an act of resistance to the operation of power. In this way creative avenues of changes might be found. The very act of doing research into this area of knowledge in this study, its an act of resistance to the line of power being perpetuated within this HWU.

The discourse of apartheid also as deserves special reflection. Apartheid had at different times and for different groups of people, a multitude of meanings and functions (McCallum, 2009). Apartheid has been related to a machine (Campbell, 2007) that has countless small cogs that, even in current South Africa, are slowly turning. It is through the operation of discourse and the non-discursive aspects of discourse that these cogs are turned. Therefore apartheid functions on a network of discursive structures, and non-discursive structures, that are either actively or passively maintained in South Africa society. It is against these powerful discourses of apartheid that I attempted deconstruction. Deconstructing apartheid requires more than the deconstruction of apartheid as a cognitive exercise as apartheid was/is enacted in real terms. That is, the constructions rooted in the apartheid discourse are connected to non-discursive actions and they operate to construct various bodily actions as well as thoughts. The discourses around apartheid exist is a complex

system of embedded material relations. For example in the practicality of how people live. In South Africa, as stated in Chapter 2, people still to a large extent live in separated communities despite the era of democracy in the country. Thus as Winslade (2009) points out they contain discursive and non-discursive elements that operate together. Participants mention their frustration in that changes in thinking regarding apartheid, and specifically racism, and how this will not be enough to change the machine that is apartheid. The idea being that these constructs are very powerful and that it would be unrealistic to expect change to occur rapidly and in great shifts. But how could a preferred discursive landscape be created? It appears that to dismantle the apartheid machine requires patience and time to allow a counter narrative, which has strength enough to withstand the pressure and relentlessness of a machine that has successfully ran for so many decades. Through developing counter narrative and re-authoring our stories (White, 1995) or lines of escape (Deleuze & Parnet, 2002) change becomes possible. Through the consistent asking of the question how might we live? (May, 2005). How might, we as post-apartheid South Africans find ways to escape the dominant discourse of apartheid to find ways of resisting the power relations that threaten to close down the possibilities that exist? Many authors suggest (Deleuze & Parnet, 2002; Foucault, 1981; May, 2005; White, 1992; Winslade, 2009) creating new territories (landscapes for change), new selves and new relationships to expand the possibilities and escape the threat.

In this section of the discourses of identity are described. I first discussed a discourse of participants resisting or accepting race as being primary to their identity. Participants negotiated their identity in a discursive context where race was regarded as defining subjectivity and not being politically correct in the current discursive landscape of South Africa. White participants resisted race as an identity marker, by drawing on a discourse that resisted race as primary to their identity. Participants employed various strategies to downplay the significance of their identification as racialised in their descriptions of themselves. In this manner white participants challenged the importance of race in constructions of identity, while black participants accepted and even promoted the construction of race as identity.

I also discussed a second discourse in this section, where the focus was on how participants made sense of their identities in a context of post-apartheid South Africa and a resistance to identity politics. Participants' resistance to fixing their identity along strictly defined racial categories of identity was partly informed by a view of such categories being oppressive (Erasmus, 2010). In this context, participants were critical of rigidly constructed lines of difference, such as the boundaries around race.

Their reluctance to privilege certain aspects of identity, such as their identification as white or black, was constructed in relation to such a political resistance against reified racial categories of identity.

The post-apartheid and historical discourses were shown to be intricately embedded in and reinforcing the clean-slate discourse. Constructions of an evolving South African identity were described as being the desired outcome. However, these constructions were foiled at each turn by the dominant race discourse. Participants were either for or against a South African identity that was based on race. Thus a stalemate was reached where black participants accepted race and white participants rejected it in their creation of identity. This process of South African identity creation was described within an appreciative discourse. The appreciative discourse noted difference as a positive construction and something to work towards and not against. Generational trends were described as providing the reasons for the differences in experience and constructions of trainers and trainees. Older trainers were constructed by the appreciation discourse as perhaps being a bit more jaded than their younger trainees. Age played into the findings as well in that age related directly to the changes in society after apartheid was dismantled.

Some findings warranted further reflection because the constructs of power, position, race and identity were found to be most salient to the study.

9.2 Reflections on the findings

This section provides further reflection on the findings of the study. I first reflect locating myself in the context of the study. Then I reflect on knowledge, power and the research process.

9.2.1 Locating myself

During the study, I began reading authors who shared ideas of “anti-oppressive” (Brown & Strega, 2005, p. 3) research practices.

While each of the authors described, in different ways, their encounters with and journeys through the boundaries of mainstream research, most also considered how their journeys had been shaped not only by their commitment to emancipatory goals but also by their location on the margins (Brown & Strega, 2005, p. 3).

This is similar to the approach I have used in this research, to journey beyond the boundaries of mainstream research and consider the discursive landscape in which

mainstream research operates while being cognizant of the knowledge creation process I was involved in.

It is essential to acknowledge that both the creation of knowledge and the participation in knowledge creation are constrained by power relations and structural inequalities. Smith (1987) refers to these as relations of ruling. Within a university institution hierarchy exists. As a researcher, I experienced difficulty in finding contextual facets that were congruent to social justice, anti-oppression, cultural traditions and life experiences within the HWU where I train and lecture.

The marginalized and those who are committed to social justice at all levels in the research process want and need different kinds of knowledge and different and more congruent means by which to create it, or to allow previously subjugated knowledges to emerge (Brown & Strega, 2005, p. 5).

Faced with this hierarchy and a desire to legitimize my marginalized construction of this context, I have strived to prove the usefulness of being active in the process of change at a local level. It is hoped that the study achieved the initiation of a process of change. My intention therefore was to contribute to the process of having research reflect, both in process and in terms of the knowledge it constructs, the experience, expertise and concerns that are raised within both traditionally marginalized and privileged contexts. Thus this research project hoped to trouble the construct about what 'counts' as knowledge in a HWU by exposing the hegemonic multicultural discourses present within a HWU context. Many 'truths' were presented in the study, which can be valued by the reader/s independently depending on the reader/s personal epistemology.

9.2.2 Knowledge

Framing the discussion about knowledge in the discourse of positivism obscures important questions about how the development of knowledge is socially constructed and controlled, how knowledge is used, and whose interests knowledge serves, while postmodernism and feminist poststructuralism attempt to construct new ways of looking at the research process. "At the same time it is important to acknowledge that this space is small and continually under threat from those who seek to reinforce the hegemony of traditional research [methodologies]" (Brown & Strega, 2005, p. 8). Historically knowledge creation practices have been separate from praxis. For example theorizing about the discourses within a HWU may be translated in transforming the praxis of psychology. Therefore focusing only on the local context of this HWU and the notion of research as praxis as an emancipatory commitment

allows the subjects to move beyond acceptance of the status quo to positions of active resistance. The location of the research in a HWU offered the opportunity to problematize, explore and offer solutions for working with the power relations between the members of training staff and the trainees within this unique location and context. It continually brought questions of ontology and epistemology into play, and by positioning the participants and myself as such made it possible for this study to be anti-oppressive and transformatory (Louw, 2011).

To discuss liberating research methodologies without critical reflection on the university's role in research and producing knowledge is impossible. Universities have long claimed a monopoly in defining what counts as knowledge... As conservatism is recharging itself in the academy, it is an arduous (though not unfamiliar) struggle for intellectuals engaged in critical discourse to procure a slice of the epistemic pie. Craving space in emancipatory research in the academy, particularly for "new" methodologies, is exhausting. Questioning established views about what counts as meaning, knowledge and truth provokes defensiveness (Brown & Strega, 2005, p. 21). Therefore the study aimed to explore the dominant academic university discourses from inside the context itself. This provided me with an advantaged position to expose and trouble the discourse in the language it speaks. The important issue of academic language within a university context also needed to be unpacked. The language that we use shapes the way we think. In centres of knowledge production, such as universities, dominant society's language is used to silence the voices of those who are marginally located. Thus the language of research becomes a powerful and pervasive vehicle for the pursuit of traditional, conservative discourses. For this reason, the sensitivity of language in the praxis of psychology was explored in the study. Ironically the process of research was reinforced by the notion that knowledge can also be turned around by language to develop counter discourses. However, I am cognizant of the fact that the language also restricted me in the study. The hegemonic discourses were presented in certain terms – in a specific language if you will. It was therefore within these language limits that I deconstructed the dominant discourses, thereby increasing the ways in which this discourses may be spoken about.

Thus while researching, I located myself with Ladson-Billings (2000), who spoke of research from the margins with regard to positioning, which "is not a privileged

position, it is an advantaged one” (p. 271). This location was an advantage in exploring the power relations existing within the discursive context of a HWU.

9.2.3 Power

Power is exercised, relational and can be oppressive or repressive. Gunew (1990) suggested that

it may well be quite misleading to think of power as consisting of a centre and a periphery and may be more productive to think of power as a network which operates everywhere in contradictory ways and can therefore be strategically resisted everywhere (p. 23).

Power was not shown to be neutral. Power affected the relation of participants and psychologists in that it enacted knowledge. Knowledge disputes were seen as power struggles concerning which/whose version of knowledge would prevail (Brown & Strega, 2005). Power is reproduced in discursive networks at every point where someone who ‘knows’ is instructing someone who doesn’t ‘know’ (Gunew, 1990, p. 23). In the study the power reinforced the construction of conservative, white and male discursive dominance. Engaging in research as a practice of resistance required challenging these power relations and the ways in which they shape our research projects and us as researchers. Furthermore, Burr (1998) argued that social constructionism makes us conscious of the diversity and disparity in humanity: “I believe that it rightly cautions us against assuming that ‘we’ (whoever ‘we’ are) can legitimately speak on behalf of ‘them’ (whoever ‘they’ are)” (p. 17). This implies that when ‘we’ speak on behalf of ‘them’, we may be taking part in imposing constructions on people which may not be in their interest and which they may wish to resist. I became very aware of my role of speaking for the participants and hope that my analysis of their interview texts reflects their views. My not-knowing, insider position within this context, and the insider positions of the participants in this context made the transformatory nature of this research very exciting, as the research became praxis. It is hoped that the reader views this manuscript in a similar light.

9.2.4 Reflections on the research process

The discussion of the context is based on the opinions and perspectives of myself and the participants in the study. References are available detailing this university. However, they were not included in an attempt to protect the anonymity of the institution and the participants as well, as these texts depict the prestige of the institution and do not discuss the practicalities of the discursive context. The interview contexts, participants’ particular orientation to the interview, as well as my

own responses in my role as co-constructor of the interview data may get lost (Morrow, 2005). In reflecting back, some of the interview data may not necessarily have been lost but perhaps focused attention was given more to some constructions than to others. For example, I regret the fact that no male trainers were part of the study. Their voices would have provided insights into how this male space is constructed from a male perspective. “Story presentations are always sculpted by the context in which they are told” (Hardin, 2003, p. 536), here emphasising the need for the inclusion of more detailed accounts of the context in which interviews are constructed. I also wonder as to the resulting story my participants and I co-created.

My position as an academic, a researcher, and therapist may have been a drawback to the story, for example regarding the contextual detail of the interview being conducted at an office in this HWU. What effect did that have on the constructions? Pauw (2009) noted that the physical and contextual details of the interviews facilitate an embodied account of the research process. This space locates the interview text within a larger academic discursive context, which may have played a role in the resulting data. The interview text was thus created within the conservative, white and male space. By being reflexive in the interview process and the detailed analysis I engaged in, I hoped the academic discursive context would be acknowledged and sufficiently presented within the data and findings so as to allow further distilling regarding its effects. The process appeared to be balanced in that there were participants, mostly trainees, who spoke openly about this conservative, white and male space. The absence of the trainer voice in this contextual space discussion perhaps links to the discursive effect of the HWU that I was concerned about. Another example could be the fact that narrative therapy is second-nature to me even in the research context, so what effect did this have on the participants? I can only speculate as to its effects. Perhaps it was facilitative or perhaps it positioned some participants in ways they would not have liked.

Finally, in assuming a reflexive approach it is necessary to be mindful of the extent to which participants’ voices might be diminished by the presence of my own voice as the researcher in the study (Parker & Burman, 1993). At the same time, my comments and reflections form part of the research report and can add value by clarifying the personal context in which the study was constructed, data were created and interpretations were made (Hollway, 1989; Willig, 2013). I have included my own reflections throughout this report and in this section I comment specifically on how I approached issues around commonality and difference as it relates to my own

positioning in this study. I also consider how power operated during the process of analysis and influenced the analytical claims I have formulated.

The shifts that occurred in my positioning as insider and outsider throughout the study illustrate the dynamic and contextually negotiated character of identity and multiculturalism. Insider/outsider status is perhaps more productively conceptualised as a fluid and shifting process than as a static binary (Allen, 2010; Best, 2003). Researchers often simultaneously inhabit both insider and outsider positions in relation to participants. There are both advantages and disadvantages to insider and outsider positions. During the interviews I found that being afforded insider status facilitated rapport and in those instances the interviews flowed with a comfortable ease. The sense of shared understanding allowed me to question participants on aspects based on my insider knowledge of their experiences and personal narratives. In instances where I was positioned as different from participants I was able to use my ignorance or outsider status to further explore participants' constructions. I was able to ask naïve questions and elicit more detailed descriptions based on my own lack of understanding. In this manner my positioning in relation to participants contributed to the type of knowledge created during the interviews.

I was mindful of the potential power differential between participants and myself, where I was formulating interpretations of their constructions and their realities without their direct involvement in the process. Acker, Barry and Esseveld (1983) described their own discomfort with issues of power during analysis when they stated that during the analysis they "found that [they] had to assume the role of the people with the power to define. The act of looking at interviews, summarising another's life, and placing it within a context is an act of objectification" (Acker et al., 1983, p. 429). In an attempt to address the power differential in the process of analysis and minimise instances of objectification of participants' realities, I included many verbatim quotes in the chapter detailing the findings in order to promote the visibility of participants' voices and allow for the reader to judge the credibility of my interpretations.

However, Gilbert (1994) warns that while measures aimed at reducing power differentials can add value to the analysis, the final "power of interpretation" (p. 94) remains with the researcher. It is not possible to entirely erase power differentials between the researcher and the researched. The possibility of imposing meaning on participants' experiences remains. However, I recognised that participants also exercise power throughout the research process (Wilkinson, 1998). I found this particularly relevant at points where participants made decisions regarding the

duration of interviews, what type of content they felt comfortable discussing, and whether they wished to add more personal and sensitive anecdotal information to the interview. It is inaccurate to simplistically portray researchers as powerful and participants as powerless – such a view runs the risk of only describing participants in relation to their identities as marginalised or subjugated, without considering participants' agency (Butler, 1995; Parker, 2002), such a view works against the objectives of the study.

The reflections on the study granted me an opportunity to look into the value and challenges of the study. These are discussed in the next section.

9.3 The value and challenges of the study

Regarding the quality evaluation of the study, Willig (2013) referred to discursive psychology and Foucauldian discourse analysis as “best evaluated by the quality of the accounts they produce” (p. 174). She went on to say that discursive psychology and Foucauldian discourse analysis may be “evaluated by assessing the extent to which they have successfully grounded their observations within the contexts that have generated them” (p. 174). Thus I have included many excerpts in the findings chapters to allow the reader the opportunity to evaluate the quality of the accounts described for themselves.

Willig (2013) noted that these types of studies aim to provide rich and comprehensive descriptions of the phenomenon, “where the researcher aims to ground discourse in social and institutional practices” (p. 174) as well as acknowledge and “demonstrate how, the researcher’s perspective and position shaped the research” (p. 174). In the discussions regarding acknowledgement and demonstration of the researcher’s position in the study, Willig also pointed to the inclusion of practice-based knowledge in the research process. Similarly, I included therapy knowledge in the study with regard to the process of deconstruction and externalisation. Furthermore, Willig speaks of the scientist-practitioner research and refers specifically to the use of narrative therapy (Epston & White, 1994). Willig (2013) stated that “data analysis could potentially be used in order to systematically interrogate and reflect on psychological work that is done within an applied setting” (p. 180), therefore providing support for the approach used in this study. The value of the study is seen in that the descriptions add to the existing body of psychological knowledge of multiculturalism in therapeutic training and specifically in relation to how deconstruction and externalisation can be used. The inclusion of therapy knowledge increased the value of the constructions and discourses yielded in the interview text. Deconstruction

highlighted the need for greater sensitivity of language in the praxis of psychology, while externalisation made it possible for the participants and the researcher to enact a position of resistance to the power of the dominant discourses in the context of multicultural training in South Africa. This positioning allowed me to craft a viable position for change and for development of counter discourses that may be built upon in the future.

In the study, the research methodology worked well to elicit constructions and discourses of multiculturalism in the training context. The use of semi-structured interviews yielded interview text that enabled a rich data analysis to take place. However, the volume of data gained from 27 interviews was unnecessary. Much time was spent on chunking and reducing the 27 interview transcriptions into usable interview text. A positive side of the volume of data was that I was sure of the findings, as many interviews supported the constructions and discourses that were described. However, it was difficult to demonstrate this in writing it up while being concise.

A methodological limitation of the study is its reliance on individual interviews in collecting data. The use of individual interviews complemented the theoretical approach underpinning the study, as poststructuralist and social constructionist theory, as well as discourse analysis, is concerned with how meaning is constructed among people through language. An alternate approach could have been the use of group interviews or focus groups. Group interviews or focus groups do not necessarily provide access to personal and more private participants' constructions (Wilkinson, 1998) because some participants might be concerned about confidentiality in a group context, which could impact on how comfortable they felt during the discussions and could limit the extent of their participation. Some marginal discourses might also be silenced during the focus group discussions. It is then possible that constructions and discourses that are silenced in a group context can be drawn on more freely in the context of an individual interview. However, it is also important to acknowledge the advantages that a group interview might have yielded in this study. Group interviews may have provided an opportunity to demonstrate different aspects of the dominant discourses that my approach may have missed, such as specifically how the dominant discourses affect the group's construction of multiculturalism versus the very individual and subjective personal constructions.

Perhaps the largest limitation of the study was the abundance of white voices. I was very aware of my whiteness in the study, but also of the amount of white participants in the study. Unfortunately due to the cohort of the participants the sample is skewed

to whiteness. I did try to supplement the sample by adding participants from previous training years to increase the number of participants of colour. I hope that the voice of whiteness was tempered by the inclusion of more voices of colour. In my presentation of the findings I not only presented the dominant white voice but also deconstructed it. Thereby removing the mask on invisibility of whiteness (McIntosh, 1988). The findings chapters yield many voices of non-whites. For example the dominant voice of Rani in the findings chapters cannot go unnoticed. Therefore perhaps in a way white voices may have been underrepresented or incorrectly represented through my attempts at not allowing them dominance.

I further hope that my position of whiteness did not appear as my denial of the discursive landscape and its intricate network of illusions. Even in my stating it in this manner here, I wonder whether I am denying my experience of denial. As pointed out by Hook (2013), the discursive network permeates individual, local constructions and the question then arises as to how we remove the innate - the denial? He explained that the situation becomes complicated in that perhaps it becomes a denial of denial. Hook spoke to denial of denial in the form of an apology. Apologies colloquially are viewed as positive and assisting in the process of restoration and change. However, Hook warned that an apology disrupts the process of restoration. For example, irrespective of whether you deny racism or admit your belief in racism, racism still exists. The only agency that seems to remain for me as a proactive researcher and therapists is to develop ethical agency (Hook, 2013). I hope that I demonstrated my ethical agency in this study by presenting all sides of the discursive network. Hook stated also that it becomes ethical to generalise these issues theoretically to develop some form of agency, thus in some instances I have generalized my findings found in this HWU to the larger social discursive landscape of South Africa as specified in my study objectives.

Linking to the above objective, a note concerning how I would like to continue with this study in the future would be the inclusion of other university training contexts to describe the constructions and discourses in these contexts. Although the findings of this study might be generalizable to the larger discursive landscape of tertiary training of psychologists in South Africa, at this punctuation outright generalisation may not be possible. I can only comment on the HWU where the study was conducted and speculate as to this context being similar to the larger South African discursive landscape. This is both a strength of the study as well as an area of future research.

9.4 Recommendations for future research

Based on the limitations discussed in the previous section, the following suggestions for future research are proposed:

- To conduct a similar study within more than one HWU to reflect the generalizability of the findings;
- To include an even broader and more diverse pool of participants so as to address the issues of diversity regarding gender etc. more successfully.
- To include male trainers as it may have had an impact of the findings that can only be speculate due to their lack of participation.
- To include broader academic knowledges such knowledge and experience from interdisciplinary fields such as anthropology, and sociology. These subject fields may be able to provide knowledge of how cultures can be developed and fostered.

For the study probably the most important section would be the discussion on recommendations for training in the South African context. This is discussed in the next section.

9.5 Recommendations for training in the South African context

From the findings of study, recommendations can be made regarding areas of development, such as

- By increasing the diversity of the trainers and trainees in the Masters programmes, as the present demographics were shown to be reinforcing the constructions of a white, male and privileged space.
- By casting a wider net during the process of selection to increase the pool of applicants from which trainees are selected. For example advertising the selection processes of the Master's programmes within larger social media forums such as township newspapers and radio stations.
- By adopting an integrated approach to training, a process praxis was suggested by the participants as a ways to develop therapeutic praxis for a diverse and changing South African context. Included in such a process praxis could be multiculturalism as a golden thread and not an isolated course or module. That is including multiculturalism as the point of departure of the entire Masters programme. The development of such a praxis was proposed from a position of engagement and dialogue between the various stakeholders in psychology and psychology training itself.

- From theory, White (1994) suggested developing counter plots and discourses as well as new stories that speak of the dominant discourses in challenging ways. I experienced these dominant discourses as rigid and so powerful. Ideas that come to mind are developing gender sensitivity workshops, race cognizant programmes and publishing a vast quantity of articles from this and similar studies to bombard the knowledge available 'out there'. The larger South African psychology landscape, and on a local level the HWU discursive network, need to 'buy into' these constructions as being problematic to start a process of change. Falling back on therapy knowledge participants showed to craft some beginnings of a new story line. For example participants spoke of developing counter discourses of appreciation, not only within the larger social landscape but the development of practices of appreciation within the training programmes. They spoke of how spaces might be opened for such appreciative practices to occur. Dialogue and engagement were named as the avenues of creating appreciative spaces.
- Taking of lens broader, training within the South African context, which may not be the case generally, is shown to be blanketed by a protective layer of fog. This fog prevents visibility from the outside. Thus the processes inside remain vague and perpetuate the current status quo and power relationships. The processes in this HWU might have been invisible to the larger South African society and psychology training as well. This study might bring some into the light. The purpose of using deconstruction in the study is to expose the many faces, and masks, of the discourses. Seeing the different faces and masks, making them distinct from each other, this makes them known. I am able to look at my enemy in his many different forms. In providing descriptions of his faces and masks others, trainers, trainees, and psychologists, can recognize them working within their contexts and choose where they want to position themselves at different times in different discourses. For me therefore the recommendations for training in the South African context would be for institutions to become aware of the blanket. To remove the discursive noose around their neck and allow transparency to enter.

Furthermore,

- to bring a sensitivity of language to the praxis of psychology through attention to discursive positioning;

- to become aware of the very rigidity of the dominant discourses, which makes it imperative to develop new ways of undermining their power and thereby improving training;
- to interrogate and challenge the discursive processes behind maintaining white, male and privileged space so that institutional change can occur;
- to take into consideration the broader discursive landscape within training programmes;
- to focus on the production of knowledge that is beneficial for the larger South African population, and on service needs such as therapeutic needs, which work towards the benefit of the larger discursive context and not the perpetuation of the current status quo;
- to trouble all constructs of multiculturalism, especially race and identity, which trainers and trainees need to do despite the discomfort thereof.
- to cast our eye further afield into anthropology and sociology to glean some of the knowledges and experiences that these fields have gained to assist in the development of a South African 'culture' or South African 'nation' or identity.

Therefore, in summary, those who are in positions of training or are being trained as psychologists within the South African context need to become vulnerable and aware of themselves and the hegemonic discourses within the context. This presents as the paradox of discourse – the 'out there' versus 'in here'. Acknowledging our fragility within this discursive context can become the point of agency to stand together, to provide witness and support for the transformation at a larger training level. As stated by Louw (2011), our emancipation from dominant discourses resides in our ability to collectively resist the invitation or sanction to reinforce and protect dominant discourses. Louw went further to say that "My academic practice is therefore at heart a practice of learning with others, in the company of others" (p. 165). Thus our strongest weapon against the hegemonic discourses that constantly seek to derail us is the process of transformation of ourselves and the transformation of the discursive landscape. Reason and Torbert (2001) argued that

a transformational science needs to integrate first-, second- and third-person voices in ways that increase the validity of the knowledge we use in our moment- to-moment living, that increase the effectiveness of our actions in real-time, and that remain open to unexpected transformation when our taken-for-granted assumptions, strategies, and habits are appropriately challenged (p. 1).

Tolman and Brydon-Miller (1997) point out that “transformation is always in some way personal, political, and psychological” (p. 598). In essence, this study is about the personal, the political (Crocket, 2010), the psychological and about transformation (Louw, 2011): my personal transformation as an academic and therapist from naivety to more transparency, and the future transformation of a HWU landscape.

9.6 Conclusion

This study into the constructions of multicultural therapeutic training in the South African context has demonstrated the dominant discourses at work within the discursive landscape of this HWU. The dominant discourses are unpacked, deconstructed and externalized for the reader/s to become familiar with their many faces and masks of deception. The deception warrants interrogation by all involved in psychology and specifically in the training of psychologists in the South African context. The enemy has been shown up, his tactics, escape routes and other strategies have been named. Therefore the development of counter practices, such as practices of appreciation, become possible. This study highlighted various ways in which trainers and trainees work towards change within their therapeutic practice through a focus on the discursive context of practice. Thus the process of praxis becomes our shield against this enemy and the time for counter attack is now.

Reference list

- Acker, J., Barry, K., & Esseveld, J. (1983). Objectivity and truth: Problems in doing feminist research. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 6, 423-435.
- Aiden, H., & McCarthy, A. (2014). *Current attitudes toward disabled people*. Retrieved 24 October 2014 from <http://www.scope.org.uk/Scope/media/Images/Publication%20Directory/Current-attitudes-towards-disabled-people.pdf?ext=.pdf>.
- Ainsworth, S., & Hardy, C. (2004). Critical discourse analysis and identity: why bother? *Critical Discourse Studies*, 1(2), 225-259.
- Akbar, N. (1989). *Chains and images of psychological slavery*. Jersey City, New Jersey, NJ: New Minds Productions.
- Alcoff, L. (1991, April). The Problem of speaking for others. *Cultural Critique*, 5-32. Retrieved 24 October 2014 <http://www.alcoff.com/content/speaothers.html>
- Alexander, N. (2007). Affirmative action and the perpetuation of racial identities in post-apartheid South Africa. *Transformation*, 63(1), 92-126.
- Allen, L. (2010). Queer(y)ing the straight researcher: The relationship(?) between researcher identity and anti-normative knowledge. *Feminism & Psychology*, 20, 147-165. doi:10.1177/0959353509355146
- Althusser, L. (1984). *Essays on ideology*. London, ENG: Verso.
- Arredondo, P., & D'Andrea, M. (1995). The challenge of multiculturalism and organizational development: Outlining the 'call of conscience.' *Counseling Today*, 37(12), 29-31.
- Atkinson, D. R., Brown, M. T., & Casas, J. M. (1996). Achieving ethnic parity in counseling psychology. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 24, 230-258.
- Atkinson, D. R., & Lowe, S. M. (1995). The role of ethnicity, cultural knowledge, and conventional techniques in counseling and psychotherapy. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.). *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 387-414). Thousand Oaks, San Francisco, CA: Sage.
- Atkinson, D. R., Staso, D., & Hosford, R. (1978). Selecting counselor trainees with multicultural strengths: A solution to the Bakke decision crisis. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 56, 546-549.

- Bakhtin, M. (n.d.) Retrieved July 5, 2011 from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mikhail_Bakhtin
- Bakker, T.M. (2009). Reflections on the local and the global in psychology: Innovation, liberation and testimonio. *The Qualitative Report*, 4(2), 201-229.
- Bakker, T.M., Eskell-Blokland, L.M. & Ruane, I. (2007, March). *The textbook as conversational partner*. Paper presented at Teaching in Practice Conference, Bloemfontein, South Africa.
- Ballard, R. (2004). Assimilation, emigration, semigration and integration: 'white' peoples' strategies for finding comfort zones in post-apartheid South Africa. In N. Distiller & M. Steyn (Eds.), *Under construction: 'Race' and identity in South Africa today* (pp. 51-66). Johannesburg, South Africa: Heinemann.
- Baldwin-Ragaven, L., De Gruchy, J., & London, L. (1999). *An ambulance of the wrong colour. Health professionals, human rights and ethics in South Africa*. Rondebosch: UCT Press.
- Barnes, E.J. (1972). Cultural retardation or shortcomings of assessment techniques? In R.L. Jones (Ed.), *Black psychology*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Berger, P.L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. London, ENG: Penguin Books.
- Berger, S., & Lazarus, S. (1987). The views of community organisers on the relevance of psychological practice in South Africa. *Psychology in Society*, 7, 6-23.
- Best, A. L. (2003). Doing race in the context of feminist interviewing: Constructing whiteness through talk. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 9(6), 895-914.
- Beyers, D. (1994, January). *Training in psychotherapy: a process of co-creation*. Paper presented at the Psychology and Societal Transformation Conference, University of the Western Cape, Belville, South Africa.
- Bhavnani, K. (1990). What's power got to do with it? Empowerment and social research. In I. Parker & J. Shotter (Eds.), *Deconstructing social psychology* (pp.141-152). New York, NY: Routledge
- Billig, M. (1988). Methodology and scholarship in understanding ideological explanation. In C. Antaki (Ed.), *Analysing everyday explanation: a casebook of methods*. London, ENG: Sage.

- Bodibe, R.C. (1990). Traditional healing: An indigenous approach to mental health problems. In J. Uys (Ed.), *Psychological counselling in the South African context* (pp. 149-165). Cape Town, South Africa: Maskew Miller Longman.
- Bodibe, R.C. (1993). What is the truth? Being more than just jesting Pilate in South African psychology. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 23, 53-58.
- Bohan, J. S., & Russell, G. M. (1999a). Conceptual frameworks. In J. S. Bohan & G. M. Russell (Eds.), *Conversations about psychology and sexual orientation* (pp. 11-30). New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Bohan, J. S., & Russell, G. M. (1999b). Implications for psychological research and theory building. In J. S. Bohan & G. M. Russell (Eds.), *Conversations about psychology and sexual orientation* (pp. 85-105). New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Bradford, M. (2004). The bisexual experience: Living in a dichotomous culture. *Journal of Bisexuality*, 4(1/2), 8-23.
- Braidotti, R. (1994). *Nomadic subjects: Embodiment and sexual difference in contemporary feminist theory*. New York, NY: Columbia University.
- Brannick, T. & Coghlan, D. (2007). In defense of being “native”: The case for insider academic research. *Organisational Research Methods*, 10(1), 59-74.
- Broverman, I. (1970). Sex-role stereotypes and clinical judgments of mental health. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 34 (1), 1–7.
- Brown, L. (2009). From West Street to Dr Pixley KaSeme Street: *How contemporary racial subjectivities are (re)produced in the city of Durban*. Unpublished doctoral thesis University of KwaZulu-Natal, Pietermaritzburg, South Africa.
- Brown, L., & Strega, S. (2005). *Research and resistance: Critical, indigenous, and anti-oppressive approaches*. Toronto, ON: Canadian Scholars' Press.
- Brown, R. (2006). *Prejudice: Its Social Psychology*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Brunsma, D. L., Brown, E.S., & Placier, P. (2013). Teaching race at historically white colleges and universities: Identifying and dismantling the walls of whiteness. *Critical Sociology*, 39(5), 717-739.
- Bulhan, H.A. (1985, November). *Afrocentric psychology: perspectives and practice*. Opening address read at University of the Western Cape conference on Psychology and Apartheid.

- Burkholder, J.R. (2007). *Multicultural training in the counseling profession: Current status and future directions*. Retrieved 22 August 2007 from www.ohiocounseling.org/docs/jreno.pdf.
- Burr, V. (1995). *An introduction to social constructionism*. London: Routledge.
- Burr, V. (2003). *Social constructionism*. London, ENG: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (1995). Contingent foundations: Feminism and the question of postmodernism. In S. Benhabib, J. Butler, D. Cornell & N. Fraser (Eds.). *Feminist contentions: A political exchange* (pp. 34-56). London, ENG: Routledge.
- Carter, R. T., & Qureshi, A. (1995). A typology of philosophical assumptions in multicultural counseling and training. In J. G. Ponterotto (Ed.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 239-262). Thousand Oaks, San Francisco, CA: Sage.
- Chick, J.K. (2014). Constructing a multicultural national identity: South African classrooms as sites of struggle between competing discourses. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 23(6), 462-478.
- Constantine, M. (2002). Racism attitudes, white racial identity attitudes, and multicultural counseling competence in school counselor trainees. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 41, 162-174.
- Coetzee, C.J.S., & Geggus, C. (1980). *University education in South Africa*. Pretoria, GP: HSRC.
- Cole, M. (1998). *Cultural psychology: A once and future discipline*. New York, NY: First Harvard University Press.
- Coleman, H.L.K. (1996). Portfolio assessment of multicultural counseling competence. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 24, 216-229.
- Cooper, S., & Nicholas, L. (2012). An overview of South African psychology. *International Journal of Psychology*, 47, 89-101.
- Cooper, S., Nicolas, L.J., Seedat, M., & Statman, J.M. (1990). 'Psychology and Apartheid: The struggle for psychology in South Africa.' In L.J. Nicolas & S. Cooper (eds), *Psychology and apartheid*. Johannesburg: Vision Publications.
- CACREP (1994). Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Programs. *CACREP Connection*, Summer 1994.

- Campbell, H. (2007). The dismantling of apartheid war machine. *Third World Quarterly*, 9(2), p. 468-492.
- Coupland, N., & Jaworski, A. (1999). *The discourse reader*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Crocket, A. (2010). *Pakeha counsellors consider their positioning: Towards postcolonial praxis*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. Australia: University of Waikato, Waikato.
- Crocket, K., Drewery, W., McKenzie, W., Smith, L., & Winslade, J. (2004). Working for ethical research practice. *International Journal of Narrative Therapy and Community Work*, 3, 61-66.
- Cuddy, A.G.C., Norton, M.I., & Fiske, S.T. (2005). This old stereotype: The pervasiveness and persistence of the elderly stereotype. *Journal of Social Issues*, 61(2), 265-283.
- Daly, M. (1978). *Gyn/ecology*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- D'Andrea, M., & Daniels, J. (1991). Exploring the different levels of multicultural counseling training in counselor education. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 70, 78-85.
- D'Andrea, M., & Daniels, J. (1997). Multicultural counseling supervision: Central issues, theoretical considerations, and practical strategies. In D. B. Pope-Davis & H. L. K. Coleman (Eds.), *Multicultural counseling competencies: Assessment education and training, and supervision*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Darke, P., Shanks, G., & Broadbent, M. (1998). Successfully completed case study research: combining rigour, relevance and pragmatism. *Info System*, 8, 273-289.
- Davies, B. (1991). The concept of agency. *Postmodern Critical Theorising*, 30, 42-43.
- Davies, B., & Harré, R. (1990). Positioning: the discursive production of selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 20, 43-63.
- Davis-Russell, E., Forbes, W.T., Bascuas, J. & Duran, E. (1992). Ethnic diversity and the core curriculum. In R. L. Peterson, J. D. McHolland, R. J. Bent, E. Davis-Russel, G. E. Edwall, R. Polite, D. L. Singer, & G. Strickler (Eds.), *The core*

- curriculum in professional psychology* (pp. 147-154). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Dawes, A. (1985). Politics and mental health: The position of clinical psychology in South Africa. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 15, 55-61.
- Dawes, A. (1986). The notion of relevant psychology with particular reference to Africanist pragmatic initiatives. *Psychology in Society*, 5, 28-48.
- Dawes, A. (1998). Africanisation of psychology: Identities and continents. *PINS (Psychology in society)*, 23, 4-16.
- Dé Ishtar, Z. (2005). Striving for a common language: A white feminist parallel to indigenous ways of knowing and researching. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 28(5), 257-368. doi:10.1016/j.wsif.2005.05.006
- Deleuze, G. & Parnet, C. (2002). *Dialogues II*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- De la Rey, C. (2001). Racism and the history of university education in South Africa. In N. Duncan, A. van Niekerk, C. de la Rey & M. Seedat (eds), *Race, racism, knowledge production and psychology in South Africa*. 7-15. New York: Nova Science Publishers.
- De la Rey, C., & Ipser, J. (2004). The call for relevance: South African psychology ten years into democracy. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 34, 544-552.
- Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S. (Eds.). (2005). *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, San Francisco, CA: Sage.
- Derner, G.F. (1959). The university and clinical psychology. In M.H.P. Finn & F. Brown (Eds), *Training for clinical psychology*. New York, NY: International University Press.
- Derrida, J. (1976). *Of Grammatology*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Derrida, J. (1978). *Writing and difference*. London, ENG: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- De Saussure, F. (1972). *Course in general linguistics*. London, ENG: Duckworth.
- De Saussure, F. (1983). *Course in general linguistics*. London, ENG: Duckworth.
- Dodds, M., & Hart, S. (2000). *Doing practitioner research differently*. London, ENG: Routledge.
- Drewery, W. (2005). Why we should watch what we say: Position calls, everyday speech and the production. *Theory Psychology*, 15(3), 305-324.

- Drewery, W., & Winslade, J. (1997). The theoretical story of narrative therapy. In G. Monk, J. Winslade, K. Crocket & D. Epston (Eds.), *Narrative therapy: The archaeology of hope* (pp. 32-52). San Fransico, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Dreyfus, H.L. & Rabinow, P. (1982). *Michel Foucault: beyond structuralism and hermeneutics* (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Duncan, N. (2001). 'Dislodging the sub-texts: An analysis of a corpus of articles on racism produced by South African psychologists.' In N. Duncan, A. van Niekerk, C. de la Rey & M. Seedat (eds), *'Race', racism, knowledge production and psychology in South Africa*. (pp.125-152). New York, NY: Nova Science Publishers.
- Duncan, N. & Lazarus, S. (2001). Introduction. In M. Seedat, N. Duncan & S. Lazarus (Eds.). *Community psychology: Theory, method and practice – South African and other perspectives*. (pp. 360-388). Oxford, ENG: Oxford University Press.
- Du Preez, E. (2004). *The social construction of counsellor identity in a South African context*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. University of Pretoria, South Africa.
- Du Preez, E & Roos, V. (2005). The construction of counsellor identity in a South African context. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 38(4), 699-709.
- Durrheim, K., & Moleki, S. (1997). 'Race and relevance: A content analysis of the South African Journal of Psychology. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 27(4), 206-213.
- Eagle, G. (2005). "Cultured clinicians": The rhetoric of culture in clinical psychology training. *Psychology and Society*, 32, 41-64.
- Ebersohn, D. (1983). *Die sielkundige van die Republiek van Suid Afrika* (The South African Psychologist). Pretoria, GP: HSRC.
- Edwards, D., Ashmore, M., & Potter, J. (1995) Death and furniture: The rhetoric, politics and theology of bottom line arguments against relativism. *History of the Human Sciences*, 8(2), 25-49.
- Edwards, D., & Potter, J. (1992). *Discursive psychology*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Elliot, J. (2005). *Using narrative in social research. Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. London, ENG: Sage.
- Elliott, T. R., & Klapow, J.C. (1997). Training psychologists for a future in evolving health care delivery systems: Building a better Boulder model. *Journal of Clinical Psychology in Medical Settings*, 2(4), 255-267.

- Eppley, K. (2006). Review essay: Defying insider-outsider categorization: One researcher's fluid and complicated positioning on the insider-outsider continuum. *Forum: Qualitative research*. Retrieved 23 September 2012 from [http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view Article /150](http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/Article/150)
- Eppley, K. (2008). *Friction, Fiction, and Failure: Scientifically based research and the Rural*. Ann Arbor, USA: ProQuest Information and Learning Company.
- Epston, D. (1998). *Catching up with David Epston: A collection of narrative practice-based papers*. Adelaide, South Australia, SA: Dulwich Centre.
- Epston, D., & White, M (1994). Experience, Contradiction, Narrative & Imagination: Selected paper of David Epston & Michael White 1989-1991. Adelaide, South Australia, SA: Dulwich Centre Publications.
- Erasmus, Z. (2010). Confronting the categories: Equitable admissions without apartheid race classification. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 24(2), 244-257.
- Erwin, K. (2010). *The theory and practice in the field of race and race thinking: Critical reflections from, and for, South Africa and beyond*. Unpublished paper. Durban, South Africa: The Center for Critical Research on Race and Identity, University of Kwa-Zulu Natal.
- Eskell-Blokland, L.M. (2002). *An ecological approach to diversity in a South African township*. Paper presented at the 10th Biennial Conference of the International Society for Theoretical Psychology, Istanbul, Turkey.
- Eskell-Blokland, L.M. (2005). *Voice from the silent: An ecology of local knowledge in psychology*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa.
- Eze, N. (1991). Progress and status of psychology in Africa. *Journal of Psychology in Africa*, 4, 27-37.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Language and power*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Faubert, M., & Locke, D. C. (1996). Applying a cognitive-behavioral approach to the training of culturally competent mental health counselors. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*, 18, 200-215.
- Featherstone, B., and Fawcet, B. (2000). Seeing the scene: An appraisal of

- postmodernism, postmodernity and postmodern feminism. In B. Fawcett, B. Featherstone, J. Fook, and A. Rossiter (Eds.), *Practice and research in social work: Postmodern feminist perspectives*, pp. 5–23. London: Routledge.
- Fenster, A. (1996). Group therapy as effective treatment modality for people of color. *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy*, 46, 399-415.
- Findley, L. & Ogbu, L. (2011). South Africa: From Township to Town *After apartheid, spacial segregation remains*. Retrieved 12 March 2013 from <https://placesjournal.org/article/south-africa-from-township-to-town/>
- Fiske, J. (1990). *Introduction to communicative studies*. (2nd ed.) New York, NY: Routledge.
- Flaskas, C., & Humphreys, C. (1993). Theorizing about power: Intersecting the ideas of Foucault with the “problem” of power in family therapy. *Family Process*, 32, 35-47.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *An archaeology of knowledge*. London, ENG: Tavistock.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. New York: Pantheon.
- Foucault, M. (1980). Body/power. In C. Gordon (Ed.), *Michel Foucault: Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977* (pp. 55-62). Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Foucault, M. (1988). Technologies of the self. In L. H. Martin, H. Gutman & P.H. Hutton (Eds.), *Technologies of the self: A seminar with Michel Foucault* (pp. 16-49). London, ENG: Tavistock Publications.
- Frankenberg, R. (1993). *White women, race matters: The social construction of whiteness*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Freedman, J., & Combs, G. (1996). *Narrative therapy: the social construction of preferred realities*. New York: Norton.
- Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Frye, M. (1983). On being white: Thinking toward a feminist understanding of race and race supremacy. In T. Burg (Ed.), *Politics of reality: Essays in feminist theory* (pp. 150-151). New York, NY: Crossing Press.
- Garland-Thomson, R. (2002). Integrating disability, transforming feminist theory. *NWSA Journal*, 14(3), 1-32. doi: 10.1353/nwsa.2003.0005.

- Gaudio, R.P., & Bialostok, S. (2005). The trouble with culture: Everyday racism in white middle-class discourse. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 2(1), 51-69.
- Gentz, S. G., & Durrheim, K. (2009). Psychological expertise and governmentality in democratic South Africa: A tracer study of masters graduate students from UKZN. *Psychology in Society*, 37, 18-38.
- Gergen, K. J. (2008). Therapeutic challenges of multi-being. *Journal of Family therapy*, 30(4), 335-350.
- Gergen, K.J. (1985). The social constructionist movement in modern psychology. *American Psychologist*, 40, 266-275.
- Gergen, K.J. (2001). Psychological science in a postmodern context. *American Psychologist*, 6(10), 803-813.
- Gilbert, A. (1989). Things fall apart? Psychological theory in the face of rapid social change. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 19, 91-100.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Giliomee, H., & Schlemmer, L. (1985). *Up against the fences: Poverty, passes, and privilege in South Africa*. New York, NY: St Martin's Press.
- Giroux, H. (1991). Border crossing: Cultural workers and the politics of education. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Glover, D., & Kaplan, C. (2000). *Genders (the new critical idiom)*. Canada, ON: Routledge.
- Gough, A. (2005). Body/mine: A chaos narrative of cyborg subjectivities and liminal experiences. *Women's Studies*, 34, 249-264.
- Graham, L. (2005, November). *Discourse analysis and the critical use of Foucault*. Paper presented at the Annual conference of the Australian Association for Research in Education 2005, Sydney, Australia.
- Gulich, E. & Quasthoff, U.M. (1985). Narrative analysis. In T.A. van Dijk (Ed.) *Handbook of discourse analysis (Vol. 2), Dimensions of discourse* (pp. 169-198). London, ENG: Academic Zebra Press.
- Gunew, S. (1990). *Feminist knowledge: Critical and construct*. London: Routledge
- Gunew, S. (1994). *Postcolonialism and multiculturalism: Between race and ethnicity*. London, ENG: Routledge.

- Guthrie, R. (1970). *Even the rat was white*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Hall, S. (1993). Culture, community, nation. *Cultural Studies*, 7(3), 349-363.
- Hall, S. (1996). Race. The floating signifier. Lecture presented Northampton. (captured on film). Directed by J. Sut. Northampton, MA: Media Education Foundation. Retrieved 13 August 2012 from <http://www.mediaed.org/cgi-bin/commerce.cgi?preadd=action&key=407>
- Hall, S. (1997). The work of representation. In S. Hall (Ed.), *Representation: Cultural representation and signifying practices* (pp 15-64). London: Sage.
- Hardin, P. K. (2003). Constructing experience in individual interviews, autobiographies and on-line accounts: A poststructuralist approach. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 41(6), 536-544. doi:10.1046/j.1365-2648.2003.02565.x
- Haring-Hidore, M., & Vacc, N.A. (1988). The scientist-practitioner model of training entry level counsellors. *Journal of Counselling and Development*, 63, 545-547.
- Hatfield, J. T., & Jacobs, R. C. (1989, October). *Students of color as subject and text in the multicultural university*. Paper presented at Multicultural University Conference, Oakland, CA.
- Hayes, G. (1997). The politics of industrial psychology. *Psychology in Society (PINS)*, 7, pp. 67-77
- Heckman, S. (1997). Truth and method: Feminist standpoint theory revisited. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 22(2), 341-365.
- Henriques, J., Hollway, W., Urwin, C., Venn, V., & Walkerdine, V. (1984). Introduction: The point of departure. In J. Henriques, W. Hollway, C. Urwin, V. Venn & V. Walkerdine (Eds.), *Changing the subject: Psychology, social regulation and subjectivity* (pp. 1-10). London, ENG: Methuen.
- Henry, F., & Tator, C. (2006). *The colour of democracy: Racism in Canadian society*. (3rd ed.). Toronto, ON: Nelson.
- Hepburn, A. (1999). Derrida and psychology: Deconstruction and its ab/uses in critical and discursive psychologies. *Theory & Psychology*, 9(5), 639-665.
- Hepburn, A. (2000). Power lines: Derrida, discursive psychology and the management of accusations of teacher bullying. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 39, 605-628.

- Hill Collins, P. (2000). *Black feminist thought* (2nd ed). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Holdstock, T.L. (1981). Psychology in South Africa belongs to the colonial era. Arrogance or ignorance? *South African Journal of Psychology*, 11, 123-129.
- Holdstock, L.T. (2000). *Re-examining psychology: Critical perspectives and African insights*. London, ENG: Routledge.
- Hollway, W. (1989). *Subjectivity and method in psychology: Gender, meaning and science*. London, ENG: Sage.
- Hollway, W., & Jefferson, T. (2000). *Doing qualitative research differently: free association, narrative and the interview method*. London, ENG: Routledge.
- Hook, D. (Ed). (2005). *Critical Psychology*. Cape Town, South Africa: UCT Press.
- Hook, D. (2013). *What is the location of racism? Racist belief and socio-symbolic structure*. Seminar presentation: University of Pretoria, South Africa, 10 April, 2013.
- Hooks, B. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge.
- Hooyman, N.R. & Kiyak, H.A. (1993). *Social Gerontology*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Hopa, M., Simbayi, L. C., & Du Toit, C. D. (1998). Perceptions on integration of traditional and western healing in the new South Africa. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 28(1), 8-14.
- Howitt, D. & Owusu Bempah, J. (1994). *The racism: Time for change*. New York, NY: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Hruby, G.G. (2001). Sociological, postmodern, and new realism perspectives in social constructionism: Implications for literacy research. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 36(1), 48. Retrieved April 10, 2005, from the InfoTrac OneFile database.
- Ignatiev, N. (1996). *The point is not to interpret whiteness but to abolish it. Race traitor Anthology*. Retrieved 30 November 2013 from <http://racetraitor.org/abolishthepoint.pdf>
- Jackson, S., & Scott, S. (2002). Introduction: The gendering of sociology. In S. Jackson & S. Scott (Eds.), *Gender: A sociological reader* (pp. 1-26). London, ENG: Routledge.

- Johnson, S., & Meinhof, U. (Eds.). (1997). *Language and masculinity*. Oxford, ENG: Blackwell.
- Jones, H (1997). *Towards a classless society?*. London, ENG: Taylor & Francis
- Katz, J. (1985). The sociopolitical nature of counseling. *Counselling Psychologist*, 13, 615-624.
- Kezar, A.J., & Eckel, P.D. (2002). The effect of institutional culture on change strategies in higher education: universal principles or culturally responsive concepts? *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(4), 435-460.
- Kim, B. S., & Lyons, H. Z. (2003). Experiential activities and multicultural counseling competence training. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 81, 400-408.
- Kiselica, M. S. (1998). Preparing Anglos for the challenges and joys of multiculturalism. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 26, 5-21.
- Kite, M. E., Stockdale, G. D., Whitley, B. E., & Johnson, B. T. (2005). Attitudes towards younger and older adults: An updated meta-analytic review. *Journal of Social Issues*, 61, 241–266.
- Kivel, P. (1996). *Uprooting racism: How white people can work for racial justice*. Gabriola Island, Canada, BC: New Society Press.
- Knight, Z. (2004, September). *The training of psychologists, and by implication, the majority of practitioners of psychotherapy in South Africa*. Paper presented at 2nd International Congress of the Asian Federation for Psychotherapy, Tehran, Iran.
- Kotze, E. (1994). *Family of origin work from a narrative perspective*. Unpublished doctoral seminar paper, Rand Afrikaans University, Johannesburg, South Africa.
- Kress, G. (1985). Ideological structures in discourse. In T.A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Handbook of discourse analysis, volume 4: Discourse analysis in society* (pp. 27-42). London, ENG: Academic Press.
- Kristeva, J. (1982). *Powers of horror: An essay on objection*. New York: Columbia.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (1999). Critical classroom discourse analysis. Special-topic issue: Critical approaches to TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33, 453-484.
- Kuper, L. (1974). *Race, class and power: Ideology and revolutionary change in plural societies*. London, ENG: Duckworth.

- Kvale, S. (1996). *InterViews: an introduction to qualitative research*. London, ENG: Sage.
- Laclau, E. (1990). *New reflections on the revolution of time*. London, ENG: Verso.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2000). Racialized discourses and ethnic epistemologies. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 257-277). Thousand Oaks, San Francisco, CA: Sage.
- Lago, C. (2006). *Race, culture and counseling*. Berkshire, ENG: Open University Press.
- Lapadat, J., & Lindsay, A. C. (1999). Transcription in research and practice: From standardization of technique to interpretive positionings. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 5(1), 64–86.
- Lark, J. S., & Paul, B. D. (1998). Beyond multicultural training: Mentoring stories from two White doctoral students. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 26, 33-42.
- Larkin, M. (2004). *What is social constructionism?* Retrieved May 3, 2010. http://www.psy.dmu.ac.uk/michael/soc_con_disc.htm
- Lather, P. (1991). *Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy with/in the postmodern*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lather, P. (1992). Critical frames in educational research: Feminist and post-structuralist perspectives. *Theory into Practice*, 31(2), 87-99.
- Lee, R. M., Chalk, L., Conner, S. E., Kawasaki, N., Jannetti, A., Tracy, L., & Rodolfa, E. (1999). The status of multicultural counseling training at counseling center training internship sites. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 27, 58-74.
- Levett, A. (1989). *Psychological trauma: discourses of childhood sexual abuse*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa.
- Levett, A., Kottler, A., Burman, E., & Parker, I. (Eds.). (1997) *Culture, power and difference: discourse analysis in South Africa*. London, ENG: Zed Books.
- Levine, M., & Perkins, D.V. (1987). *Principles of community psychology: Perspectives and applications*. 2nd Edition. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Lieblich, A., Tuval-Mashiach, R., & Zilber, T. (1998). *Narrative research*. London, ENG: Sage.

- Lifschitz, S. & van Niekerk, S. (1990). Three views of a psychotherapy service in Mamelodi. In J. Mason, J. Rubenstein & S. Shuda (Eds.), *From diversity to healing. Papers from the Fifth Biennial International Conference of the SA Institute of Marital and Family Therapy* (pp.130-146). Durban, South Africa: Artworks Desktop Publishing.
- Lock, A., & Strong, T. (2010). *Social constructionism: Sources and stirrings in theory and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Locke, D. C. (1990). A not so provincial view of multicultural counseling. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 30*, 18-25.
- Locke, D.C., & Kiselica, M.S. (1999). Pedagogy of possibilities: Teaching about racism in multicultural counseling courses. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 77*, 80-86.
- Lock, A. & Strong, T. (2010). *Social constructionism: Sources and Stirring in Theory and Practice*. London, ENG: Cambirdge University Press.
- Louw, W.P. (2011) *Turning resources into assets: improving the service delivery and relevance of a psychology training clinic through action research*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. University of Pretoria, South Africa
- Lynch, I. (2011). Exploring gender and sexuality in South African bisexual women's accounts: A feminist poststructuralist analysis. Unpublished doctoral thesis. University of Pretoria, South Africa
- Mackelprang, R.W., & Salsgiver, R.O. (1996). People with disabilities and social work: Historical and contemporary issues. *Social Work, 41*(1), 7-14. doi: 10.1093/sw/41.1.7.
- Macleod, C. (2002). Deconstructing discourse analysis: extending the methodological conversation. *South African Journal of Psychology, 32*(10), 17-25.
- Macleod, C. (2004). South African psychology and 'relevance': Continued challenges. *South African Journal of Psychology, 34*(4), 613-629.
- Macleod, C., and Howell, S. (2013). Reflecting on South African Psychology: Published research, 'relevance', and social issues. *South African Journal of Psychology, 43*(2), 222-237.
- Madeira, A., & Veloso, M. (2012, November). Seminar: *Brazilian readings: Writing the nation and identity*. Seminar presented at the University of Pretoria.

- Madigan, S. (2010). *Narrative therapy (theories of psychotherapy)*. Washington D.C: American Psychological Association.
- Maher, F.A., & Tetreault, M.K. (1994). *The feminist classroom*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Makau, K. (2003). *Counselling across cultures: experiences of intern clinical psychologists*. Unpublished Master's dissertation. University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa.
- Marchetti-Mercer, M., Beyers, D., & Daws, L. (1999). Training family therapists in a multicultural setting. *Contemporary Family Therapy*, 21(2), 187-201.
- Magwaza, A. (2001). Submissions to the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission: The reflections of a commissioner on the culpability of psychology. In N. Duncan, A. van Niekerk, C. de la Rey, & M. Seedat (eds), *'Race', racism, knowledge production and psychology in South Africa*, (pp. 37-44). New York, NY: Nova Science Publishers.
- Marsella, A.J. (1998). Toward a "global community psychology": Meeting the needs of a changing world. *American Psychologist*, 53(12), 1282-1291.
- May, T. (2005). *Gilles Deleuze*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- McCallum, C. (2009). *Beyond equality and difference: Empowerment of black professional women in post-apartheid South Africa*. Unpublished doctoral theses: University of South Africa.
- McConnell, S.C. (1984). Doctor of Psychology degree: From hibernation to reality. *Professional Psychology: Research & Practice*, 15(3), pp. 362-370
- McGoldrick, M., Pearce, J.K., & Giordano, J. (1982). *Ethnicity and family therapy*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- McIntosh, P. (1988). *White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack*. Retrieved 12 May 2011 from [http://www.nymbp.org/reference/ WhitePrivilege.pdf](http://www.nymbp.org/reference/WhitePrivilege.pdf)
- 'Mikhail Bakhtin.' (n.d.) Wikipedia. Retrieved July 5, 2011 from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mikhail_Bakhtin
- Miller, G., & Fox, K.J. (1999, spring). Learning from sociological practice: the case of applied constructionism. *The American Sociologist*, 54-73.
- Mills, C.W. (1997). *The racial contract*. Ithaca, New York, NY: Cornell University Press.

- Mills, C.W. (2008). White ignorance. In R.N. Proctor and L. Schiebinger (eds). *Agnology the making and unmaking of ignorance*. Stanford University Press, CA, pp. 230-249
- Mitchell, R., & Rosiek, J. (2006). Professor as embodied racial signifier: A case study of the significance of race in a university classroom. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 28(3-4), 379-395.
- Morrow, S.L. (2005). Quality and trustworthiness in qualitative research in counseling psychology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 52(2), 250-260.
- Mungazi, D.A. (1996). *The mind of Black Africa*. New York, NY: Praeger.
- Murai, Y. (2011). *'Alive with Possibility': Brand South Africa and the Discursive Construction of South African National Identity*. Dissertation submitted to Department of Media and Communication: London School of Economics and Political Sciences. Submitted August 2010.
- Murphy, T. F. (1984). Freud reconsidered: Bisexuality, homosexuality, and moral judgment. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 9(2/3), 65-77.
- Mwamwenda, T.S. (1999). Culture and self: An African perspective. *Mboya*, 99, 1-18.
- Naidoo, A.V. (1996). Challenging the hegemony of Eurocentric psychology. *Journal of Community and Health Sciences*, 2(2), 9-16.
- Ncgoba, N. (2008). I'm a coconut and proud of it – say it with me. *Thought Leader*. Retrieved 10 November 2014 from <http://www.thoughtleader.co.za/silwane/2008/03/19/im-a-coconut-and-im-proud-of-it-say-it-with-me/comment-page-3>
- Nelson, T.D. (2005). Ageism: Prejudice against our feared future self. *Journal of Social Issues*, 61(2), 207-221.
- Nicolas, L., J. (1990). The response of South African professional psychology association to apartheid. In L.J. Nicolas & S. Cooper (eds), *Psychology and apartheid*. Johannesburg: Vision Publication.
- Nicolas, L., J. (2001). The history of racism in professional South African psychology. In N. Duncan, A. van Niekerk, C. de la Rey, & M. Seedat (eds), *Race, racism, knowledge production and psychology in South Africa*. (pp. 37- 42). New York: Nova Science Publishers.
- Nsamenang, A.B. (1995). Factors influencing the development of psychology in sub-Saharan Africa. *International Journal of Psychology*, 30(6), 729-739.

- Oakes, D. (ed) (1988). *Illustrated history of South Africa. The real story*. Cape Town: Reader's Digest Association.
- Oakley, A. (1972). *Sex, gender and society*. London, ENG: Temple Smith.
- Oliver, D.G., Serovich, J.M., & Mason, T.L. (2005). Constraints and opportunities with interview transcription: Towards reflection in qualitative research. *Social Forces*, 84(2), 1271-1289.
- Ostertag, P.A., & McNamara, J.R., (2006). Feminization of Psychology: The changing of sex ratio and its implications for the profession. *Psychology for Women Quarterly*, 15(3), 349-369.
- Palmary, I. (2010). Critical psychology for South African transformation? *Psychology in Society*, 40, 112-115.
- Parker, A.D. (1986). *An evaluation of the present status of clinical psychology training in South Africa*. Unpublished Masters dissertation, University of Cape Town, South Africa.
- Parker, I (1990). Discourse: definitions and contradictions. *Philosophical Psychology*, 3, 227-233.
- Parker, I. (1992). *Discourse dynamics: Critical analysis for social and individual psychology*. London, ENG: Routledge.
- Parker, I. (2002). *Critical discursive psychology*. New York, NY: Palgrave.
- Parry, A., & Doan, R. E. (1994). *Story re-visions. Narrative therapy in the postmodern world*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Pauw, A. (2009). A qualitative exploration of gendered discourses of South African women in middle management. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Pretoria, South Africa.
- Payne, M. (2000). *Narrative therapy: an introduction for counsellors*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pederson, P. (1994). *A handbook for developing multicultural awareness*. (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: American Counselling Association.
- Peltzer, K.P. (1998). *Psychology and health in Africa*. Inaugural lecture, University of the North, South Africa, 21 October.

- Pfeiffer, D., Sam, A.A., Guinan, M., Ratliffe, K.T., & Robinson, N.B. (2003). Attitudes toward disability in the helping profession. *Disabilities Studies Quarterly*, 23(2), 132-149.
- Pillay, A. L., & Kramers, A. L. (2003). South African clinical psychology, employment (in) equity and the 'brain drain'. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 33, 52-60.
- Pillay, Y. G., & Petersen, I. (1996). Current practice patterns of clinical and counselling psychologists and their attitudes to transforming mental health policies in South Africa. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 26, 76-80.
- Pillay, A., Ahmed, R., & Bawa, U. (2013). Clinical psychology training in South Africa: A call to action. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 43(1), 46-58.
- Ponterotto, J.G. (1998). Charting a course for research in multicultural counseling training. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 26, 43-61.
- Ponterotto, J.G., Alexander, C.M., & Grieger, I. (1995). A multicultural competency checklist for counseling training programs. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development*, 23, 11-20.
- Ponterotto, J.G. & Benesch, K.F. (1988). An organizational framework for understanding the role of culture in counseling. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 66, 237-241.
- Ponterotto, J.G., & Casas, J.M. (1987). In search of multicultural competence within counselor education programs. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 65, 430-434.
- Ponterotto, J. G., Rieger, B. P., Barrett A., & Sparks, R. (1994). Assessing multicultural counseling competence: A review of instrumentation. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 72, 316-322.
- Pope-Davis, D.B., & Coleman, H.L.K (Eds.). (2007). *Multicultural counseling competencies: Assessment education and training, and supervision*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Potter, J. (1996). *Representing reality: Discourse, rhetoric and social construction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Potter, J. (2010). Contemporary discursive psychology: Issues, prospects, and Corcoran's awkward ontology. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 49(4), 657-678.

- Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Discourse and social psychology*. London: Sage.
- Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1995). Discourse analysis. In J.A. Smith, R. Harre, & L. Van Langehoven (Eds.), *Rethinking methods in psychology* (pp.80-92). London, ENG: Sage.
- Professional Board for Psychology. (1999). *Policy on roles, registration/licensing, training and education within the professional field of psychology*. Attachment B; Section 1. Pretoria, GP, South Africa: Author.
- Professional Board for Psychology. (2001). *Policy on roles, registration/licensing, training and education within the professional field of psychology*. Version 2. Pretoria, GP, South Africa: Author.
- Professional Board for Psychology. (2002). *Minutes of a meeting between the executive committee of the Professional Board for Psychology and representatives of universities*. Pretoria, GP, South Africa: Author.
- Professional Board of Psychology. (2007). *Core competencies of psychologists*. Letter to universities.
- Pryor, J. (2008). *Constitutions: Writing nations, reading difference*. Abingdon, VA: Birkbeck Law Press.
- Psychology. n.d. In *Oxford English Dictionary Online* (2nd ed.). Retrieved on November 15, 2012 from <http://www.oed.com/psychology>
- Ralekheto, M. (1991). The black university on South Africa: Ideological captive or transformative agent? In J. Jansen (ed), *Racism and colonialism*. The Hague: Leiden University Press.
- Ramazanoglu, C. (1993) *Up against Foucault: explorations of some tensions between Foucault and feminism*. London, ENG: Routledge.
- Rautenbach, C. (2012). *Irrelevant, irreverent or idealistic: (White) debate around the (theoretical) possibility of a 'post-race' academy*. Social Psychology Lab. March 2012.
- Razack, S. (1998). *Looking white people in the eye: Gender, race, and culture in courtrooms and classrooms*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Reason, P., & Torbert, W.R. (2001). Toward a transformational science: A further look at the scientific merits of action research. *Concepts and Transformations*, 6(1), 1- 37.

- Reynolds, A. L. (1999). Challenging our profession, challenging ourselves: Further reflections on multicultural counseling and training. In M. S. Kiselica (Ed.), *Confronting prejudice and racism during multicultural training*. Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Richter, L.M., Griesel, R.D., Durrheim, K., Wilson, M., Surrendorff, N., & Asafo-Agyei, L. (1998). Employment opportunities for psychology graduates in South Africa: A contemporary analysis. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 28, 1-7.
- Robus, D., & Macleod, C. (2006) 'White excellence and black failure': the reproduction of racialised higher education in everyday talk. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 36(3), 463-480.
- Rodríguez, L., Rodríguez, J., & Mojica, A.M. (2012). Invisible boundaries in the construction of ethnic identity: A systemic development perspective. *Culture & Psychology*, 18(2), 261-271. doi:10.1177/1354067x11434842
- Rooney, S.C., Flores, L.Y., & Mercier, C.A. (1998). Making multicultural education effective for everyone: Response to Kiselica. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 26, 22-31.
- Ruane, I. (2006). Challenging the frontiers of community psychology: A South African experience. *Journal of Psychology in Africa*, 2, 283-292.
- Ruane, I. (2010). Obstacles to the utilisation of psychological resources in a South African township community. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 40(2), 214-225.
- Rubin, G. (1984). Thinking sex: Notes for a radical theory of the politics of sexuality. In C. Vance (Ed.), *Pleasure and danger: Exploring female sexuality* (pp. 267-319). Boston, MA: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Russ, J. (1983). *How to suppress women's writing*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Said, E. (1991). Orientalism reconsidered. In E. L. Sullivan & J. S. Ismael (Eds.), *The contemporary study of the Arab world* (pp. 35-50). Edmonton, AB, Canada: University of Alberta Press.
- Said, E. (1993). Culture and imperialism. London, ENG: Chatto & Windus.
- Sampson, E.E. (1993). Identity politics. *American Psychologist*, 48, pp. 1219-1230

- Sampson, E.E. (1998). Establishing embodiment in psychology. In H.J. Stam (Ed.), *The body and psychology* (pp. 30-53). London, ENG: Sage.
- Sarup, M. (1993). *An introductory guide to post-structuralism and postmodernism* (2nd ed.). Hemel Hempstead, England: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Savage, M. (1981). Constraints in research sociology and psychology in South Africa. In J. Rex (ed), *Apartheid and social research*. Lausanne, CH: UNESCO
- Schensul, D., & Heller, P. (2010). Legacies, Change and Transformation in the Post-Apartheid City: Towards an Urban Sociological Cartography. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 35(1) , pp. 110-129.
- Seedat, M. (1997). The quest for liberatory psychology. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 27(4), 261-270.
- Seedat, M. (1990). Programmes, trends and silences in South Africa psychology 1948-1988. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Western Cape, Belville, South Africa.
- Seedat, M. (2001). Invisibility of South African psychology (148-1988): The impact of exclusionary ideology. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 27(4), pp. 261-270.
- Seedat, M., Mackenzie, S., & Stevens, G. (2004). Trends and redress in community psychology during 10 years of democracy (1994-2003): A journal-based perspective. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 34(4), 595-612.
- Simon, R. (1982). Gramsci's political thought. London, ENG: Laurence & Wishart.
- South Africa, 1959. Extension of University Act, No 45 of 1959. Government Gazette: pp. 554 Retrieved 23 April 2011. http://www.polity.org.za/searchadvanced_lb.ph
- Spaull, N. (2013). Poverty and privilege: Primary school inequality in South Africa. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 33(2), 436-447.
- Spender, D. (1980). *Man made language*. London, ENG: Routledge.
- Spivak, G.C. (1976). Translator's preface. In J. Derrida (Ed). *Of Grammatology*. Baltimore, KY: John Hopkins University Press.
- Stead, G., & Bakker, T.M. (2010). Discourse analysis in career counselling and development. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 59(1), 72-86.

- Stein, E. (1992). Conclusion: The essentials of constructionism and the construction of essentialism. In E. Stein (Ed.), *Forms of desire: Sexual orientation and the social constructionist controversy* (pp. 325-353). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Stevens, G. (2003). Academic representations of 'race' and racism in psychology: Knowledge production, historical context and dialectics in transitional South Africa. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 27(2), 189-207.
- Stevens, G.R. (2008). *Men and meanings of murder: Discourses and power in narratives of male homicide in South Africa*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. Pretoria, South Africa: University of South Africa.
- Steward, R. (1991, August). *Present challenges and future directions in teaching cross-cultural coursework*. Symposium presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco.
- Steyn, M. (2012). The ignorance contract: recollections of apartheid childhoods and the construction of epistemologies of ignorance. *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power*, 19(1), 8-12.
- Steyn, M., & Foster, D. (2008). Repertoires for talking white: resistant whiteness in post-apartheid South Africa. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 31(1), 25-31.
- Strydom, H., Fouche, C.B., & Delport, C.S.L. (2002). *Research at grass roots: for the social sciences and human service professions*. Pretoria, GP, South Africa: Van Schaik.
- Sue, D.W. (1981). *Counselling the culturally different*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Sue, D.W., Arredondo, P., & McDavis, R.J. (1992). Multicultural competencies and standards: A call to the profession. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 70, 477-486.
- Suffla, S., Stevens, G., & Seedat, M. (2001). Mirror reflections: The evolution of organised professional psychology in South Africa. In N. Duncan, A. van Niekerk, C. de la Rey & M. Seedat (Eds.), *"Race", racism, knowledge production and psychology in South Africa* (pp. 27-36). New York, NY: Nova Science.
- Swanepoel, H., & de Beer, F. (1995). Training of racially mixed groups in South Africa. *Community Development Journal*, 30, 296-303.

- Tembo, M.S. (1985). The concept of African personality: Sociological implications. *Asante & Asante, 1985*, 193-206.
- Terre Blanche, M. & Durrheim, K. (1999). *Research in Practice. Applied methods for the Social Sciences*. Cape Town, South Africa: University of Cape Town Press.
- Tolman, D.L., & Brydon-Miller, M. (1997). Transforming psychology: Interpretive and participatory research methods. *Journal of Social Issues, 53*(4), 597-603.
- Trinh, M. (1989). *Woman native other*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Tuckwell, G. (2002). *Racial identity, white counsellors and therapists*. Buckingham, ENG: Open University Press.
- Tuhiwai Smith, L. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. London, ENG: Zed Books.
- Usher, P. (1997). Challenging the power of rationality. In G. McKenzie, J. Powell, and R. Usher (Eds.), *Understanding social research: Perspectives on methodology and practice*, pp. 42–55. London, ENG: The Falmer Press.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (1999). Critical discourse analysis and conversation analysis. *Discourse and Society, 10*(4), 459-450.
- Van Langenhoven, L., & Harré, R. (1991). Varieties of positioning. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour, 21*(4), 394-407.
- Van Langenhoven, L., & Harré, R. (1999). Introducing positioning theory. In R. Harré & L. Van Langenhoven (Eds.), *Positioning theory: Moral contexts of intentional action* (pp.14-31). Oxford, ENG: Blackwell.
- Van Niekerk, E.C. & Prins, A. (Eds.) (2001). *Counselling in Southern Africa: A youth perspective*. Cape Town, South Africa: Heineman.
- Vogelman, L. (1986, May). *The political economy of mental health in South Africa*. Opening address to OASSSA Conference on 'Apartheid and mental health', Johannesburg, South Africa.
- Vogelman, L. (1987). The development of an appropriate psychology: The work of The Organisation of Appropriate Social Services in South Africa. *Psychology in Society, 7*, 24-35.

- Walker, G. (1990). *Family violence and the women's movement: The conceptual politics of struggle*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Weedon, C. (1987). *Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory*. Oxford, ENG: Basil Blackwell.
- Weeks, J. (1987). Questions of identity. In P. Caplan (Ed.), *The cultural Construction of Sexuality* (pp. 31-51). London, ENG: Tavistock Publications.
- Weingarten, K. (1995). Radical listening: challenging cultural beliefs for and about mothers. In Weingarten, K. (Ed.), *Cultural resistance: challenging beliefs about men, women and therapy* (pp.7-22). New York, NY: Haworth Press.
- Weisstein, N. (1971). Psychology constructs the female. In V. Gornick and B. Moran (Eds.), *Woman in sexist society*, pp. 207–224. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Welsh, D. (1981). Social research in a divided society: The case of South Africa. In J. Rex (ed), *Apartheid and social research*. Lausanne, CH: UNESCO
- West, C., & Zimmerman, D.H. (1992). Doing gender. In J.S. Bohan (Ed.), *Seldom seen, rarely heard: Women's place in psychology* (pp. 379-403). Oxford, ENG: Westview Press.
- Wetherell, M (1998). Positioning and interpretative repertoires: conversation analysis and post-structuralism in dialogue. *Discourse & Society*, 9(3), pp. 387-412.
- Wetherell, M. (2001). Minds, Selves, and sense-making: Editor's introduction. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, & S.J. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse theory and practice: A reader* (pp. 186-197). London, ENG: Sage.
- Wetherell, M., & Maybin, J. (1996). The distributed self. In R. Stevens (Ed.), *Understanding the self*. London, ENG: Sage.
- White, M. (1994). Deconstruction and therapy. In D. Epston & M. White (Eds.), *Experience, contradiction, narrative and imagination* (pp. 109-147). Adelaide, SA: Dulwich Centre.
- White, M. (1995). 'A conversation about accountability'. In M. White (Ed.) *Re-authoring lives: Interviews and essays*. Adelaide, SA: Dulwich Centre.
- White, M. (2007). *Maps of narrative practice*. New York, NY: Norton & Company.
- White, M. & Epston, D. (1990). *Narrative means to therapeutic ends*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton.

- Whitehead, D. (2003). *Rehabilitation counselors' perceived multicultural competence: working with African American and other culturally diverse clients with severe mental illness*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Maryland, Australia.
- Widdicombe, S. (1995). Identity, politics and talk: a case for the mundane and the everyday. In S. Wilkinson & C. Kitzinger (Eds.), *Feminism and discourse: psychology perspectives* (pp. 106-127). London, ENG: Sage.
- Wilkinson, S. (1986). Sighting possibilities: diversity and commonality in feminist research. In S. Wilkinson & C. Kitzinger (Eds.), *Feminism and discourse: psychology perspectives* (pp. 7-24). London, ENG: Sage.
- Wilkinson, S. (1998). Focus groups in feminist research: Power, interaction, and the co-construction of meaning. *Women's Studies International Forum*, (21)1, 111-125.
- Williams, R.L. (1972). Abuses and misuses in testing black children. In R.L. Jones (Ed.), *Black Psychology*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Willig, C. (2013). *Introducing qualitative research in psychology (3rd ed.)*. Berkshire, ENG: McGraw Hill.
- Wilson, S. (2008). *Research is ceremony. Indigenous research methods*. Halifax & Winnipeg, Canada: Fernwood Publishing.
- Winslade, J.M. (2005). Utilising discursive positioning in counseling. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, 33(3), 351-364.
- Winslade, J. (2009). Tracing lines of flight: Implications of the work of Giles Deleuze for narrative practice. *Family Process*, 48(3), p. 332-346.
- Wittstock, S., Rosenthal, L., Shuda, S., & Makgatho, G. (1990). Links between rituals, ecologies of ideas, health, and illness. In J. Mason, J. Rubenstein, & S. Shuda (Eds.), *From diversity to healing* (pp. 120-129). Papers from the Fifth Biennial International Conference of the S.A. Institute of Marital and Family Therapy. Durban, South Africa: Artworks Desktop Publishing.
- Wittig, M. (1992). "The Straight Mind." *The Straight Mind and Other Essays*. Boston, MA: Beacon Publishers.
- Wohl, J. (1989). Integration of cultural awareness into psychotherapy. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, 43(3), 343-355.

Young, A. (1987). How medicine tamed life. *Culture, Medicine and Psychiatry*, 11, 107-121.

Young, R. (1981). *Untying the text: A post-structuralist reader*. Routledge & Kegan Paul. London, ENG.

Appendix A:

Dear MA trainer or trainee

I would like to request your participation in the following Phd study. The study entitled "Construction of multicultural therapeutic training in the South African context".

Participation would require being part of an individual interview discussing various issues around multiculturalism in Masters therapeutic training.

Please feel free to email any queries that you may have. I would appreciate it if you could let me know via a return email as to whether or not you are willing to participate.

Kind regards
Ilse

Appendix B

CONSENT AND DISCLOSURE LETTER FOR MA TRAINEES

Dear MA trainee

Your participation is being requested in a doctoral research study entitled “Constructions of multicultural therapeutic training in the South African context”.

Your voluntary involvement. The research process includes a focus group with other MA trainees and individual interviews to bring the constructions together. Both the focus group and individual interviews will be audio recorded for later transcription and all data will be stored for archive and research purposes within the Department of Psychology for the prescribed 15 year period. All data will be treated with confidentiality. The focus groups and interviews will be confidential and all participants are requested to keep all discussions confidential.

Although the risks to you are viewed as minimal, in the event that counselling is needed, the Student Services Centre of the university are available to provide counselling services. Possible benefits include having an opportunity to develop alternate ways of meaning creation in relation to multiculturalism, better understanding of issues of diversity etc as well as a greater confidence in working with people from different cultures. As a participant, you have the right to withdraw at any stage of the research and all data gained from your participation will be destroyed upon withdrawal.

I have read and understand the above information and understand that I have the right to refuse participating. My right to withdraw from the study at any time will be respected.

Name: _____ Researcher Name: Ilse Ruane
Signature: _____ Signature: _____

Thank you for your time and participation.

Ilse Ruane



Appendix B

CONSENT AND DISCLOSURE LETTER FOR TRAINERS

Dear MA trainer

Your participation is being requested in a doctoral research study entitled “Constructions of multicultural therapeutic training in the South African context”.

Your voluntary involvement in this study will be greatly appreciated. The research process includes a focus group with other MA trainers and individual interviews to bring the constructions together. Both the focus group and individual interviews will be audio recorded for later transcription and all data will be stored for archive and research purposes within the Department of Psychology for the prescribed 15 year period. All data will be treated with confidentiality. The focus groups and interviews will be confidential and all participants are requested to keep all discussions confidential.

Although the risks to you are viewed as minimal, in the event that counselling is needed, the Human Resources Employee Assistance Programme of the university are able to provide counselling services. Possible benefits include having an opportunity to develop alternate ways of meaning creation in relation to multiculturalism, better understanding of issues of diversity etc as well as a greater confidence in working with people from different cultures. As a participant, you have the right to withdraw at any stage of the research and all data gained from your participation will be destroyed upon withdrawal.

I have read and understand the above information and understand that I have the right to refuse. My right to withdraw from the study at any time will be respected.

Name: _____ Researcher Name: Ilse Ruane

Signature: _____ Signature: _____

Thank you for your time and participation.

Ilse Ruane

Appendix C

INTERVIEW GUIDELINE FOR MASTERS TRAINERS AND TRAINEES

Thank you for your participation

1. How would you describe multicultural counselling?
2. What competencies constitute multicultural counselling?
3. To what extent do you, as a professional therapist, perceive yourself to be multiculturally competent based on these competencies?
4. What is your personal perspective on multicultural training of psychologists in the South Africa context?
5. How do you suggest supplementing this perspective with the textbook/practical knowledge taught within your training?
6. Please describe how multicultural training is part of your training, if at all, and evaluate to what extent you found this useful.
7. Please give your opinion on what areas you would want included in future.
8. How has multicultural interaction with culturally diverse individuals impacted on your perspectives?
9. How does this perspective supplement your book knowledge or personal experiences?
10. How does this perspective challenge your comfort at an affective level?
11. Is there a relationship between selected demographic factors (eg race, gender, ethnicity) and multicultural competence? If so how do you see this relationship?
12. Is there anything else that you feel is important related to multicultural counselling that has not been asked about?