

https://dspace.org/

Reflection as a tool for managing difference in a post-apartheid school

Dornbrack, Jacqui

2009-04-06T09:54:53Z
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/6872

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, the research topic and context are introduced, and an historical account of the ex-Model C school provided. In addition, the researcher's position is clarified and the origins of this research explained. The research question and aims are described and the notion of critical reflection is introduced. Because the topic deals with issues of difference and of representations of difference, a space is devoted to explaining the choice of terminology and the decision to use the term *difference* rather than *diversity*. Thereafter the notion of *thirdspace* is explained. This is followed by an overview of the thesis.

1.1 BACKGROUND

Issues of multiculturalism are unique in South Africa in the sense that the dominant culture and norms in education tend to be those of a minority group that is white and middleclass, while the values and norms of the majority cultures have been marginalised. This anomaly was mainly due to colonialism and the establishment of apartheid, a system of government that privileged white citizens at the expense of the indigenous people of South Africa. Consequently, after the first democratic elections in 1994 and the second in 1999, widespread concerns with issues of redress and equity were expressed.

One of the institutions specifically targeted for redress has been education since schools are powerful generators, justifiers and transmitters of racialised, gendered and classed thoughts, actions and identities. Therefore the challenge is to shift the 'roles, rules, social character and functioning of schools' (Nkomo, Chisholm & McKinney, 2004:3) and stimulate new ways of being, thinking and practising that are in keeping with ideals of equity and justice.

Prior to the 1994 elections, most government schools were segregated

according to colour; white children went to schools reserved for whites, and black children usually went to township and rural schools that tended to be overcrowded and poorly resourced. White schools tended to have smaller classes, better-qualified teachers, and good supplies of books, equipment, and other resources. The unequal spending was a deliberate strategy by the Nationalist apartheid government to advance white South Africans while suppressing black South Africans.

In 1990, Minister Clase, Minister of Education in the white Nationalist government, announced that white schools were now permitted to admit black learners. White schools were able to choose between three Models of desegregation:

- Model A allowed white schools to close down as state schools and re-open as private schools
- Model B allowed white schools to remain state schools but have an open admissions policy
- Model C allowed schools to convert to semi-private and semi state schools where teachers' salaries would be paid by the state and other operational expenses would be borne by the school community itself (Carrim, 1998).

All three Models allowed schools to enrol black students but were subject to the following conditions:

- Schools needed to ensure that 51% of the school population remained white
- The cultural ethos was to remain intact
- The state and/or school were not obliged to assist any incoming black learners financially
- In the event of any white parent refusing to remain in the school because of the presence of black learners, should they choose to move their child to another white-only school, the state would bear the cost of such relocation
- The school and/or the state were under no obligation to provide any special programmes or support to facilitate the adaptation of black students into such schools (Carrim, 1998:308).

In 1992, Minister Clase announced that all white schools would be converted to a Model C status. This meant that they would be state-aided and managed by a school governing body (SGB), consisting of teachers, the headmaster, and selected parents. A set number of teachers would be employed and paid for by

the government, while the rest of the staff were to be paid by school fees from the parents. This often necessitated an increase in school fees, which, in turn, excluded the vast majority of black parents from sending their children to Ex-Model C schools. In addition, admissions tests, transport problems, language issues, and being outside of the 'feeder' areas for a school were often used by the white schools as reasons for preventing the majority of black South Africans from enrolling at the previously whites-only schools. Clearly the Clase Models of 'opening' 'white' schools were organised around ensuring the continuation of white privilege and security (Carrim, 1998:308). This shift of power from the state to the local site of the school has been pivotal in the continuation of exclusionary practices and has 'severely compromised and undermined' the government's ability to enforce reform policies (Soudien et al., 2004:113).

Class therefore plays an important role in the composition of most privileged state schools where black children who can afford the fees and who live closer to the school are accepted and valued at the school, while poorer black children are generally excluded. Vally and Dalamba (1999:20) argue the following:

> While desegregation allows for the presence of learners from diverse socio-cultural backgrounds on the same school premises, they primarily accommodate the values, need and aspirations of learners from the 'racial' group for which these schools were originally established by the previous apartheid government.

At the time the South African Human Research Council (Vally et al., 1999) report was written, learners from other-than-white racial groups were expected to adapt in order to fit into the existing norms and values of the school. This assimilationist model requires the minority group in the context of the host school to change while the host school remains the same, and this model was shown to be the dominant approach to desegregation in a national survey conducted on 80 South African schools (10 schools from each province). As was reported, 'while "tolerance" is espoused, little effort is made to accommodate the differences of new learners, nor the issues around discrimination or prejudice' (Vally et al., 1999: 24).

Model-C schools continued to exist until the end of 1996, when the South

African Schools Act (Department of National Education 1996) was passed. In this Act, the status of Model-C schools was abolished legally, and all schools became either 'public' (government) or 'private' (self-funded). Most former Model-C schools became public with special provisions, thus allowing them to 'maintain the character of their schools' (Carrim, 1998:309). The provisions allowed these schools a high level of decision-making although they were still to act within the national policies and the new Constitution of South Africa, which clearly rejects racist practices. Schools could therefore not blatantly reject someone based on his or her race; however, the headmasters and governing bodies had the power to decide on their own admissions criteria that included admission and selection tests. These tests examined learners in areas of English or Afrikaans language proficiency and mathematical ability (Carrim & Soudien in May, 1999). Residential requirements and ability to pay school fees were also considered[1]. Given the history of Bantu Education[2] and the Groups Areas Act[3], it was extremely difficult for black learners to meet the admission requirements. From this perspective, it is plain to see how the previous Model-C schools have been encouraged and enabled to take on an assimilationist approach to school desegregation. (This approach and other approaches are discussed in Chapter 2).

According to Sleeter and McLaren (1995:7), the dominant culture of schools mirrors that of the larger society, and teachers and learners willingly or unwillingly situate themselves within structures and practices that reinforce and constitute the unjust race, class, gender and cultural affiliations of their societies. Teachers are therefore partaking in a 'culture of silence' that teaches learners to accept and homogenise in order to 'fit in' and not stand out as 'different'. Rather than transforming the fundamental nature of the school and its rules, its sports and its practices, most schools have simply set in place mechanisms to help

---

1 Inability to pay school fees may not be used as admissions criteria as learners may apply for exemption for paying. However I believe that many parents are unaware of this.

2 A deliberate strategy used during apartheid to under-resource schools in black areas thereby ensuring an inferior education for black learners. As argued in the literature chapter, the way Model C schools were conceptualised, allows this to be perpetuated even today.

accommodate learners who are not white by using cross-cultural music programmes and multi-faith assemblies (Carrim et al., 1999). Many of these mechanisms are constructed within a discourse of disadvantage which perpetuates the notion that the black children coming into the previously white schools are the ones who must adjust and 'get up to scratch' in order to fit into the existing norms of the school. These kinds of practices maintain discrimination and disallow equal opportunities for success, and therefore must be challenged. In South Africa the Government has policies in place that mandate all public schools to provide equal opportunities for all learners (See South African Schools Act of 1996). However, these policies are only as effective as their implementation, and therefore unless there are stakeholders within each school who are committed to driving this process, the assimilationist approach is likely to continue.

I believe that teachers in these schools are powerfully located to implement change, but as Moletsane, Hemson and Muthukrishna (2004:61) argue, in South Africa many teachers are either 'unwilling or unable to implement the requisite changes to respond qualitatively to [the] mandates'. The reasons for this, they believe, are 'lack of commitment to school integration, as well as inadequate and/or inappropriate teacher and school development for the required changes' (Moletsane et al., 2004:61). To this I would add that teachers, especially older white teachers in ex Model-C schools, have not been given adequate training, support or motivation to engage with issues of difference. Another consideration is that many of the older white teachers would have grown up, been schooled and trained during the apartheid era. As such, they would have been exposed to apartheid discourses that stressed separatist notions and racial division. Apart from national public attempts to promote discourses of unity through concepts of *Simunye* (We are One) and the *Rainbow Nation,* teachers have not been exposed to alternative discourses. Therefore my research hopes to create awareness among teachers of the powerful role that discursive constructions play in perpetuating discrimination, and of the need to construct alternative discourses.

---

[3] An Act that constrained people to living in areas designated for particular races.

1.2 ORIGINS OF THE RESEARCH

As an educator in language and literacy at secondary and tertiary levels in South Africa for the past 22 years and as a researcher committed to encouraging an examination of social practices, I was interested in contributing to the transformation of hegemonic teaching practices and of promoting equity. My particular interest in the issues of difference was consolidated during a year spent in Australia while studying for a Master's degree and while enrolled in a course entitled *Difference and Equity in Education* at Deakin University. During this course, I encountered the work of Sleeter (1993), Burbules (1997), and Bacchi (1996).

Their critical stance on multicultural issues and the politics of identity made me question my personal beliefs about treating everyone in the same way. I realised that many white South Africans, in an attempt to obliterate the boundaries between black and white that were associated with apartheid, were, and are, fearful of recognising and acknowledging differences, in case they are seen to be racist. The zeal associated with treating everyone the same or overcompensating for 'disadvantage' has nullified important differences and has simply reinforced mainstream hegemonic practices. Many South Africans are merely, 'juggling with traditional categories... privileging some over others, some at the expense of others, without changing the power structures behind such constructions' (Gunew & Yeatman, 1993: Introduction).

Having grown up as a white South African during the peak of apartheid, I agree that after decades of racial reasoning, the notion that South African society is made up of distinct races, namely, whites, coloureds, Indians, and indigenous Africans, 'has become a habit of thought and experience' (Posel, 2001:50). In addition to this, many white South Africans lived (and continue to live) in patriarchal homes that expected children to unquestioningly accept what authority tells them. Unused to questioning and faced with different classes to those they were trained to teach, many of the older white teachers are fearful

and insecure. Therefore, in addition to the need to address training of new teachers in terms of human rights issues, I believe that many white teachers need to

> acknowledge and understand their personal, social and political fears and insecurities. These may include fears about affirmative action, as well as perceptions of reverse racism, which tend to legitimise, at least in their own minds, prejudice against the 'other' and to perpetuate discrimination (Moletsane et al., 2004:69).

1.3 AIMS AND RESEARCH QUESTION

The research question guiding my work is:

> What are the effects on a post-apartheid high school when selected teachers are encouraged to reflect critically in order to affect change in the management of difference in their school?

This question contains within it certain sub-questions that are outlined as follows:

- What do teachers understand by reflective practice, and what kinds of aspects do they reflect on?
- Do they locate their practices and the underlying assumptions within a broader social and political context?
- What discourses do teachers draw on to describe learners? Do discourses shift during the intervention?
- Which stereotypes emerge? What do they reveal about how learners and teachers are positioned?
- Who is constructed as the ideal learner?
- Do teachers view reflection as a political act? (Carr & Kemmis, 1995)
- What tools do they use to reflect on their practice?
- What changes have the teachers made in relation to difference?
- Have these changes been to the benefit of all learners?
- What are the issues around difference that these teachers believe need the most attention? Do these issues shift during the year when they are working together as a group? Which issues surface, and when? What prompted those issues to surface at that particular time?
- Which theories do teachers find helpful for encouraging reflection and effecting changes in practice?
- Which strategies for developing critical reflection are effective for which teachers and why are they effective?
- How does the establishment of a research group or a 'community of practice' assist in the reflective process?
- How much of the reflection from teachers is transformed into practice?
- What are the constraints inhibiting critical reflection at this school?

The primary aim of this research has been to construct an intervention that would encourage critical reflection and unsettle exclusionary discourses and practices. Schon (1983) explains that much of teaching happens spontaneously and is guided by beliefs and understandings that teachers are not even aware of having learnt**.** Teachers find themselves doing things without questioning the origin or consequences of their action. This can result in unfair practices. Unless teachers are encouraged to reflect on these beliefs and assumptions and to identify how they might negatively impact on certain learners, they will perpetuate inequality and discrimination.

It is insufficient for teachers to simply identify unjust practices; they need also to locate their practices in the broader context and to consciously work towards shifting the assumptions and institutionalised traditions which allow such

practices to exist. This kind of reflection moves beyond the realm of examining technical aspects of teaching and becomes a 'political act'. Kemmis (1985) refers to it as 'critical reflection'. In critical reflection the teacher needs to focus ‘inwardly at his or her own practice and outwardly at the social conditions in which these practices are situated’ (Zeichner & Liston, 1996:59).

The intervention, consisting of 13 focus group meetings, set out to develop critical reflective practices among the volunteer teachers as well as to construct spaces where naturalised practices could be critically examined. This entailed the teachers identifying unfair practices, locating them within the wider socio-political context and then consciously working towards reconstructing more equitable ways of speaking and behaving. In particular, I wanted the teachers to reflect on the approaches the school had taken towards desegregation.

1.4 CHOICE OF TERMINOLOGY

Given South Africa’s history of apartheid and the use of racial categorisation to extend and implement discriminatory measures, terms such as ‘race’, ‘racism’, ‘blacks’ and ‘whites’ need to be clarified. In the context of this study, ‘race’ and labels such as ‘blacks’ and ‘whites’ will be viewed as social constructs. That using such labels can reinforce the categorisation and attendant discrimination that this research is trying to expose, is acknowledged, and using these terms to discriminate against people will therefore be avoided. At the same time, however, avoiding reference to people in racial terms (sometimes referred to as the ‘colour-blind’ approach) can be used as a strategy in educational institutions to maintain the status quo. Attempts to deny racial identification can be a discursive strategy that serves to cloud inequalities and discriminatory practices, and Carrim (1998:302) argues that the shift from the use of descriptors of ‘race’ to ‘ethnicity’, rather than being a positive shift, is used to homogenise and stereotype groups of people. For this reason, the use of terms such as ‘race’, ‘blacks’ and ‘whites’ will be retained; however, the use of this terminology must not be misinterpreted or seen to be ‘lending legitimacy or credibility to the many stereotypes and caricatures that accompany these group descriptors’ (Vally et al., 1999:8).

I will use the term ‘black’ to refer to people who are classified coloured and Indian as well as to include all the indigenous people of Africa. The term ‘white’ will refer to people of European origin living in South Africa.

The term ‘diversity’ has been associated with multicultural approaches to education. As will be discussed later in this thesis, the term is often used to describe groups in essentialist and fixed ways. In an attempt to move beyond a multicultural approach, the term 'difference' is favoured, so argues May (1999:33) who, elaborating on the work of Bhabha (1994), explains that the concept of 'cultural diversity' treats culture as a static, historically bound object, whereas 'cultural difference' captures the flexibility and dynamic nature of culture. While this may appear to the reader as simply a semantic variation, I tend to believe that 'diversity' is often used to refer to more permanent categories such as race, class, gender, and so on Since my aim is to de-essentialise notions of fixity, I tend to favour the term 'difference'. Rooted within a notion of critical anti-racism, 'difference' acknowledges complex understandings of identity that are unfixed, de-essentialist, and fluid. While South African educators may be more familiar with the term 'diversity', the notion of difference was chosen in the hope that it would become a more familiar concept to the teachers who participated in this research.

1.5 CONSTRUCTION OF THIRDSPACE

Much of this research is written in the form of a journey that the teachers and I took. En route we constructed various pathways to reflect on dominant practices at the teachers’ school. The prevalence of spatial metaphors and references to journeys and routes allowed for understanding the embodied nature of the reflective process. The various readings, tasks, dialogues, and discussions opened up a space in which new paths were created and explored. Some paths led to interesting discoveries, some to painful realisations, and some to dead ends. Often the journey required the teachers to return to the past and in so doing, construct new pathways for the future.

Teachers needed a dedicated space where they could meet to reflect. This space was created in the form of 13 focus group meetings where the teachers and I met weekly for about an hour over a period of 18 months. During these meetings we spoke, argued, challenged, contradicted each other, became angry, became defensive and at times, when the emotions became too intense, cried. It is therefore no easy task to describe the complexity of what occurred during those 18 months, and I make use of the notion of 'thirdspace' to facilitate a reading of the multiple occurrences and understandings that developed during this time. I deliberately use the term 'space', not 'place', to capture the embodied and spatial nature of what occurred during the 18 months while I was at the school.

Recognising the spatial nature of humanity is essential, according to Soja (1996:1), who believes that we are, and always have been 'intrinsically spatial beings, active participants in the social construction of our embracing spatialities'. I understand this to refer to our ability to transcend our physical presence via our thoughts and imagination. However, rather than having expansive ideas with infinite possibilities, we tend to confine our thinking to established, fixed notions thereby limiting new understandings and the creation of new knowledges.

The term 'thirdspace' is used by a variety of theorists (Bhabha, 1994; hooks, 1990; Kostogriz, 2002; Soja, 1996; Gutierrez, Rymes & Larson, 1995) but it is believed to have originated in the writings of Henri Lefebvre. Lefebvre, according to Soja (1996:29) did not actually use the term 'thirdspace' but ‘was the first to discover, describe and insightfully explore Thirdspace as a radically different way of looking at, interpreting, and acting to change the embracing spatiality of human life’. His notion of 'thirding-as-Othering' was key to his conceptualising of thirdspace. He attempted to disrupt binary oppositions and sought always to conceptualise an *Other*, 'a third term that disrupts, disorders and begins to reconstitute the conventional binary opposition into an Other that comprehends but is more than just the sum of two parts' (Soja, 1996:31). Thirdspace for Lefebvre was therefore ontological and epistemological in that he urged people

to be 'restlessly and self-critically moving on to new sites and insights, never confined by past journeys and accomplishments, always searching for differences, an Otherness, a strategic and heretical space "beyond" what is presently known and taken-for-granted' (Soja, 1996:34).(See 2.4 for other understandings of thirdspace).

Employing the notion of thirdspace to construct and interpret the data generated from the 13 focus groups of the teachers enabled me to see my intervention as a political act, one that deliberately sought to challenge the teachers to reflect critically on taken-for-granted practices that were unjust and discriminatory. This meant that the space I had constructed became, at times, ‘a difficult and risky place on the edge, filled with contradictions and ambiguities, with perils but also with new possibilities: a Thirdspace of political choice’ (Soja, 1996:97). A sense of new possibilities was achieved by the emergence in the space of new discursive constructions. Some of the teachers shifted from talking about learners in essentialised, fixed ways and started to construct alternative discourses that included more nuanced fluid notions of difference. It is believed that discursive shifts lead to epistemological shifts, which in turn result in transformed notions of subjects and subject positions (Foucault, 1972a; Fairclough, 1992).

It was in the space of the focus groups that one teacher eloquently articulated the need to address the disproportionate number of black learners in detention. This became the case study for the group and resulted in a meeting between all the group members, myself and three staff representing the management of the school. (See Chapter 7).

However, the political nature of this research and the pressure and exposure experienced by the management as a result of the research gaze, caused them to withdraw and resist. This resistance illustrates the difficulty of instituting change, particularly in a school where the management is keen to conserve old ways and entrenched practices. While the intervention did achieve many positive outcomes, particularly at a personal and interpersonal level, it was not sufficient to bring about any substantial institutional change. The reasons for this

and the outcomes of the intervention are discussed in the thesis.

1.6 THESIS OVERVIEW

In this Chapter, the focus of the research has been introduced and a brief background to Model C schools provided. The importance of critical reflection has been presented and distinguished from simply thinking about an issue in general. The research aims and research question have been provided, along with the sub-questions that arose out of the main question.

In Chapter Two selected literature is provided and organised around the key elements embedded in the research question, difference, change and critical reflection. In the first section, various approaches to multiculturalism and work conducted in South Africa in this field are described. The notion of inclusion and integration forms part of this discussion. Theories of achieving positive changes in schools are provided and the South African National Education policies on school integration are outlined. Also in Chapter Two are further debates on reflective practice and on various understandings of the concept of thirdspace.

In Chapter Three the methodological choices are outlined, the selection of 'Model C Ordinary' justified, and the critical role that focus groups play in the research is explored. Discussion about the significance of ethical issues in the research is also included.

Chapter Four analyses the constructions of difference at Model C Ordinary and reveals the essentialised ways of discussing race, gender and culture at the school. Resistances from both teachers and learners to taking up essentialised subject positions are also examined.

Chapter Five explores how the teachers understand change and the existing structures that enable change as well as those which inhibit change. That change involves interrogating deep-rooted beliefs and assumptions and invariably causes pain and loss, is also discussed in this chapter.

The results and effects of engaging in critical reflection are examined in Chapter Six along with specific examples of significant 'turn-around moments' for individual teachers.

In Chapter Seven, the discipline system at the school and the 'technologies of discipline' (Foucault, 1977) employed are examined. It argues that the school constructs gendered and racial identities and perpetuates entrenched stereotypes of the '*Other*'.

Conclusions are presented in Chapter Eight, along with the implications of this research, specifically in light of the Department of Education's aim to assist and support institutions to deal with the challenges of integration (Department of Education, 2006).

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter contains four main bodies of literature which have been selected and organised in accordance with the three key concepts embedded in the research question, namely, *difference*, *management of change* and *critical reflection*. Since the notion of discourse is central to this study, I begin the chapter by defining discourse and situating its relevance in educational research. Rather than view discourse as a discrete entity, I view it as an overarching concept that permeates the whole thesis. Thus it is positioned at the beginning as a way of foregrounding its centrality to this study.

2.2 DISCOURSE

The notion of discourse is critical to this research. The term 'discourse', is used

widely across various disciplines, so how the term pertains to and is used in this research is discussed. Candlin (1997 cited in Jaworski & Coupland, 1999:3) defines discourse as follows:

> Discourse refers to language in use, as a process, which is socially situated. However...we may go on to discuss the constructive and dynamic role of either spoken or written discourse in structuring areas of knowledge and the social and institutional practices which are associated with them. In this sense, discourse is a means of talking and writing about and acting upon worlds, a means which both constructs and is constructed by a set of social practices within these worlds, and in so doing both reproduces and constructs afresh particular social-discursive practices, constrained or encouraged by more macro movements in the overarching social formation.

This definition foregrounds the *social situatedness* of discourse and the requirement of examining language within its local and larger social context. Therefore in South African schools, discourse needs to be understood not only as produced and reproduced within the school itself but also as having been constituted within broader social, political and economic forces. Any attempt to understand prevailing discourses in a desegregated school would necessarily need to engage with identity and subjectivity formation during apartheid. The potential of discourses to both represent and shape our thoughts is highlighted; language not only represents meaning, it also shapes and reshapes people's understandings. Institutionalised discourses determine what counts as knowledge and whose knowledge is preferred. It also shapes the understandings of what constitutes difference and how it is represented and enacted in everyday practices. By drawing the teachers' attention to the discursive power of language to construct subject positions and shape understandings, as well as providing spaces to contest and disrupt prevailing discourses, the potential is created for positive change to occur.

Central to any discussion of discourse, is power since power and social relations are constructed and contested through discourse. Foucault's (1972a) understanding of discourse strongly foregrounds aspects of power and indicates how power is implicit within everyday social practices. However, power is not viewed as sovereign and hierarchical, forcing people to submit to it; rather it is *productive* in that it produces us as particular kinds of embodied subjects. This

occurs ‘within the social body, rather than from above it’ (Foucault, 1972b: 39). Foucault, like Candlin (cited in Jaworski et al., 1999), takes note of the constraining aspects of discourse:

> In a society such as our own we all know the rules of *exclusion*; the most obvious and familiar of these concerns what is *prohibited*. We know perfectly well that we are not free to say just anything, that we cannot simply speak of anything, when we like or where we like; not just anyone, finally, may speak of just anything (Foucault, 1972a:216, original emphasis).

In an institution such as a school, teachers know that if they are to maintain good working relations and conditions, they cannot position themselves as overtly critical of dominant practices. Therefore teachers who want to challenge traditions, need to do so within the confines of the existing power relations and structures.

Discourses embody meaning and social relationships: they constitute both subjectivity and power relations (Ball, 1990:2). The possibilities for meaning and definition are pre-empted through the social and institutional position(s) held by those who use the discourse. Meanings arise not only from language, but also from institutional practices and power relations. Words and concepts change their meaning and their effects as they are employed within different discourses. Discourses constrain and enable the possibilities of thought. They order and combine words in particular ways and exclude or displace other combinations. Discourses are constituted by inclusions and exclusions, by what can and cannot be said.

People draw (usually unconsciously) on existing discourses to express and construct meaning; these discourses are not neutral: they have pre-existing meanings and values attached to them. However, meanings are not fixed; people consciously and unconsciously change and contest meanings and the use of words. A conscious contesting of a particular word and its dominant meaning is apparent, for example, when South Africans use apartheid categories such as ‘coloured’ or ‘African’ but preface them with the expression, ’so-called’ in order to signal their distancing from the dominant meaning that is attached to these categories. One can therefore say that meanings are

constituted *in their use*. Ball (1990) contends that the issue in discourse analysis is why at a given time (in a particular context); out of all the possible things that could be said, *particular things* are selected. These choices would have been structured by assumptions, often unconscious, made by the speaker(s) in order for them to be heard as meaningful. This is particularly true of an educational setting where there are often strict regulations (both explicit and implicit) about what may or may not be said or done.

Ball (1990:3) believes that educational sites are generators of historically specific discourses which are characterised by inclusions and exclusions. He claims that while educational institutions have restricted the discourses available to them (and they are restricted by policy in terms of which discourses they publicly use), they are also involved in the propagation and selective dissemination of certain discourses. This is particularly true of South Africa, where the political, social and economic legacy of apartheid continues to infiltrate into the available discourses. Evidence to this effect is illustrated in research conducted in South African schools where the findings indicate that

> apartheid mindsets and racialised and class-based forms of identity continue to inform people's perceptions of themselves and 'others' and significantly inform their practices and determine their institutional dynamics…exclusion in South African schools was and still is achieved through mainstreaming of dominant middle-class education (Soudien, 2007a:125).

A discourse commonly generated in multicultural settings is that of a shared notion of universally accepted values, including neatness, punctuality, and politeness. However this discourse of neutrality and 'charade of universalism' ignores the historical and cultural situatedness and cultural specificity of these values (May, 1999:31). In most ex-Model-C schools, the discourses around 'ideal learners' are constructed within the dominant values ascribed to white middleclass practices. Therefore concepts such as neatness and politeness are devised around versions of specific cultural understandings of what a neat learner looks like and how she/he behaves. These understandings may not be the same for different cultural groups who have different politeness and neatness norms.

In an educational institution, 'normalisation' refers to the practices that place constant pressure on learners (and staff) to conform to what has been constructed as 'normal' and 'acceptable'. These practices include measures to enforce conformity, ‘so that they might all be like one another’ (Foucault, 1977:182). Normalisation is achieved in the institution of a school by means of comparing, differentiating, hierarchising, homogenising and excluding (1977:183). In ex-Model-c schools, what is regarded as 'normal behaviour' is usually based on culturally specific values and is often couched euphemistically as 'traditions' and 'maintaining standards'. While these discourses never become explicitly racial,

> they subsist on deeply racialised assumptions, such as the equation of high standards with whiteness. The discourses are never transacted in racial terms, but their general tone, and the demarcation, emplacement and positioning of subjects within them, are largely racial (Soudien et al., 2004:106).

Another important aspect of discourse within multicultural schooling that may cause misunderstanding has to do with conversational discourse strategies. May (1999:31) explains that the way we speak, to whom, in what context and for what purpose, as well as the views about linguistic interactions are culturally specific, and yet most teachers seem to assume that the discourses they employ are culturally universal. Therefore an important aspect to consider in this thesis is how embodied behaviour is socially learnt, and why in South Africa there are likely to be distinct differences in terms of race, culture and class. Here it is helpful to refer to the notion of 'habitus', as theorised by Bourdieu (1979). He explains that the social experiences throughout our lives, but especially during childhood, predispose us to particular attitudes, perceptions, mannerisms and linguistic habits.

2.2.1 Cultural capital and habitus

Using an economic metaphor of capital, Bourdieu (1979) argues that certain cultural practices are perceived as having more currency than others. These cultural practices he refers to as 'capital' which he believes is acquired through

one's family and upbringing, He postulates that educational institutions reward and reproduce the values and practices associated with the culture of the dominant group. Style, language, taste, dispositions and social graces constitute cultural capital (Harker, 1984:124). Cultural capital can also be seen as the 'intergenerational transmission of class privilege' (Devine-Eller, 2005). One of the most frequently cited definitions of cultural capital is:

> [w]idely shared high status cultural signals (attitudes, preferences, formal knowledge, behaviours, goods and credentials) used for social and cultural exclusion (Lamont and Lareau, 1988:156).

Those who have not had access to this capital are therefore at a disadvantage because 'schools reward particular dispositions and tastes that are claimed to be in-born and "natural" but are actually taught to and developed in upper class children by their family experiences' (Devine-Eller, 2005:2). Critical for my research is the inclusion of race and class as key components of cultural capital (Lareau & Horvat, 1999). Lareau and Horvat claim that the race and class of parents influence the interactional patterns of parents and teachers, and in a school context being white becomes a cultural resource that white parents draw on to facilitate positive exchanges. However, overall, the influence of class plays a bigger part in child-rearing behaviours (Lareau, 2003). Middleclass parents not only possess the favoured cultural capital but also know how to use it to their advantage in a schooling context (Lareau & Weininger, 2003). This has also been shown to exist in the South African schooling context where it is argued that aspects such as language use, parental responsibilities and rules of deportment, work to exclude groups that are perceived to not possess the 'social and cultural capital privileged by the school' (Soudien, 2007:131).

How one embodies cultural capital is what Bourdieu (1979) refers to as 'habitus'. He claims that:

> The habitus, as a system of dispositions to a certain practice, is an objective basis for regular modes of behaviour, and thus for the regularity of modes of practice and if practices can be predicted…this is because the effect of the habitus is that agents who are equipped with it will behave in a certain way in certain circumstances (Bourdieu, 1979:203).

Bourdieu is therefore arguing that people are disposed to certain ways of behaving, talking and being, based on the communities in which they live. The primary socialising influence is usually the family, where one learns how to talk, sit, stand, walk, etc. This embodied behaviour includes aspects such as style of dress, taste and aspirations (Swartz, 1997; Devine-Eller, 2005). While the concept of habitus has been criticised as being a ‘conceptual strait-jacket that provides no room for modification or escape and smothers the possibility for social change’ (Giroux, 1982 in Harker, 1984), it does provide a useful tool to describe social reproduction and how the body comes to be seen as a signifier of particular cultural norms. Given the multicultural and varied background of the students at Model C Ordinary, the notion of habitus is vital.

Gee (1999) provides an interesting link between Bourdieu’s habitus and discourse. He suggests that habitus can be conceived of as socially accepted ways of using language: of thinking, valuing, acting, and interacting, in the 'right' places and at the 'right' times with the 'right' objects (Gee, 1999:17). This Gee refers to as Discourses of language plus 'other stuff'. The notions of discourse, habitus and cultural capital are useful in this study for explaining the ways in which difference is understood and enacted in the research site by the staff, students and institutional structures of the school.

2.3 UNDERSTANDING DIFFERENCE

2.3.1 Multicultural Models

The following multicultural models are to be viewed within the larger perspective of postcolonial theory and particularly the work of Edward Said, a key scholar in this regard. Rizvi and Lingard (2006:294) argue that Said produced a new understanding of the effects of colonialism and the historical construction of the Orient as an ‘object of the Western gaze represented as alien, barbaric, uncivilized, sensual or exotic’.

Said's canonical work, *Orientalism* (2003, original 1978) highlights the need to examine issues of representation of the 'subaltern' and of those regarded as *Other.* Said viewed educational structures as key institutions through which colonial hegemony was produced and reproduced particularly through representations and texts. Educational institutions provided the structures of unequal power relations which involved a 'cultural politics through which the colonial subjects were both named and represented' (Rizvi et al., 2006:304). Likewise, Rizvi and Lingard posit that it was within and through these colonial institutions that the students themselves came to accept as natural the links between colonial power and knowledge. These representations construct distinct binaries between cultures and essentialise those already marginalised, thus shaping future cultural exchanges. Such constructions resonate with those applied to the indigenous people of South Africa and reproduced through the discourses of apartheid. Understanding how historical representations and understandings are perpetuated through internalised ways of talking and being in places like schools long after the colonisers have left, is key to this research. If discourse is viewed as socially constructed and reproduced then we can begin to understand how apartheid discourses can continue to exist and proliferate, especially in institutions that were originally established for colonial interests. Notions of white superiority and the valorising of western norms and values are entrenched and embodied in the thinking and being of many South Africans, and therefore it is hardly surprising that research in desegregated ex-Model C schools in South Africa reveals an overwhelming tendency towards assimilationism.

A number of substantive studies of multiculturalism in educational settings in South Africa exist, as do a variety of frameworks and perspectives from which these studies have been conducted. I briefly describe some of the emerging trends and discourses associated with multiculturalism in South Africa before elaborating on my selected framework. This is necessary because, as Sayed and Soudien (2003) stress, how one *talks to and about issues of social justice* are complex because implicit in one's choice of language are underlying assumptions and understandings.

Current literature on multiculturalism in the South African context reveals a profusion of concepts and approaches used in the discussion of racial desegregation in South African schools. These terms include 'deracialisation', 'desegregation', 'integration', 'difference' and 'diversity', 'inclusion' and 'exclusion', 'equity' and 'equality', 'assimilationism', 'multiculturalism', 'anti-racism', 'critical anti-racism', 'citizenship', 'colour-blind', 'contributionist', 'denialist' approaches and 'human rights' approaches. Fairclough (2001) explains that a high number of words that are near synonyms, or 'overwording' as he calls it, shows a preoccupation with some aspect of reality as well as the instability of the concept. The overwording of the approaches to multiculturalism reveals high levels of concern regarding the inequity resulting from school desegregation. Different terms/labels enable different positions, for example the term, 'deracialisation' places race at the forefront, excluding other aspects that make up difference such as class, culture, religion and others. A focus on 'equality' rather than on 'equity', as another example, might signal to teachers that they should provide the same amounts of resources (such as time, homework, questions) for everyone rather than focus on achieving equity (justice) which, at times might call for differential treatment to accommodate and allow for the differences in take up. Therefore, what term or label one uses is never neutral.

In an attempt to avoid slippage between terms I have selected to work with the four approaches or 'scapes' (Soudien, 2004) highlighted below. However, I attempt at all times to avoid essentialising discourses and strive to implement an 'interlocking framework' (Sayed, 2002; Sayed et al., 2003) in which race, gender, class, religion, language, and culture intersect in complex ways that produce unique and particular experiences. Central to the ways in which these various interfaces meet and cut across each other is the notion of power, which is manifested in various ways in educational settings including, among others, the curriculum and the 'social capital of parents' (Delpit, 1995:120).

In addition to examining the intersection of multiple aspects of identities it is also important to acknowledge that the intersection frequently shifts. Some changes occur as a direct result of the power and dominance of certain discourses and agendas. For example the privileging of race as a category of analysis in South

Africa, sometimes at the expense of other important considerations of class, gender and language, has been noted. This is to be expected, given the racialised legacy of the Apartheid State. However, foregrounding race reduces the complexity of the various other forms of oppression that play themselves out in multiple ways. Calls have been made for this to change. Soudien explains the resilience of racial discourses:

> The racial discourse of apartheid has been sustained and carried into the new South Africa, even as the new state struggled to assert itself. The new reform agenda has remained firmly within the discourse of race. While recognising how and why the language of race retains its pertinence, of concern in thinking about questions of integration, is the question of how the theory we use is able to engage with and even displace the power/knowledge couplet of race (and even class)(Soudien, 2004:91).

In order to achieve a comprehensive understanding of the complex social influences of race, class, gender, language, region, religion and others, Soudien (2004) suggests two available approaches. One is where we work with the dominant languages of description (referred to as the dominant factor Model, which is easier, owing to available material, but limiting). The second is that we also try to develop an approach that works with the notion of *multiplicit*y, where we identify a range of factors that can be identified within a given context (the contingent approach).

I now describe four approaches to multiculturalism that I use as a framework for my data analysis. The first three approaches can be seen to fall under Soudien's 'dominant factor model ' whereas the fourth approach, the critical anti-racist approach, attempts to embrace the concept of multiplicity and to move beyond essentialised categories of description. While the models will be presented in different sections, they are viewed as existing on a continuum and as such they overlap and intersect and should not be considered as discrete approaches. Represented as a continuum, the four models are:

- Assimilationist
- Multiculturalism
- Anti-racism
- Critical anti-racism.

These four models of multiculturalism provide a lens through which to identify

the dominant model at work in my selected school as well as to distinguish areas that need to shift before critical anti-racism can be achieved.

2.3.1.1 Assimilationist

The assimilationist approach to multiculturalism adopts the view that the [4]minority groups or groups joining the mainstream school are the ones who need to assimilate and change. The host school usually implements strategies to encourage and assist members of previously excluded groups to fit into the existing cultures and norms of the school, so the existing norms remain intact and little is changed (Naidoo, 1996a; Carrim, 1998; Valley & Dalamba, 1999; and Soudien, 2004). A deficit discourse is usually used to describe these students. This approach is often accompanied by a notion of colour-blindness: all learners or students are assumed to be the same, and an attempt is made to treat them as the same or to encourage them to all take on the norms of the dominant culture. The colonial mindset of white superiority is clearly apparent in this approach. Naidoo (1996a:13), speaking of schooling in South Africa, argues that the [5]foreign students are often given 'powerful incentives to assimilate into the dominant culture as quickly as possible and have a chance of receiving meritocratic rewards.' This suggests that in order to succeed, marginalised groups are required to conform and adopt the dominant ways of being, of learning, of behaving and of becoming. Not only are the new students expected to make the changes, but often the norms and values of the dominant group are assumed, and therefore not always made explicit to newcomers who find the

[4] While blacks are a majority race in South Africa, I refer to the use of 'minority' in the sense that in many ex-Model-c schools, the management deliberately keep black learners in the minority compared to white learners so as to avoid 'white flight', an exodus of white learners to private schools.

[5] Naidoo's use of 'foreign' refers to black South African learners who were treated as if they were exotic.

new school environment unfamiliar and difficult. Thus the assimilationist approach clearly protects the material interests of the dominant group (Vandeyar, 2003:195).

Within an assimilationist model, the existing school tends to make very few attempts to change existing norms and practices. Underlying this is the belief that the host schools are educationally and culturally superior (Gillborn, 1995; Naidoo, 1996b, Vandeyar, 2003). In a South African context of formerly white Model-C schools (as well as Indian and coloured schools), (Carrim 1992; 1995), that have been financially advantaged, it means that learners who have previously attended a black or township school who are accepted into a Model-C school for the first time, might find many discrepancies. These discrepancies could include some of the following: teaching styles, use of classroom space, forms of discipline, language of instruction, ways of communicating with the educators, classroom practices such as standing in queues and questioning the teachers, use of technology, and so on. These practices are often so habitual that they are seldom made explicit. That all the learners are familiar with them is assumed and learners who take on alternative subjectivities or identities are positioned as ‘disruptive’, ‘unruly’ or ‘badly behaved’. Rather than adjust values, practices and traditions that are discriminatory, the schools continue with ‘business as usual’ and simply expect learners to fit into the existing ways (Moletsane et al., 2004). It therefore becomes a situation where opening up access and introducing privileges to marginalised communities, ‘produces new oppressive responses from old power groups’ (Soudien, 2007a:127).

Another feature of the assimilationist approach is the view that integration of different race groups into a context that is racially homogeneous is a process that is *natural* and that requires little intervention or conscious effort. A South African Human Rights Commission report by Vally et al. (1999:25) states that a ‘constant refrain from headmasters is that integration must be "natural", "slow" and "not forced".’ This belief is based on the view that racism stems from individual prejudice and that if learners are taught to tolerate and appreciate each other’s culture and learners are slowly and naturally integrated, then racism will eventually disappear. This ignores the ways in which racism is

structured in society and the influence of power in any given situation. It also ignores how practices and habits are socially and institutionally ‘sedimented’ and ‘extremely difficult to undo’ (Soudien, 2007b:9).

Soudien (2004) and Moletsane et al., (2004) argue that assimilationism is the dominant model of school integration in South Africa. Forms of assimilationism vary from context to context. The first form Soudien identifies is what he calls ‘aggressive assimilationism’, which is characterised by ‘high degrees of intolerance and often violence’ (2004:104). This he identified at a formerly coloured school, which had taken in black learners. A less aggressive form of assimilationism, ‘assimilationism by stealth’ is found in former Indian and coloured schools and is characterised by the ‘so-called black children being recruited into new ’’non-racial” identities that have never been opened up to inspection’ (2004:104). Finally, ‘benign assimilationism’ appears to exist in most former white schools. This form, Soudien (2004:105) argues, appears to recognise cultural diversity in the form of cultural evenings, and the schools present themselves as 'self-consciously inclusive' but the dominant relationships in the school remain unchanged. This variety of assimilationism is made to look as if it is multicultural in its approach. It will be useful to apply these distinctions to my research site to ascertain whether this particular ex-Model C school is indeed practising ‘benign assimilationism’.

While the majority of South African schools seemed to adopt an assimilationist approach to integration, (Carrim et al., 1999; Naidoo, 1996a, 1996b), many educators found it impossible to carry on as usual. Teachers were suddenly faced with classrooms of learners who no longer spoke the same language, behaved the same way, possessed similar backgrounds, shared similar values, and learnt in the same way. In order to reach the new learners, teachers had to adopt new pedagogical approaches. Carrim et al. (1999:160) argue that many teachers were therefore ‘forced to shift from assimilationist approaches and assumptions to more multicultural ones that would acknowledge the different backgrounds and experiences incoming students were bringing with them.’ However, the dominant approach of many schools to school desegregation, particularly previously white, Indian and coloured schools in South Africa, remain

within an assimilationist framework (Carrim et al., 1999; Vandeyar, 2003; Moletsane, et al., 2004; Soudien, 2007). Furthermore the assimilationism is *enabled* through a set of policies that favour particular middle-class white and English ways of thinking and being and disregard indigenous languages and meaning-making practices (Soudien, 2007a:125).

2.3.1.2 Multiculturalism

The multicultural approach, while acknowledging differences among learners, often applies essentialist and stereotypical views to particular groups of learners. Particular cultures are viewed superficially as having to do with food and clothes, and as such, many schools organise 'cultural evenings' where learners are asked to dress up in 'traditional' clothes and bring traditional foods. In this view, learners are narrowly portrayed and are assumed to have fixed identities. Troyna (1984) sums up the narrowness of this approach with the phrase, 'the three S's' (saris, samoosas and steelbands) to characterise the superficial multicultural practices in Britain. Nieto (1995) refers to this type of multiculturalism as 'heroes and holidays' to depict the essentialist nature of the approach.

In South Africa, race and culture often become conflated and black learners are grouped together as if they are all of one culture or ethnicity. Instead of asking the black learners which cultural group they feel aligned to, white teachers might ask black learners to dress up in animal skins with spears and shields to portray the Zulu culture, or rather a stereotype associated with Zulu culture. This learner might not be a Zulu but a Xhosa or Tswana that has different traditional clothing and weapons. Additionally many of the urban black learners feel no affiliation to traditional dress and customs, and identify themselves more with 21st century hip hop and Kwaito. Carrim et al. (1999:161-2) argue that portrayals in so-called cultural festivals are demeaning and offensive:

> Students are positioned in stereotypical ways [and] assumed to be fixed in their identities, [and] portrayed as necessarily representative of and loyal to their supposed cultures. Prevalent understanding of culture seems to be narrowly defined as a reference to lifestyles, particularly in regard to

> dress, food and language. The effect is to project differences among people in negative ways and to reinforce rather than erode racist practices.

It is interesting that most ex-Model-C schools find it necessary to hold Xhosa or Zulu evenings or festivals of cultures they perceive to be 'different' yet they do not see a need to hold British or Dutch evenings to represent white culture. This suggests that many ex-Model-c schools perpetuate the *Othering* discourse holding Xhosa, Zulu, Sotho students as ' the exotic other' as opposed to the unmarked, 'normalised' 'accepted' and dominant culture of white students.

Within a multicultural approach, *diversity* is acknowledged and even celebrated; however, it is usually perceived within a deficit discourse. The notion of *diversity* is favoured within this approach rather than the more nuanced and shifting notion of *difference*. While multiculturalism is an improvement on the assimilationist approach, differences (or diversities) are assumed to be essential and are usually perceived as negative. Schools that claim to celebrate diversity fail to recognise differences within all cultural groups, as well as the shifting nature of difference and the influence of context on differences. Also, the multicultural approach seems to foreground issues of diversity in relation to learners they perceive to be *Other* and ignore diversity among the dominant group. For example a Muslim learner entering a dominantly Christian, white school might be identified primarily by his/her religion and may be referred to as 'the Muslim learner', whereas among the white and black learners, there are bound to be a number of diverse religions such as Jehovah's Witnesses, Jews, Seventh-Day Adventists and Catholics and they are unlikely to be singled out or referred to in essentialised religious terms.

Including and respecting different cultures in both the curriculum and teaching methods does not make any real difference in the life experiences of previously disadvantaged learners, nor does it address institutional and classroom practices that are discriminatory to certain groups. Speaking of multiculturalism in Britain, Troyna and Carrington (1990:20) explain that the determination to reflect and respect different cultures is alluring, but has no real impact on racism:

> This belief in the causal relationship between the promotion of lifestyles and the enhancement of life chances for black learners was seductive, enduring and non-threatening. Indeed the definitive link in the policy approaches to which these paradigms gave rise, was the absence of any sustained consideration of the impact of racism on black students' differential access to, experiences in, and outcomes from, the educational system.

One of the major criticisms of a multicultural approach is the absence of direct references to race and racism, and a shift from race to ethnicity (Carrim, 1998). In this shift there is a denial of cultural differences within racialised groups. For example whites are homogenised as all belonging to one group without recognition of the various different cultures and languages among the whites, such as English and Afrikaans speakers, Portuguese and German. This homogenisation occurs among all the race groups. Deracialised discourses and discourses of tolerance and harmony cloud the real issues of racism, and the insistence that *'We don't allow any racism in our school'*, while well-intentioned, avoids dealing with the reality of the lived experiences of the learners in multiracial settings. Schools that take on a United Nations or 'rainbow' ideology are in fact ignoring and nullifying the material differences that exist among the learners:

> In these ways, the actual basis of the inequalities suffered by Blacks does not receive adequate attention, if at all, and the focus on the socially constructed nature of racism remains unexplored. The result is that racism gets displaced into considerations of different lifestyles, and racist practices, processes and assumptions continue almost unabated (Carrim et al., 1999:168).

The multicultural approach, while recognising selected aspects of diversity, does not address discrimination, and does not recognise the 'actual ways in which people live their lives and the various dimensions of their identities' (Carrim, 1998:316). The weaknesses of multicultural education can be summed up in the following:

> Multicultural education, as it is being practised both here in South Africa and overseas, has little hope of enhancing the life chances of children from black groups because it ignores issues of power, social class, the economy and politics (Vandeyar, 2003:196).

Concerned by the continued prevalence of racism and spurred on by the constitutional provisions of human rights, various national and civil initiatives took up anti-racist debates with renewed zest (Vandeyar, 2003). These debates led to calls for new approaches to multicultural education within an anti-racist framework.

2.3.1.3 Anti-racism

The anti-racist movement developed because of disillusionment with the limited ability of the multicultural approaches to make any real difference to the lives of learners of minority groups. Anti-racists believe that the issue of racism needs to be acknowledged, challenged, and brought to the forefront of educational debates. Inherent in anti-racist thinking is the view that power and the restructuring of power are essential. Anti-racists also argue that de-racialised discourses and 'glib references to "culture" require closer analysis' (Vally et al., 1999:35). Vandeyar (2003:196) argues that anti-racist education promotes political education with the 'ultimate aim of transformation and a restructuring of the relations of dominance'.

Additionally, anti-racist education emphasises how differences are used not as strengths or resources but rather as reasons to entrench inequality. Therefore a critical concern of anti-racist education is to recognise and address systemic discrimination in all its manifestations and forms, and to identify ways to empower people to respond actively to injustice, especially in collective ways.

While the anti-racist movement has been credited with bringing race issues out into the open, it has also been widely criticised for the essentialist manner in which race has been conceived. All whites are seen to be racist and all blacks are considered victims of racist practices. Race is privileged at the expense of other categories such as gender and class, and nuances and contradictions within human relations are not considered. Also, racism is polarised as existing between whites and blacks only, and 'intra-black' dynamics are not addressed. A further criticism levelled against this approach is that the focus on race

exacerbates the very stigmatisation that it aims to destigmatise, and that the labelling of immigrant groups in the United Kingdom as 'blacks' assumes that all minorities identify with the label and see themselves in terms of colour (Vandeyar, 2003:196).

The limitation of the anti-racist approach was made apparent in the racially motivated school murder that made headlines in England in 1986. In this incident, a white student murdered a Bangladeshi classmate at Burnage High, Manchester, England. An investigation into the murder found that the anti-racist policies of Burnage High and the manner in which racism was conceptualised was ‘divisive and doctrinaire’ and had contributed to the incident (Donald & Rattansi, 1992:12). By focusing on race alone, other aspects of inequality such as gender, language, class, age, region, and others are ignored, which leads to frustration and resentment. In addition, ignoring the role of power and specificity of each context results in events being simplified. Having policies that mandate equality between all are useless if people's underlying beliefs, assumptions and fears are not addressed and considered.

The lessons learned from the Burnage High incident have resulted in a more complex conceptualisation of racism and anti-racism, one that acknowledges a more complex notion of identity, in which an intersection of class, race, culture and gender exists. In South Africa, this more sophisticated approach is what Carrim refers to as 'critical anti-racism' (1998:317) and Moletsane, et al. describe as a ‘human rights framework’ (2004:66). It is a framework that acknowledges the multiple aspects that interconnect to impact on teaching and learning and foregrounds the role of power. It is an approach that ‘encompasses all forms of oppression resulting from unequal power relations’ and needs to be context specific (Moletsane, et al. 2004:66). Failure to identify and work with the ‘context-specific dynamics’ of each situation may result in well intentioned interventions producing new inequities (Soudien, 2007a).

2.3.1.4 Critical anti-racism

Critical anti-racism builds upon and refines the anti-racist perspectives,

recognising the need to move beyond the 'racial dualism' of black and white. Critical anti-racism, while acknowledging the important work of the anti-racist movement, calls for a more *nuanced* view of racial issues that takes into account the intersection of race, class, gender and other categories, and that resists fixed, inflexible categorisation. Additionally, it argues that we must learn from past failures and adopt a more 'complex and contextualized understanding of racialised differences' (Gillborn & Ladson-Billing, 2004:44). Critical anti-racism distances itself from

> dogmatic forms of anti-racism which homogenise and caricature whites as proto-racists and blacks as victims. It implies that the bipolarity inherent in the 'white' versus 'black' construction common to both the racist and anti-racist arguments is unhelpful in coming to terms with the complex ways in which racism expresses itself in various settings, particularly in regard to 'intra-black' dynamics (Valley & Dalamba, 1999:36).

That there are racist tendencies within all groups and amongst all groups is recognised. An example of discrimination between white South Africans can be seen in the antagonism felt between English- and Afrikaans-speaking whites. So, too, are there frequent media reports of xenophobia between local Africans and foreign Africans. These examples illustrate that racism exists on many levels between many groups and cannot be reduced simply to racism between whites and blacks. Issues in South Africa and Africa cannot be described in single terms as they are complex and multifaceted (Soudien, 2007b).

Central to critical anti-racism is a non-essentialist concept of identity. No-one is simply black or simply white. Everyone has multiple identities and is multiply positioned:

> Not all Blacks are the same, and Blacks are actually much more than simply being black. A de-essentialised conception of blackness enables us to view the many ways in which people experience their 'race', the ways in which they position themselves within it, and the motley array of other identities that make up their persons. Being African in an Indian or 'Coloured' school is decidedly different from being African in a white school. Being African, middleclass and proficient in English is very different from being African, working class, from a rural area and not having English at all (Carrim, 1998:317).

Here Carrim is calling upon researchers and teachers to refrain from essentialising and privileging ‘race’ over other categories (such as class, gender, environment, background and language) that have an equally strong bearing on a person’s identity. Issues of class are increasingly important in the South African school context as ‘a distinct realignment of socio-economic groups is taking place in the schools, with the large-scale exodus of middle-class black parents and their children out of the former DET systems into the former white system’ (Soudien, 2004:106). In addition to class, aspects of HIV/AIDS and poverty need to be factored into studies attempting to address issues of equity and access in South African schools.

Coupled to a non-essentialised notion of identity is the need to avoid constructing categories such as race, culture, and class as fixed and unchanging. This can be challenging, as there are ‘significant forces at work which have the effect of stabilising the meanings’, Soudien (2007:119). Bhabha (1994:66) argues that ‘an important feature of colonial discourse is its dependence on the concept of "fixity" in the ideological construction of otherness’. He is arguing that essentialised and fixed descriptions and traits are used to describe certain cultures and groups. These stereotypes are repeated and become accepted truths that are passed on through generations becoming naturalised in the process. This ‘unchangeable’ feature then becomes the basis upon which certain groups are defined and spoken about. Fixed and unalterable views of what cultures, races, genders, ethnicities, religions, and other identities mean, form the very basis of racism. May (1999:31) explains that key to developing non-essentialist views is maintaining a ‘reflexive critique of specific cultural practices that avoids the vacuity of cultural relativism, and allows for criticism (both internal and external to the group), transformation, and change.’ This is why he favours the concept of difference over diversity, as he believes that the term 'difference' allows for a more dynamic understanding of categories.

Another feature of critical anti-racism is the recognition and appreciation of ‘contradiction, ambivalence, and context with sensitivity to the variability of discourses’ (Donald et al., 1992:27). Depending on the context and situation, a

person might appear to have conservative and racist views, and yet that same person, in a different context, might show insight and sensitivity to racial issues. Recognition of the ambivalent and changeable nature of people as well as the powerful influence of the context will prevent stereotypical representations. Alerting people to the influence of the context and the available discourses may have a more positive effect than assuming that they have unchangeable views. However, it is also necessary to interrogate the reproductive processes and discourses that allow for the continuation of fixed views and dominant practices.

Central to the need to construct more nuanced ways of understanding difference is the recognition that 'we are constrained by the dominant languages of description that exist within our sociological repertoires' (Soudien, 2004:110). These dominant languages limit and predefine what people see and how people see others. In South Africa discourses of race continue to dominate the ways in which people talk about and make meaning of social practices. This is hardly surprising given the 'ideological grip' of race (Soudien, 2007a:115). As Soudien (2007a) explains, privileging race or even class as single categories of analysis undermines the highly complex conditions and processes that work together to form cohesion and fragmentation among people. Therefore, the challenge is to identify the limits of current language structures while developing more subtle, inclusive ways of talking about and understanding the complexity of difference. Ways of talking include far more than just the use of words. They include, among others, values, attitudes, upbringing, education, class and assumptions, and are constructed and contested in various social settings. These ways of 'acting-interacting-feeling-emoting-valuing-gesturing-posturing-dressing-thinking-believing-knowing-speaking-listening' (Gee,1999:38) can be referred to as 'discourse'.

In my study, the identification of dominant discourses provides essential clues to the ways in which multiculturalism is understood and experienced by staff and learners at the school site. So, too, can changes in discourse be traced which signal disruptions and shifts and point to the production of alternative discourses that might be less exclusionary.

Acknowledging the difficulties inherent in shifting entrenched patterns of meaning making and behaviour, the Department of Education (DoE) has developed strategies and programmes to assist educators to move away from assimilationist practices. The following section discusses some of these strategies.

2.3.2 National strategies to promote anti-racism and human rights

In this section I briefly describe two forums established to address issues of racism and human rights in South African schools (Manjoo, 2004). Thereafter I outline key plans from the *Values in Education Programme of Action (*DoE), June 2002) as well as the *Strategy for Racial Integration* (DoE, 2006).

Two specialist national forums were convened by the South African Human Rights Commission to address issues of racism and human rights within education. One is the Discussion Forum on Anti-Racism in the Education and Training Sector and the other is the National Forum on Democracy and Human Rights Education. The former, which is no longer active, was hosted by the South African Human Rights Commission in October 2000-September 2002. The forum consisted of representatives from national and provincial departments of education, teacher unions, learner organisations, school governing bodies, NGOs, academics and practitioners (Manjoo, 2004:80). One of their main purposes was to build capacity for a culture of non-discrimination and to provide support for anti-racism initiatives. During the two years of their existence, a number of reports, capacity development, networks and recommendations were provided. The recommendation most relevant to this research was the need for anti-discrimination training and education and the need to provide in-service training (INSET) for educators (Manjoo, 2004:81).

The second forum developed to address racism is the National Forum on Democracy and Human Rights Education that was established in 1996 by the South African Human Rights Commission and the Independent Electoral Commission (IEC). Their primary aim is to facilitate and support the

institutionalisation of human rights education in the new curriculum, and support interests and activities in the field of democracy and human rights education (Manjoo, 2004:83). They work closely with non-government organisations, civil society organisations, government departments and state institutions to help build a culture of human rights. Membership of the forum includes democracy and human rights theorists and practitioners, lawyers, paralegals, children's rights specialists, Chapter 9 institutions, teacher unions and provincial and national departments of education (Manjoo, 2004:84). One of the major achievements of this forum has been the successful lobbying of the formal educational sector to recognise the need for democracy and human rights education and the development of the Standards Generating Body (SGB) to generate unit standards and qualifications on human rights (Manjoo, 2004:84).

One such qualification is the newly developed two-year Advanced Certificate in Education which focuses on the integration of values, human rights and democracy into all aspects of the curriculum. Provision is also made for participants to have emotional, psychological and therapeutic support. (Values and Human Rights in Education Project). The course is both academic and practical (Mottee, 2005).

In addition to the above support, a special department (Race and Values Directorate) has been established to work with office- and classroom-based educators to build democracy and a human rights culture. They offer resources and a two-day workshop for teachers. They have recently launched their *Strategy for Racial Integration (2006)* which has been developed to 'assist institutions deal with the challenges of integration' (DoE, 2006:3). This booklet outlines the strategic approach as well as providing a framework of action for establishing procedures for dealing with racism and providing support in the form of interventions and evaluations to institutions wanting to improve racial integration. The implementation plan of these strategies spans from 2006-2008 and includes the provision of training of educators, managers and district staff. It is hoped that findings from this research can be used to further enable these strategies to materialise as well as to provide insight into the conceptualisation of training workshops.

2.3.2.1 Values in Education Programme of Action (ViEPoA)

The Values in Education Programme of Action arose from a conference entitled *Saamtrek: Values, Education and Democracy*, held in Kirstenbosch in February, 2001. The primary task of the development of the Values in Education Programme of Action is to:

> Secure commitment amongst educators and learners to the values derived from the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, thus deepening the contribution of education to the creation of a democratic, united and non-racial society. (Values in Education Programme of Action, DoE, June 2002).

These values can be summed up as follows:

- Democracy
- Social justice and equity
- Equality
- Non-racism and non-sexism
- Ubuntu (human dignity)
- An open society
- Accountability (responsibility)
- Rule of law
- Respect
- Reconciliation (ViEPoA, June 2002:3).

The main objective of this programme is to provide further support for the integration of values into the school curriculum, and to target clusters of schools identified by the provincial departments with training. Additionally the DoE plans to organise workshops with the School Governing Body Federations to promote awareness and provide training for the integration of values into schools.

2.3.2.2 Limitations of these support structures

These initiatives offer considerable support for teachers who are passionate about human rights issues and who are aware of the need to undergo training.

These are usually the teachers who are already sensitised to unfair practices and who are eager to examine their own practices critically in order to promote equity. However there are numerous teachers who remain oblivious to issues of equity or more seriously, who knowingly retain practices that favour certain groups of learners over others in order to resist change. There are also teachers who believe that no discrimination exists in their schools and that all learners are given equal chances of success. Such beliefs, unless challenged, are likely to remain unchanged. How does one go about changing beliefs and practices that have been entrenched and naturalised and then fossilised over years? In an attempt to answer this question, I now turn to theories on how to facilitate change, especially within schools since this is the context of my research. Furthermore the aim of this study is to provide insight into practical ways of rupturing entrenched practises and denaturalising taken -for -granted beliefs.

2.4 FACILITATING CHANGE IN SCHOOLS

In this section I examine the theories of change as described by Evans (1996) and Fullan (1991; 1999). Fullan discusses change within the British school context and Evans within the American school context. Thereafter I briefly examine a British case study of anti-racist change to get an idea of how change happens in practice. This is followed by a description of a local intervention at a primary school in the greater Durban area, which did not deliver the expected results and the reasons for this. I begin this section with a brief outline of some of the major changes that have occurred in the South African schooling context over the last decade.

2.4.1 Change in South Africa

Significant shifts have occurred within the educational landscape since 1994 in an attempt to achieve equitable outcomes and address racial imbalances of the past. Some of these changes include decentralisation of educational control,

redesign of curricula, restructuring of management and administration, introduction of different forms of assessment and the development of the National Qualifications Framework (NQF) (Chisholm 2004:1). In addition to this, many new policies have been developed with the express intention of eradicating discrimination and promoting a culture of equity and human rights. Therefore it can be said that major changes have been instituted at a departmental level. However there is a concern with the effective implementation of many of these policies at the school level. Criticism has been levelled at the government for their apparent 'preoccupation' with 'policy struggles' rather than with practice (Chisholm, 2004:15 referring to Jansen, 2000) and that 'policies on paper have not translated into gains on the ground' (Soudien, 2007a:122). It would be unfair, though, to say that no change has taken place within schools; there have been some positive changes at the school level, including the abolition of single-race schools and the consequent changes in the racial composition of learners. However major concerns still exist. These include the dominance of assimilationist approaches to school integration (Sekete, Shilubane & Moila, 2001; Sayed et al., 2003; 2004; Carrim, 1998; Vandeyar, 2003) and the lack of transformation of the racial profile of staff, especially at former Model-C schools (Moletsane et al., 2004; Soudien, 2007). There is also a growing disquiet over the favouring of a racially mixed middleclass (Fiske & Ladd, 2004; Grant Lewis & Motala, 2004) and unease at some specific state interventions (such as 'redeployment in the 1990's') which 'backfired' and has resulted in further inequity (Soudien, 2007a:123).

Having identified both shifts and concerns in South African education, I now turn to literature on facilitating processes of change in schools.

2.4.2 Theories on the change process

Evans (1996:1) claims that the futility of school change is legendary in America. The central reason for the common failure of innovations in schools, he argues, is that the fundamental feature of school life, the norms and beliefs of practitioners, is not changed. Trying to change existing practices without

addressing the underlying goals, structures, roles and assumptions is what Evans refers to as 'first order changes'. First order changes seldom achieve results. Rather one should aim for second order changes, which he believes, 'require people to not just do old things slightly differently but to change their beliefs and perceptions' (Evans, 1996:2). Central to achieving second order change is the need to acknowledge that implementation depends on the meaning the change has to those who must implement it. Put simply, if we want teachers and school management to implement changes, we need to address how they understand the changes and how the changes will affect their identities, social investments, attachments, relationships and positioning in the structures. Because change provokes loss, challenges competence, creates confusion and causes conflict (Evans, 1996:6), understanding these feelings is vital to the successful implementation of any innovation. It is also essential for my research to be aware that issues of race, class and gender inevitably raise strong feelings (Obear, 2000) and that these emotions need to be recognised and managed with sensitivity.

So, too, is it important to understand the tendency of people to resist, and to assimilate reality according to existing structures. This instinct to conserve the status quo needs to be understood and worked with, rather than seen as a major barrier. Resistance, anger, fear and confusion are inevitable, and any purposeful attempt to bring about change needs to address this phenomenon. Evans (1996:8) explains that people must discover their own meaning in the change before they accept it, and since meaning is rooted in feelings and experiences, the emotional significance of change must be acknowledged. He adds: 'our perceptions and purposes can rarely be altered by rational explanation alone; our investment in them is too personal' (Evans, 1996:8). Therefore the issue of teachers' identities and shifts in their identities as they work towards achieving reform needs to be recognised as a critical component of change. Van Veen, Sleegers, and van de Ven (2005:918) argue that most research on teachers' reactions to change attend to the rational and cognitive responses and fail to explore the 'layers of emotion that seem to be involved'. The identities of the teachers in my research and the ways in which their identities shift or do not shift during the intervention will be discussed.

Dealing with personal issues involves conflict because inevitably some staff begin to benefit more than others, some have their views discredited while others are validated, and while some gain influence, others lose it (Evans, 1996:9). The conflict generated from these issues must be addressed openly and honestly, otherwise it will 'drive issues underground where they are likely to enhance divisiveness and hamper change' (Evans, 1996:9).

Evans also believes that in addition to dealing effectively with conflict, pressure is also vital to innovation as it makes the change inevitable. Pressure usually implies the use of power. Power does not only mean coercion; it can also mean influencing people to achieve goals. This influence is more likely to be attended to if it comes from above, as in the headmaster/headmistress or the Department. In South Africa the policies and structures are in place to be able to exert pressure. However, the power historically ascribed to the school management and governing bodies of ex Model-C schools has allowed these institutions to retain the status quo and avoid committing to real transformation. Soudien (2007a:132) articulates this irony when he says, ‘In devolving power to school governing bodies, without deracialising them, the state has effectively ceded its advantage’. Therefore it is significant that in the *Strategy for Racial Integration* the need for staff and leaders to reflect the demographics is clearly stated as a primary task. This is an essential aspect of promoting equity within ex-Model-C schools.

Another aspect of Evans' theory of change has to do with the issue of time. Here he draws on Fullan (1991) as he advises that responses to change are so highly personal that individuals need to work through them at their own pace to become familiar with the new ideas and discover the associated costs and benefits. This takes time, and if the process is hurried, resistances are likely to become stronger and old values will resurface. Therefore training must include opportunities for teachers to 'consider, discuss, argue and work through changes' (Evans, 1996:15).

A final consideration from Evans is the need to make change feasible and

manageable so as to allow teachers to have a sense that they can achieve the change. He also recommends that change must be practical and 'come with useful how-to-do-it measures' (1996:19). Teachers should be allowed to experiment and fail at new ideas without penalty; therefore a high degree of safety (both professional and psychological) should accompany change.

Having discussed Evans' theory, I now move onto Fullan (1991,1999) who describes change processes specifically related to difference and equity. I discuss the two chapters from Fullan (1999) that were given to the teachers to read and discuss at a focus group meeting. One chapter deals with ‘Moral Purpose and Complexity’ and the other with the ‘Deep meaning of Inside Collaboration’.

Fullan (1991, 1999) equates change in schools with moral purpose. He believes that moral purpose means 'making a difference in the life chances of all students' (1999:1). He stresses that change is confusing, difficult, and frustrating, and that in order to achieve moral purpose, one must develop empathy and relationships across diverse groups. This, he says is not easy as we tend to 'keep people different than ourselves at a distance' (1999:2). In addition, we tend to associate with people who agree with us and avoid those who do not. However, we learn more from people who disagree with us than those who agree, though we tend to 'underlisten’ to the former and ‘overlisten’ to the latter. To counteract this Fullan suggests that differences should be incorporated early in the process so that possible conflict can be dealt with early (Fullan, 1999:23). Conflict, he says, if respected, 'is positively associated with creative breakthroughs under complex, turbulent conditions. Consensus would be pleasant, but actually is impossible to achieve except through superficial agreement' (1999:22). Therefore Fullan is arguing that conflict and disagreement are necessary features of change and that without them, real change is unlikely to happen. Also, building relationships with people different to one is a vital component of effective change. He explains:

> To be effective you have to form relationships with people you might not understand and might not like (or vice versa). Working through the discomfort of each other's presence, learning from dissonance, and forging new more complex

> agreements and capabilities is a new requirement for living on the edge of chaos (Fullan, 1999:23).

'Living on the edge of chaos' is for Fullan, the key to effective change. He explains that change occurs in non-linear ways and in order for it to happen; there needs to be a fine balance between structure and chaos. Too much structure or stability causes stagnation and ossification. Too little stability and structure causes chaos. Therefore success lies in 'sustaining an organisation in the borders between stability and instability. This is a state of chaos, a difficult-to-maintain dissipative structure' (Stacey, 1996 quoted in Fullan, 1996:4). Living on the edge of chaos means living with uncertainty, anxiety and disruption, and experiencing these feelings is a necessary part of the change process. Inherent in working with chaos is the need to recognise and value emotions. Fullan explains that until recently emotions were seen to 'cloud logic', but this view has altered. Emotions are now viewed as imperative to rational decision-making. Given the sensitivity of equity concerns and the strong emotions attached to issues of redress in South Africa, I needed to ensure that my intervention made space for and valued the emotional responses of the participants.

Before moving onto the case study of change in three schools in England, a final comment from Fullan (1996:36) is included. He asserts that collaboration between people, both internally and externally, can significantly improve the success of change. Working collaboratively allows for different perspectives and access to new ideas, and it encourages conflict to be brought into the open. It encourages dialogue and enables people to see how their understandings are rooted within their own historical, social and political experiences. By listening to other perspectives people come to realise that meanings are not singular or fixed, but rather multiple and fluid. This is of particular importance in my research, as only exposing teachers to new ideas is insufficient; teachers often simply adapt new views to fit into their existing world views (Sleeter, 1992). Therefore it is essential that the teachers in this group are not only exposed to alternative views and diverse perspectives, but also that they have opportunities to grapple with and work through what these new ideas mean to them and their identities. Therefore they need to have space and time in which to talk about the ideas and discuss concerns and possible solutions or ways of addressing them.

Having discussed the theoretical underpinnings of change, I now examine a case study of three schools in England, which is followed by the description of an intervention in the greater Durban area.

2.4.3 British case study of school reform

Gillborn (1995) traced anti-racist change in three secondary schools in England. The schools were located in different parts of England with very different student populations. In each case, a core group of committed teachers initiated anti-racist change. Of particular interest is his finding that the learners themselves were key players in anti-racist changes and that all learners and not just minority learners should be involved in the change processes. He also stresses the need to see new changes in the light of the larger context of changes that each school is facing and warns that change cannot simply be programmed into a school. Change needs to address 'institutional inertia and established traditions' (Gillborn, 1995:99). This is likely to be an important consideration in this study as most educational institutions have strongly entrenched traditions and investments that ensure that self interests are maintained and reproduced.

Gillborn's view is that whole school change, while an important goal, is extremely difficult. He argues that 'to bring about change in reality (as opposed to rhetoric) requires an engagement with the forces that shape routine interactions inside schools' (Gillborn, 1995:99). Therefore whole school change should be a goal and not a strategy. Gillborn goes on to explain that change threatens people's view of themselves and their role in the school, and therefore change is about the power of one or more groups to influence the shape of the institution. This is often against the wish of some and can cause hostility. Therefore change must be dealt with sensitively and strategically. One method that Gillborn found to be useful in all three of the schools he examined was the establishment of a core of committed teachers, who, with the support and involvement of the headteachers, were able to work constructively on anti-racist issues and slowly involve other staff members. However, Gillborn stresses that

'without the support of the headteacher, any group that seeks to change the taken-for-granted assumptions of a teaching staff will face a difficult, if not impossible task' (Gillborn, 1995:103). Epstein (1993), who examined anti-racist and anti-sexist reforms in three primary schools in England, supports this finding. However, neither of the studies explicitly states the extent of support given or the details of support. The impact of the type of support given by the principal and the extent of this support emerged as a critical consideration in this study.

Gillborn elaborates on the work of the core groups in his three schools. He explains that once core groups of teachers were established, they set about learning more about anti-racism. Group 1 obtained policies and other documentation from the local authorities in the hope of finding examples of good practice. Group 2 invited speakers to address them on various issues. All three groups committed to involving other staff members. Group 1 ‘headhunted’ staff members who they knew had similar views to theirs on anti-racism, whereas group 2 slowly recruited other members whenever they could. Group 3 deliberately involved someone from each subject department.

Group 2 involved a 'minority teacher' who challenged racist beliefs and assumptions, but only after she had established a relationship with the group. Gillborn comments that while this strategy worked well for that group, it is essential that ethnic minority teachers are not the only ones given responsibility to educate other staff members about anti-racism. This, he argues, will absolve white teachers of responsibility and marginalise minority teachers (1995:112). Since I had only one black teacher in my group of eight volunteers, I had to be particularly sensitive to this issue.

Gillborn believes that even though conflict is necessary for change, it is important to find a balance between maintaining pressure to be reflective about assumptions and creating hostility. Creating too much anger and guilt will paralyse, rather than enable, teachers (1995:112).

Gillborn also found that In-service Education and Training played a vital role in

encouraging and supporting change in all of the groups. In addition to regular training, two groups invited members of the local minority community to speak at their schools. This proved extremely effective as it 'challenged essentialist views, gave minority communities a voice they had not previously enjoyed and began to break down the fears that some teachers felt' (Gillborn, 1995:116).

Another powerful strategy for achieving meaningful change was the formation, by group 3, of their own anti-racist policy. While the whole school was involved, small groups of staff were assigned certain sections to write. Once a complete draft was obtained, it was shown to the whole staff as well as to the student council for their views. Copies of the draft were pasted in each form room and discussions were held with each form, in which learners were asked to send written comments on the draft to their headteacher. Once all feedback had been received a final copy of the policy was written and made available to local organisations as well as at open evenings, for both parents and prospective students to take away and read. The construction of this policy not only involved all staff and students in a practical way to commit to anti-racism, it also made a public statement about the school's position on issues of justice.

What can be taken from Gillborn is that successful change within schools is possible, particularly if small groups of committed teachers work together on specific projects. Of prime importance is the need to have the support of the headmaster (headteacher) of the school and to work with, rather than against, inevitable resistances that might arise. While important lessons can be learnt from successful change, one can also learn from failed attempts at implementing change. Moletsane (2002) describes one such intervention.

2.4.4 A local intervention of school change

Moletsane (2002) describes an intervention of whole school change aimed at a primary school in the Durban area, which was unsuccessful. The intervention was part of a larger project organised in conjunction with five NGOs and two teacher education institutions and was sponsored by Toyota South Africa. Two main reasons for the lack of success were identified. One was a problem with

the design and delivery of the intervention. The second relates to contextual factors. In terms of design problems, she cites three concerns dealing with context related issues.

The first concern relating to the design of the intervention relates to the selection of participants. Unlike Gillborn's success with core groups of teachers who initiated change and then spread it to the rest of the staff, Moletsane found that choosing a few teachers to take part in the intervention caused conflict and ill feelings, as the selection was seen to be unfair. The non-participating staff felt disadvantaged as they considered their chances of promotion to be less than those who had been selected (Moletsane, 2002:127). They therefore resisted any changes that the participating teachers tried to implement. The second factor contributing to the lack of success was the venue of contact sessions for the participating teachers. Rather than hold sessions at the school, the selected teachers were taken to a venue 20km from their school. This exacerbated the mistrust between those chosen and those teachers 'left behind', who felt 'angry' (2002:128). The final concern with the design and delivery of the project was that the selected facilitator responsible for transferring what he had learnt to the rest of the staff was unable to effectively transfer the skills. He chose to focus on financial management with the staff, which the teachers found to be 'divisive and disruptive' (2002:128). In addition to these design 'errors', there were also contextual factors that worked against the realisation of the goals of the intervention.

The school was situated in a poor township community with many learners from the informal settlements attending the school, and the school ran on a ‘platoon system’[6] which did not allow for time and space for teachers to meet and discuss issues. There was also a general lack of resources to assist in implementing change. However, more than the lack of resources, the 'abstract content of the

[6] A platoon system meant that owing to overcrowding and lack of facilities, half of the learners attended school in the mornings and the other half attended school in the afternoons when the earlier group had finished.

sessions' and the lack of confidence of the selected teachers in implementing what they had learnt, resulted in inadequate whole school change. A second concern related to the management of the school that was found to show 'favouritism' and be 'authoritarian, unapproachable and unsupportive' (Moletsane, 2002:129). The lack of involvement of top management also affected the credibility among the rest of the staff. Thirdly, the perceived 'exclusivity of the selected group' caused the rest of the staff to withdraw or actively resist any suggestions. The final contextual factor was the 'lack of parental and community involvement'. While these contextual factors affected the possibilities of successful change, Moletsane (2002:132), drawing on supporting research (Christie & Potterton, 1997 in Moletsane, 2002:132), believes that some schools are able to implement change despite their negative contexts; therefore the primary problem lay with the design and delivery of the intervention.

In summary, Moletsane argues that imposing a generic intervention without significantly considering the specificity of the school is the primary reason for the limited success of this intervention. Specificity, in this instance, would include an understanding of the internal dynamics of staff relations, the implications of choosing a few teachers rather than the whole staff for further development, and the type of leadership in the school. In addition the perceptions around the content and venue (space) selected for the development of the teachers needed to be problematised.

Having discussed the work of these three groups of core teachers and that of the Durban school, I conclude this section with an important consideration highlighted by both Gillborn (1995) and Epstein (1993) that teacher reflectiveness is a key component to achieving successful change. Epstein suggests that teachers who are more reflective by nature are more likely to take on change. Gillborn argues that, teachers' responsiveness to change has to do with their ability to engage in reflective practice: 'the ability to stand back and question what one is doing' (Gillborn, 1995:115). Therefore the following section seeks to clarify what 'reflective practice' means, and to ascertain how it can assist in achieving positive changes in a school.

2.5 REFLECTION

John Dewey's (1933) writings have been credited as being the birthplace of the notion of reflective practice for teachers. Dewey, distinguished between generally thinking about something, which teachers do most of the time and actually reflecting purposefully about an issue as well as its effects: 'thinking is the accurate and deliberate institution of connections between what is done and its consequence' (Dewey, 1933:505). Often taken-for-granted practices are routinely carried out without question, which prevents teachers from exploring alternatives or questioning the source of the practice. True reflective practice only occurs when a person deliberately and consciously engages in thinking about a specific problem with the intention of solving or improving the issue at hand. This requires active and persistent consideration of the problem, the context in which it occurs as well as the consequences that might emerge from it.

Dewey believed that the qualities of open-mindedness, responsibility and wholeheartedness are essential for reflection. Open-mindedness refers to the ability and desire to question and to seek answers for our everyday beliefs and actions and to continually ask why one is doing something (Ziechner & Liston, 1996:10). Responsibility entails the consideration of the consequences of one's actions. This needs to move beyond a simple question of meeting one's goals, to an understanding of broader issues such as, 'are the results good, for whom and in what ways?' (Ziechner & Liston, 1996:11). Wholeheartedness involves a commitment to regularly examine aspects of one's teaching from various perspectives in order for teachers to 'know what [they] are about when [they] act' (Dewey, 1933:17).

Schon (1983, 1987) developed Dewey's notion of reflective practice by introducing the distinction of reflecting-on action and reflecting-in-action. Reflecting-on-action can occur before or after an action. Reflecting before includes planning and thought about one's teaching. Whereas reflecting after

includes the conscious thinking about the action, usually with the intention of making improvements. The second type of reflection, reflecting-in-action refers to 'on-the-spot' thinking while in the class. Teachers usually require reflecting-in-action to accommodate the learners and all the variables present in their classrooms. Irrespective of when the reflection occurs, it is important that teachers are encouraged to interrogate their taken-for-granted practices and to consider how their own assumptions and perceptions manifest materially on their actions and words in the classrooms and their schools. Identifying tacit understandings allows one to criticise, examine and improve them (Ziechner & Liston, 1996:15).

Reflection does not occur simply for the sake of reflecting; teachers must know what they are reflecting on and the purpose of their reflection. Van Manen (1977) has suggested that there are three levels of reflectivity: the first is concerned with the technical aspect of teaching and the skills involved with controlling and maintaining classroom order. The second is concerned with the assumptions underlying the classroom practices and the consequences of choices in the classroom. The last level relates to the ethical, moral and other normative values that the teacher brings to the classroom. Since the notion of levels suggests a hierarchical relationship, it might be more useful to refer to 'strands of reflection' (Fish & Twinn, 1997). In their own model, Fish and Twinn elaborate on the methodology of reflection. They begin with what they refer to as the 'factual strand' which requires a detailed descriptive account of what occurred. The 'retrospective strand' which encourages identification of patterns and trends follows this. Once patterns have been recognised, the 'sub stratum strand' is explored. This includes an exploration of assumptions, beliefs and value judgments that underlie practices that are being scrutinised. The final strand, 'the connective' requires of the reflecting participant to build on the results from the previous strands in order to form ideas for future practice. While the steps can be useful in guiding reflection, it is important that the process of reflection remains holistic.

2.5.1 Critical reflection

Reflection, by definition, is not critical. So says Brookfield (1995:8) who argues that in order for reflection to be critical, it needs to have two distinctive purposes: one is the consideration of questions of power that frame and impact on our practices and beliefs, and the other is the examination of our hegemonic assumptions and practices. The latter is necessary as we are ‘trapped within the perceptual frameworks that determine how we view our experiences’ (Brookfield, 1995:28). We need to learn how to create a distance that enables us to examine our taken-for-granted behaviours. One such way has been developed by Fish and Twinn (1997) for nursing practitioners, but it is equally apt for teachers as it provides clear guidelines to the reflective process as well as including the need to convert the reflection into reformed practice. The use of 'sub stratum' implies that values and beliefs are covert and hidden, though many beliefs are overt. Therefore, rather than refer to this level as substratum, I prefer the use of 'context'. Context can include individual, interpersonal and institutional as well as societal aspects. Asking teachers to reflect on their teaching contexts might encourage them to reflect on the changed and changing conditions in South Africa from a personal as well as a social, historical and political perspective, thus seeing how individual and group assumptions and values are constructed and contested in a broad context. Reflecting on moral and ethical issues is often referred to as 'critical reflection' (Gore & Zeichner, 1991; Adler, 1991) or 'social reconstructionist reflection' (Carr et al., 1986). This kind of reflection involves the examination of one's own practices in terms of how they may (knowingly or unknowingly) reproduce unjust relations. Critical reflection also 'locates any analysis of personal action within wider socio-historical and politico-cultural contexts' (Hatton & Smith, 1994:5).

A general understanding of critical reflection on teaching would include the need to examine one's own classroom and school practices with the intention of identifying aspects that might seem to discriminate against certain learners or groups of learners, and then embark on action to remedy the situation. Brookfield (1995) explains that often we believe that we are being democratic and respectful yet it may not always be perceived as such by everyone; therefore we need to acknowledge that ‘teaching can never be innocent’

(Brookfield, 1995:1). In the South African context, issues of power, politics, culture, language, poverty and the legacy of apartheid impact on teaching in complex ways. Therefore in my research intervention I needed to formulate strategies that would encourage reflection on issues of race, class, power, culture and gender as they play themselves out in this specific school. I also needed to provide a 'safe place' to allow teachers to explore how their lived experiences during apartheid influenced their current ways of being and talking.

I believe that collaboration between colleagues is vital to the process of reflection. Osterman and Kottkamp (1993:25) explain that it is often difficult to develop a critical perspective on our own behaviour, and therefore 'analysis occurring in a collaborative and co-operative environment is likely to lead to greater learning.' Calderhead and Gates (1993) and Brookfield (1995) argue that reflective teaching, professional development and personal fulfilment are enhanced through dialogue and interaction with colleagues. When engaging in critical reflection, the make-up of the group needs careful consideration. In my research it is important to have [7]differences within the group in order to allow for a variety of perspectives and meanings of events and issues.

2.5.2 Barriers to reflection

A number of barriers to reflection have been identified. Hatton et al.(1994: 8) include the following: the problem of sustaining the reflective process, fixed views of what teaching involves, and the lack of time and opportunity for reflection. Fear of discovering things about ourselves that we might not like is another potential barrier (Brookfield, 1995:2). To this list I would add, in terms of teachers in South Africa, a reluctance to engage in reflection, possibly owing to teachers being more used to 'following the prescriptions of education authorities than to working reflectively' (Reed & Adler, 2002:122).

[7] Race, gender, age, experience, subject area, background, language and status in the school were taken as categories of differences.

Barriers might also be caused by the inappropriate choice of tools or strategies to encourage reflection. Personal narratives, oral interviews, writing tasks, journal writing, action research and relevant readings have been identified as tools with which to prompt reflection (Hatton et al., 1994:6). These tools need to be chosen judiciously and with sensitivity, and they need to be relevant in terms of the specific context, teachers and time. Introducing a reading too soon or hurrying an intervention can spell failure, therefore detailed planning and good communication between teachers and the facilitator are essential. It is also necessary that both the facilitator and the teachers are clear about the purpose and process of reflection. Additionally, facilitators, researchers or supervisors who are responsible for designing and leading reflection need to create both space and time for regular opportunities for teachers to reflect and to make explicit their thoughts and beliefs with the intention of improvement and of facilitating just teaching practices.

A strategy that has been found useful in eliciting and capturing reflection is the use of metaphors by teachers. Zeichner and Liston (1996:36) explain that a number of teacher educators have examined images and metaphors of practising teachers as ‘heuristic devices for helping teachers to become more aware of their teaching identities’. Teachers' practical knowledge can be conceived of as a ‘rich interweaving of images, experiences, understandings and personal stories that guide and inform teachers' actions’ (Connelly & Clandinin, 1988:60). These understandings and stories inevitably include descriptions replete with rich images and metaphors which, when analysed, can reveal many assumptions, values and beliefs which underlie the teachers' actions and thoughts. In order to elicit metaphors from teachers the following questions are recommended:

- What metaphor would you use to describe your own approach to teaching?
- Can you think of specific examples of how your teaching reflects this metaphor?
- Does your metaphor vary according to the particular school situation, grade level or subject area?

- What are some of the metaphors you can infer from the behaviours of teachers in other classrooms you have seen? (Zeichner & Liston, 1996:37).

One difficulty in asking teachers to purposely identify their own metaphors is that they might choose one that is known to be affirming, in order to create a positive impression. More revealing might be an analysis of interview and focus group data of more naturally occurring metaphors and images.

One cannot assume that reflection will result in improved teaching and more equitable practices. In fact, at times, reflection may result in strengthening stereotypical beliefs and in cementing harmful practices. Indications of such occurrences need to be challenged in constructive ways and the reasons for such beliefs need to be questioned and probed. This is particularly the case in the South African context for many teachers (perhaps more so with white, senior staff members) who, having been schooled and often trained in racist institutions, have strongly entrenched views about race, class and gender issues. Shifting set views is difficult but necessary so that the 'process of re-vision' (hooks, 1990:145) can take place. Re-visioning involves *listening to* and *accepting alternative views*, *acknowledging multiple realities* and in so doing, constructing the ‘possibilities of radical perspectives from which to see and create, to *imagine alternatives*, new worlds’ (hooks, 1990:150) (emphasis mine). Constructing such a space is a political act, what hooks calls ‘a defiant political gesture’ (1990:145) and what Soja (1996) argues is the beginning of thirdspace. In order to construct such a space it is therefore necessary to understand how one can recognise elements of thirdspace as well as construct favourable conditions for its occurrence.

2.6 THIRDSPACE

Soja (1996:10) distinguishes thirdspace from firstspace and secondspace. Firstspace perspective, he argues, focuses mainly on the concrete materiality of spatial forms, the real. Secondspace refers to the space of ideas and the

'imagined'. The so-called spatial disciplines (Geography, Architecture, Urban and Regional Studies and City Planning) focus mainly on the first and second space perspectives but Soja explains that in the late 60's an-Other form of spatial awareness began to emerge. He refers to this awareness as Thirdspace and it results from 'thirding of the spatial imagination' (1996:11). Thirding occurs when one is able to go beyond the usual binaries of material and mental space in 'substance and meaning' (Soja, 1996:11). In other words one is able to use one's knowledge of the first and second space, the real and the imagined, to conceive of something new that is based on, but better than, the combination of the two. Hooks (1990) conceptualises thirdspace in terms of a real space of her university where racism and sexism thrive, an imagined space of justice and equality; she combines the real and the imagined in a space that transforms the oppression by interrogating 'knowledge and information in ways that transform how we think about our social reality' (hooks, 1990:6).

2.6.1 hooks

Speaking from personal experience as a black female academic working in a predominantly white male institution, hooks describes the need to educate others (colleagues and students) to acquire critical consciousness. She claims:

> Engaging in intellectual exchange where people hear a diversity of viewpoints enables them to witness first hand solidarity that grows stronger in a context of productive critical exchange and confrontation (hooks, 1990:6).

The construction of a space especially for 'black folk coming from poor underclass communities' as well as for those interested in transforming hegemonic practices enables marginalised groups to hold onto aspects they feel passionately about, while 'simultaneously seeking new knowledge and experience [to] invent spaces of radical openness' (1990:148). This allows for the creation of a community of resistance.

Hooks deliberately positions this space in the margins, 'a profound edge' which she admits is difficult, risky, but also nurturing. It is difficult because the space requires of one to delve into personal issues and to listen to views that challenge

and disrupt. It is risky in the sense that it seeks to challenge all forms of oppression, and dominant groups do not easily accept such resistance. It is nurturing because the space is about dialogue, building solidarity and 'engaging in critical dissent without violating one another' (1990:19). This is a space of 'radical openness' where new epistemologies are collaboratively negotiated and ontologically experienced. As hooks explains:

> We are transformed, individually, collectively, as we make radical creative space which affirms and sustains our subjectivity, which gives a new location from which to articulate our sense of the world (1990:153).

Particularly useful to my research is hooks' conceptualisation of thirdspace as dialogic, transformative and communal. She conceives of thirdspace as a space in which knowledge can be constructed, debated and transformed and where people themselves are transformed in this process. She also conceives of thirdspace as a space of affirmation and sustenance, a space where people, constructed by those in power as the *Other* or as 'different', can validate and share their ways of seeing the world.

Hooks' notion of thirdspace as radical and open is complemented by Bhabha's conception of third space as both epistemological and ontological and as a space in which hybridity can be constructed.

2.6.2 Bhabha

Key to Bhabha's understanding of [8]third space is the need to deconstruct and disrupt binaries, essentialised thinking and singular meanings (especially in terms of culture) and embrace instead, hybridity. Hybrid understandings and meanings are created in the 'rearticulation of elements that are *neither the One nor the Other* but *something else besides* which contests the terms and

[8] Bhabha refers to 'third space' and Soja refers to it as one word, 'thirdspace'. Apart from when describing Bhabha's usage, I refer to it as a single term.

territories of both' (Bhabha, 1994:28) (italics in the original). Bhabha (1990:211) explains that since culture is never fixed, it is always in a 'process of hybridity'. What is important in the conceptualisation and construction of hybridity is not to trace the exact moment of hybridity but rather to understand what enables it to happen. In the process of developing new initiatives and meanings, the old meanings are displaced. This gives rise to

> something different, something new and unrecognisable, a new area of negotiation of meaning and representation (1990:211).

Here Bhabha is suggesting that more significant than the new epistemologies being created are the opportunities in which to contest and negotiate those new epistemologies. It is the space of negotiation, of contestation, of ambivalence and struggle that allows for the creation of something far deeper and more meaningful to be articulated. Therefore Bhabha's third space, like that of hooks, is both epistemological and ontological because in the space of creating hybrid meanings, the participants themselves take up new subject positions, engage with multiple points of identity, and in doing so, reconfigure their own identities and 'habits of being' (hooks, 1990:149).

Elements of time and movement are explicit in Bhabha's explanation of third space. He suggests that it is insufficient to simply deconstruct grand narratives. We need to go further, what he calls going 'beyond', which is 'neither a new horizon nor a leaving behind of the past' (1994:142). The process of going 'beyond' precludes a singular direction or a narrow notion of going backwards or forwards. Rather it refers to a sense of 'disorientation, a disturbance of direction, in the "beyond": an exploratory, restless movement caught so well in the French rendition of the words, au-dela-here and there, on all sides, fort/da, hither and thither, back and forth' (Bhabha,1994:1).

Therefore Bhabha, like hooks, understands thirdspace as complex, confusing, disorientating, disruptive, yet necessary for the construction and reconstruction of new understandings, new subject positions and new identities in the pursuit of achieving justice and equity.

I now discuss thirdspace as conceptualised by Soja (1996) who, drawing on theories from Lefebvre (1991), hooks' (1990), Bhabha's (1994) and Foucault (1986), powerfully describes the relevance of spatiality in our thinking and the potential of thirdspace to radically transform conventional epistemologies and ontologies.

2.6.3 Soja

In his book, *Thirdspace*, Soja (1996:2) stresses the spatial aspect of thirdspace, and appeals to readers to keep their 'critical geographical imagination- creatively open to redefinition and expansion in new directions; and to resist any attempt to narrow or confine its scope'. Space, he argues, is not just a 'medium, a reservoir of resources and a place of action'; it is the very thing that 'brings everything together' (1996:45). Thirdspace itself he defines as a 'purposefully tentative and flexible term that attempts to capture what is actually a constantly shifting and changing milieu of ideas, events, appearances and meanings' (Soja, 1996:2). This deliberately broad definition captures the ambivalence and multiplicity of the term and of the notion it is attempting to describe. Terms that Soja uses to describe thirdspace are 'multiplicity', 'alternatives', 'critical thirding', 'radically open perspectives', 'recombinatorial', 'transdisciplinary', 'flexible', and 'limitless'. He stresses that the concept of thirdspace is where the negotiation begins and where one should 'continuously expand the production of knowledge beyond what is presently known' (1996:61).

However, thirdspace is not only about seeking new epistemologies, it needs also to address ontological issues. More specifically it is about 'seeking to rebalance the ontological foundations of knowledge formation' (Soja,1996:81). Soja explains that Lefebvre persistently demonstrated that knowledge is

> [n]ot obtained in permanent constructions confidently built around formalised and closed epistemologies, but through an endless series of theoretical and practical approximations, a critical and inquisitive nomadism in which the journeying to new ground never ceases (Soja, 1996:82).

Three important aspects emerge from this extract. Firstly, Soja stresses that

knowledge is not fixed or static; it is constantly developing, changing, moving. Secondly, knowledge is not obtained in 'permanent constructions', which I understand to mean that knowledge does not exist in books, libraries, policies or computers, but rather that it exists in people and in spaces where there are debate, critical exchanges, diverse opinions and constant searching. Lastly, Soja disrupts the binary of theory and practice and places them both as critical to the construction of knowledge.

While most counter-hegemonic traditions (including the liberal tradition based on equity and human rights as well as the cultural politics that uses differences as the basis for community) claim to be open to other alliances, they all construct their own binaries and distinct epistemologies. This results in the ‘production of parallel, analogous and segregated channels of radical political consciousness and subjectivity, each designed and primed to change its own discrete binarized world of difference’ (Soja, 1996:90). Soja believes that thirdspace theorists such as Lefebvre and hooks have ‘open[ed] up new possibilities for radical resistance to all forms of hegemonic subordination’ (1996:92). He believes they have achieved this by constructing what he calls 'thirdspace perspectives' which are characterised by their ability to unsettle cemented notions of difference and seek ‘a transgressive third way’ that is not just the sum of the original binaries but is, in fact, a new way of thinking, one that underscores ambiguity and welcomes contestation, thereby maintaining an openness to alternative possibilities (Soja, 1996:107).

The body is central to any discussion of thirdspace as it is through the actions and voices of the participants that new epistemologies are constructed and reconstructed, and identities are contested and altered. Hooper (in Soja, 1996:114) contends that our bodies are physical spaces made of flesh and bone, chemicals and energies, and they are ‘highly mediated space[s], space[s] transformed by cultural interpretations and representation; [they] are lived space[s]’ (in Soja, 1996:114). Therefore the body is a social space through which knowledges and power are mediated, produced, contested. As Soja claims, ‘the space of the human body is perhaps the most critical site to watch the production and reproduction of power’ (Soja, 1996:114). Particularly apt to

this research is Hooper's observation that during times of social crisis, collective and individual anxieties increase and the politics of difference become especially significant. She cites the example of Rodney King in 1992 in Los Angeles when in the United States the bodies of black males were (and are) demonised and identified as representing 'social disorder and pathology' (Hooper cited in Soja, 1996:115). Where bodies are constructed as deviant and disruptive, they are punished to produce docility and conformity (Foucault, 1977). Foucault's work on disciplining the body is important for understanding how student's bodies are subjected to scrutiny and punishment in the research school.

Having discussed Soja's perspective of thirdspace as a space of vibrant openness and continual change, a space of uncertainty and disruption, it is important to note that his book concludes with the words, 'to be continued…' (1996:320). If an intervention for school change were to be able to facilitate among the staff and management such a privileging of uncertainty and disregard for fixity then it can be regarded as having achieved an important step towards transformation. However, teachers are unlikely to value uncertainty unless they feel safe. Therefore in order to facilitate an understanding of the value of ambiguity and 'chaos', I needed to construct a 'safe space' in the intervention.

2.6.4 Safe Spaces

The notion of 'safe houses', as originally theorised, refers to social and intellectual spaces where groups can share 'high degrees of trust, shared understandings and temporary protection from legacies of oppression' (Pratt 1991:40). Canagarajah (2004) uses the concept of safe houses to capture the *underlife* of students (Goffman, 1961 in Canagarajah, 2004) in institutional contexts who resist dominant discourses by taking up alternative identities and practices. He explains that safe houses in academic institutions are sites that are 'relatively free from surveillance, especially by authority figures, perhaps because these are considered unofficial, off-task, or extra-pedagogical' (2004:121). The notion of a safe house is used to describe the space where the research participants were provided with opportunities to engage in dialogue and to reflect, on a regular basis, on sensitive issues. While it cannot be

regarded as ‘underlife’, ‘unofficial’ or ‘off-task’, it is away from surveillance and it allows the teachers opportunities to share aspects of themselves that are different to those institutionally desired. Another important aspect that allows a space to be safe is its detachment (in terms of space and time) from institutional practices. This enables teachers to have some sense of distance and freedom to explore ideas and imagine previously unthinkable ways of managing difference in their school. It is in the sharing and introspection that the possibilities of thirdspace can emerge.

Having provided literature on difference, on facilitating change in schools and critical reflection, the methodology employed in this study is presented in the following chapter. Chapter three also discusses specific methods selected and the tools used to analyse the generated data.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODS AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 QUALITATIVE METHODOLOGY

'Methodology' refers to a general perspective or approach that is more abstract than methods (Potter, 1996:50). Potter explains that methodology is the strategy for achieving one's goal, whereas the method refers to the tactic or tools one uses to achieve one's goals. Methodology informs how the methods (tools) will be used. A qualitative methodology is my selected approach. At a general level, qualitative approaches focus on meaning-making by humans, usually on ‘texts, institutions and people’ (Potter, 1996:67). Qualitative approaches are often referred to as 'naturalistic' when the focus is on gaining an understanding of people that is meaningful to them (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994). What appears to be common in all definitions of qualitative research is the notion of ‘human-as-instrument’ (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). People, rather than statistics and numbers, are the sources of data to be interpreted.

Since my research works primarily with the teachers' and to some extent the learners' understanding of multiculturalism in their school, a qualitative approach is relevant. Gillborn (1995:178) believes that quantitative methodology, while helpful in revealing broad patterns, ‘is not well suited to piercing the superficial characteristics of schools and rarely illuminates the diverse and changing social processes which underlie the more easily measured outcomes’.

In order to go beyond the superficial aspects of learner integration and to explore the complex social nature of school-based research, a qualitative methodology using an interpretative framework has been applied. Interpretivism, which is based on the importance of understanding people's 'lived experiences within particular contexts’, has long been associated with qualitative

methodology (Ritchie & Lewis, 2003:7). As the name implies, interpretation is a key element in interpretative research in which the researcher aims to give meanings to what is or 'the things that are' beyond the spoken and written accounts that people give. The collected data and the data analysis report the sense that the participants make of their social worlds and of what lies behind and beyond those accounts. The key aim of interpretative research is to ‘capture internal realities that people have constructed’ (Deakin, 1998:45). However it is critical that these 'internal realities' are captured in light of the context and circumstances in which the participants have made these interpretations (Ritchie et al., 2003). So, too. is it important to delineate the researcher's view and the views of the participants, as well as to acknowledge that interpretations are grounded in participants' responses but may be conceptualised and categorised in language that is not their own. Findings can therefore be said to have been mediated through the researcher or agreed between the researcher and research participants (Ritchie et al., 2003:13). My preference is the latter, and in order to achieve an 'agreed interpretation', each participant of this research was sent a first draft of this thesis via email and asked to provide feedback on any issue. However, this 'negotiation' is not unproblematic as there are unequal power relations between the researcher and participants, and participants may feel reluctant to assert their points of view.

Because a research design is designed prior to the data collection phase, a certain amount of flexibility is required in order to account for new understandings and emergent ideas. Using the metaphor of dance, Janesick (2000:379) explains that good qualitative research is much like a choreography that uses a ‘set of procedures that are simultaneously open-ended and rigorous and that do justice to the complexity of the social setting under study’. She expands on this image, explaining that qualitative research, like a choreographer and dancer,

> demands a presence, an attention to detail, and a powerful use of the researcher’s own mind and body in analysis and interpretation of the data. No one can dance your dance (Janesick, 2000:390).

This metaphor succinctly captures the embodied nature of qualitative research as well as the prominent role that the researcher has in the collection, analysis and interpretation of the data.

The role of the researcher in qualitative research needs some discussion as it raises epistemological issues. While it is often advocated, especially in natural science, that the researcher should remain detached and objective towards his/her data, this was difficult in my research which was interventionist, in order to establish to what extent reflection could produce change. Therefore I saw my relationship as the researcher, with the participants, as interactive. Even though I spent a considerable amount of time at the school and with the participants, my position remained that of an outsider.

3.2 CASE STUDY

A case-study approach was chosen in order to facilitate learning enough about a specific case ‘to encapsulate complex meanings’ and ‘describe in sufficient descriptive narrative so that readers could vicariously experience the happenings and draw conclusions’ (Stake, 2000:439). Ritchie et al. (2003:52) explain that the primary defining features of a case are the ’multiplicity of perspectives which are rooted in a specific context’. My case was structured around the examination of the process of change and shifts (or lack thereof) that occurred among my participants, the eight volunteer teachers over a period of 18 months. In addition to this case, the teachers and I constructed a case study within our case: that of an examination of the detention practices at the school.

3.3 RESEARCH SITE

Model C Ordinary, a pseudonym for the chosen school, is an ex-Model C secondary school in a previously 'white' suburb of a city in the Eastern Cape. One of the teachers who heard about my interest in issues of race and identity asked me to consider conducting the research in her school. I approached the headmaster, who granted me permission to speak to his staff in order to invite

volunteers to participate in my research (see information letter, Appendix A). He had recently taken over the leadership of the school on the retirement of the previous headmaster, having been the deputy head for sometime before that. Once he had given permission, I obtained written consent from the local district of education to proceed with the research.

3.4 CHOICE OF PARTICIPANTS

There were 50 staff members at the school. Of these, 45 were white and 5 were black (1 black, 4 coloured). I approached the whole staff during a general meeting and indicated that I was interested in conducting research at their school on issues of difference and equity (in terms of social justice and ensuring fairness) and told them what the research would entail. I asked for between six and eight volunteers to work with me over a period of approximately one year. Seven teachers indicated an interest, citing mainly a desire to improve their own teaching as the reason for volunteering. It was a diverse group in terms of the subjects they taught (mathematics, science, history, art, Xhosa, English, and Afrikaans) but not in terms of race: all seven were white. I was disappointed with this, so I asked one of the heads of department if she could possibly persuade one of the coloured or black teachers to take part. She phoned a coloured male[9] who, after some discussion, agreed to join us. He indicated that he had been thinking about joining the group when he first heard about it. Three of the teachers were heads of departments. A range of teaching experience was evident in the group.

Teachers were given information letters to read (Appendix A) and asked to sign written consent forms (Appendix B). These letters and forms were necessary for ethics clearance that was received from the University of the Witwatersrand.

[9] The only black teacher in the school, an isiXhosa teacher, did not volunteer and when specifically asked to by the HoD, she declined indicating a heavy teaching load as her reason.

The following table (Table 1) provides more details about the teachers.

Table 1. Details of Teachers Involved in the Focus Group

Pseudonym	Home language	Qualification	Age	Gender	Race	Total years taught	Taught at MCO
*Sally	Eng.	BA; BeD; Remedial Dip	52	F	W	30	28
Jenny	Eng./Afr.	BA (Phys Ed) H.D.E	48	F	W	20	10
Suzie	Eng./Afr.	BA:H.D.E	49	F	W	26	8
*Zander	Afr.	BA Hon; H.D.E	43	F	W	22	18
Alison	Eng.	BA;H.D.E	49	F	W	14	6
Emily	Eng.	BA; H.D.E	39	F	W	5	1.5
*Brolox	Eng./Afr.	BA; H.D.E	44	M	W	20	18
Mr. M	Eng.	B.SC.ED	35	M	C	11	1

Note: So-called White (W) and so-called coloured (C)
* Heads of Departments

The differences in terms of gender, age, experience and race in the group were important because they created a micro context that afforded the teachers a space to experience both the challenges and opportunities that difference provides. As the research progressed, various other differences emerged, such as varied political views, different backgrounds and different historical epistemologies. These sometimes resulted in conflict and disagreements that provided opportunities for the group to work through the conflict in order to reach new levels of understanding. It also enabled many of the teachers to better understand the partial and subjective nature of their knowledge.

While all eight teachers started with me in August 2003, by the time the research

was completed in October 2004, only five teachers remained. By the fifth focus group, Zander had become seriously ill and was forced to leave teaching. Jenny chose to leave the group quite soon thereafter because she had decided to pursue her own studies, and Alison left the school to teach at the university towards the end of the research. However, she remained in contact and participated in the second interview. The remaining five teachers continued with the research right to the end and maintained phone contact after the completion of the fieldwork. (See Afterword)

3.5 DATA COLLECTION TECHNIQUES

3.5.1 Interviews

In the context of this research, 'interviews' are understood to be social events that are based upon the mutual participation of the interviewer and the interviewee. This view stresses the socially constituted nature of meaning and of knowledge production and dismisses the view that an interviewer merely elicits answers from an interviewee. Meaning and knowledge are actively produced in the interview encounter and the data generation is collaborative. For Silverman (1997), the primary purpose of an interview is the generation of data that gives an authentic insight into people's experiences. He argues that when the interview is seen as active, the 'subject not only holds the facts and details of experience but in the process of telling them, constructively adds to, takes away from and transforms the facts and details' (Silverman, 1997:114).

According to Kvale (1996:10), developing the interview as a research method involves a challenge to 'renew, broaden and enrich the conceptions of knowledge and research in the social sciences'. Therefore conceiving of the interview as jointly constructed involves both a methodological and an epistemological framework. The knowledge constructed at the particular interview situation cannot be repeated or replicated under different circumstances of production (Silverman, 1997). The interviewer therefore does not attempt to search for the best or most authentic answer but rather aims to

‘systematically activate applicable ways of knowing’ (Silverman, 1997:125).

The interviews with the teachers provided them with their first opportunity to reflect on the changes they had made in their own classrooms as well as the institution in light of the broader educational and political shifts that had taken place in South Africa

3.5.1.1 .Interview with the outgoing headmaster

After having identified Model C Ordinary, I learnt that the headmaster of the school was about to retire. I managed to arrange an interview with him before he left as I felt that it was important to learn more about the school during the transition from being an all-white school prior to 1994 to a truly multicultural school ten years later. He informed me about his successor whom I then contacted for permission to conduct the research.

3.5.1.2 Teacher interviews

In order to find out how teachers understood difference and how they had responded to their changed and changing classrooms, semi-structured, in-depth interviews (Appendix C1) were conducted with each teacher. Questions on reflective practice were included in order to allow for the determination of whether teachers were consciously engaging in reflection about their teaching practices. The interviews were conducted at the school in the afternoons or at the interviewee's home, and they were audio-taped and transcribed.

Those teachers who remained in the group until the end of the data collection phase were re-interviewed 18 months later, once the focus group meetings had been completed. (See Appendix C2 for the second interview schedule). The main purpose of the second interview was to encourage them to reflect critically on their participation in the intervention and to ascertain whether their views on difference had changed during the course of the intervention. I also wanted to understand how they had experienced the focus groups. Teachers were

questioned on which theories or tasks they had found useful in encouraging reflection and their general impressions of the intervention in which they had participated. Finally they were asked to discuss any changes that they had themselves facilitated or that they noticed in the school that could have been a result of the intervention.

3.5.1.3 Learner interviews

It was only decided to interview learners when the issue of the disproportionate number of black learners in detention emerged. In order to understand detention from the learners' points of view, I felt that it was essential to hear what they had to say about being placed in detention so regularly. This required me to obtain ethics clearance from my university before any interviewing could proceed. Once information letters and letters of consent had been approved, I selected the interviewees. This selection was based on the statistics of those learners who were given detention in excess of 10 times in 2003. 43 learners were identified. Each of these learners was sent an information sheet with interview questions and a consent form to be signed by them and a parent/guardian (Appendix D1). This document was translated into isiXhosa and parents/guardians were sent both an English and an isiXhosa version (Appendix D2). A total of 15 slips were returned. One of these slips was from a white male learner; six were from black male learners, and eight from black female learners.

Group interviews were conducted (Appendix E) and the learners were split according to race and gender in the hope that this arrangement would make it less threatening to talk about sensitive issues. In addition, the interviews were conducted in the learners' mother tongue. As a result, I interviewed the only white male, while a black female colleague interviewed the females in isiXhosa, and a black male colleague interviewed the males in isiXhosa. All interviews were taped and transcribed, and the isiXhosa interviews were translated by the female interviewer, an isiXhosa lecturer.

In order to provide for triangulation of the data, the teacher in charge of

detention (Butch) was interviewed and all the documentation pertaining to discipline and detention at Model C Ordinary was examined. All the data generated from the detention provided the basis for the case-within-the-case.

3.5.2 Focus groups

The focus group is a ‘collectivist rather than individualistic research method that focuses on the multivocality of participants' attitudes, experiences and beliefs’ (Madriz, 2000:836). Focus groups allow researchers to observe collective human interaction and participation and have been shown to be more gratifying for the participants than individual interviews. Greenbaum, (1998) claims the most important benefit to be gained from using focus groups is the interaction between the participants. He believes the synergy of a group is greater than the additive value of individuals, and focus groups create a more complex picture of an issue. Jayanthi and Nelson (2002:2) concur, saying that the real strength of focus groups is that one gains insight into people’s reasons for responses. They cite three aspects of focus groups that allow for this, the first being the open-endedness of the discussion. The second is the assumption that participants are more willing to share views in the security of a group, and the last is that the atmosphere in a focus group is usually one of discussion and sharing rather than of interviewing.

Focus groups were critical to this research, as it was during this dialogic space with the teachers that they were afforded opportunities to discuss and reflect on their institution and on their colleagues’ understandings of the practices of Model C Ordinary. In this research group, interviews were differentiated from focus groups. The group interview consisted of interviewers asking structured questions to a group of participants such as the learners, to gain information about the detention system.

At this stage it is important for me to elaborate on my intervention and the role I played in it.

3.5.2.1 Role of the researcher

I understand 'critical reflection' to refer firstly to the process of placing what one says and does (in the classroom and school) as well as the institutional norms one partakes in, under intense scrutiny. This scrutiny would need to be framed within an acknowledgement of the some of the following:

- The violent and cruel history of apartheid, through which beliefs, ways of talking and being, assumptions, actions and habits have been acquired
- The relative newness of democracy in South Africa and the limited number of models of good practice in school integration that exist in South Africa currently.
- The need to reflect on how our perceptions and ways of seeing the world are personal and drawn from our own histories. As such there are alternative interpretations that are equally valid and important. This is particularly important given the separatist nature of apartheid
- The ongoing effects of apartheid on different sectors of schooling in terms of resources, teacher training, institutional cultures and teaching practices
- The role of language in terms of identity and issues of second language learning
- The effects of norms and their attendant practices on learners' identities
- The need to recognise that practices, traditions and 'norms' that existed in the school prior to desegregation are those of a particular group and may be inappropriate for other groups of learners
- The understanding that many traditions in ex-Model-c schools are rooted in colonial and Christian Higher Education, which may be in contradiction to principles of equity and democracy.

Having to position one's own understandings in a broader context can reveal personal, social and political investments, which can be threatening and difficult. Therefore it is necessary to ensure that reflection occurs in what is referred to in this thesis as a 'safe space'. By this I mean a space that encourages honesty and openness while retaining a focus on working towards practices that are non-discriminatory and which promote equity. It is also a space that is non-threatening, where teachers can experiment and make mistakes but where

[10]unfair statements or stereotypical assumptions are challenged. Safe spaces usually imply that support exists for the participants if they need it. However the issue of support within a critically reflective space needs to be problematised. Firstly, support can be provided by various sources, including colleagues in a group, colleagues outside of the group, the headteacher and management and the researcher/facilitator of the process. Each of these sources can provide different forms and levels of support. Colleagues within the group can be expected to support each other in the sense of regularly attending the reflective meetings and providing honest yet constructive feedback. The headteacher can provide support by giving teachers the time and space to meet and also the freedom and professional respect to truly question practices without fear of reprisals[11]. The researcher can provide support by setting up the reflective space initially, providing sufficient stimuli to enable teachers to question, learn, challenge, disagree and agree. The researcher will also need to provide support when the content of reflection becomes painful and emotional. This support can be in the form of providing a platform where the participant can be listened to through a medium such as a personal journal or telephone. While support usually connotes characteristics of assistance, encouragement and moral support, it is important that supporting a participant in the critically reflective process does not necessarily mean agreeing with the participant's contribution.

I understood my role as initiating the intervention to include:

- Organising a place and space for regular meetings
- Creating a space that was safe. This involved, among other things, a negotiated set of rules that each participant agreed to adhere to
- Ensuring that teachers were well informed about times, places, changes, etc
- Providing a focus for each meeting or developing a focus which emerged from the teachers
- Facilitating discussion/interaction/debate around critical

[10] 'Unfairness' in this instance refers to comments that discriminate or prejudice certain people or groups of people. Agreeing on ground rules before commencing reflection clarifies goals and aims and facilitates easier communication.

[11] The lack of this aspect of support proved to be an extremely powerful barrier to the teachers' willingness and motivation for reflecting critically on issues of race, gender and class.

issues that emerged
- Encouraging teachers to listen to each other, especially when alternative views were being expressed
- Providing a space where conflicting views were allowed and encouraged
- Ensuring that sensitive issues were discreetly handled and that teachers were given a space to talk through painful and difficult subjects. This also involved me engaging with teachers by phone or through their journals when they requested it
- Providing reading material and tasks that encouraged debate and critical reflection (a list of these appears later in this section)
- Directing discussion so that the focus groups did not simply become 'complain sessions'. This also involved me explicitly stating my disagreement with remarks that were racist, sexist, classist or discriminatory of any kind. Usually I asked for comments from the other teachers when such a comment was uttered and if other teachers did not highlight the discrimination, then I would do so
- Probing beliefs and assumptions to draw attention to the impact of history, culture, social investments and background on these beliefs
- Using theoretical perspectives to highlight or explain certain issues or concepts
- Using the discussion as a starting point to encourage teachers to develop strategies to promote more equitable practices in the school
- Promoting a space for hybrid ideas and for 're-visioning' where new ideas and ways could be imagined
- Providing a space in which the bodies and minds of teachers, their ways of being and their epistemologies could begin to transform ways of thinking about their social reality.

As is clear from the list above, I could not position myself as a neutral researcher. I was explicitly encouraging the teachers to critically identify customs, norms and traditions in their school which were discriminatory, so that they could work on ways to improve them or shift their perspectives. However, I strove to be objective at all times and only provided my view of incidents during the focus group when specifically asked. This often caused frustration from the participants who sometimes pressurised me to provide them with 'easy answers'. When placed under such pressure I would ask them what they thought were possible solutions to consider. The relationship between the participants and me, as well as the purpose of my research, closely resembled

key aspects of action research. Reason and Bradbury (2006: xxii) explain that action research usually responds to practical and critical issues in the lives of people in organisations, and that its purpose is to engage with these people to open up dialogue and development. Furthermore they suggest that action research is strongly value-oriented and that it is a 'living, emergent process which cannot be predetermined but changes and develops as those engaged deepen their understanding of the issues to be addressed'. Heron and Reason (2006:145) argue that action research includes the notion of co-operative enquiry, so that research is conducted *with* people rather than *on* people. This is based on the belief that traditional research 'doesn't help people find out how to act to change things in their lives'. While I share many ideological and philosophical notions of action research, my research design does not follow the traditional action research cycle of a 'self-reflective spiral of planning, acting, observing, reflecting and re-planning' with the purpose of improving one's own practice (McNiff, 1988:7). Therefore my methods are more in keeping with educational intervention research, where the focus is on developing and assessing interventions to address an area of concern (Pressley, Graham & Harris, 2006:1). Pressley et al. (2006:6) explain that qualitative research methodologies can provide 'detailed portraits of how an intervention can be delivered, the challenges in doing so, and the rich array of outcomes and relationships that might be influenced by the intervention'. These insights, they argue, can produce new theories that are grounded in data. What they leave out, however, is the need to describe the process of constructing an intervention. For me this was a critical aspect of my research, as was the need to describe and problematise my role as researcher.

One of the first aspects I needed to clarify with the participants was that I did not position myself as someone who would provide solutions and answers to their problems regarding difference in their school. Rather I wanted to work with them to understand their problems and encourage them to critically reflect on ways in which the current school practices and discourses possibly worked to position both them and the learners in ways that promoted inequity and discrimination. That my intention was to encourage teachers to be more critical and aware of naturalised practices in their school that were unjust and to work towards

changing these, needed to be explicitly stated from the onset of the research. This subject position of activist produced ongoing challenges for me in all stages of the research: data collection, interpretation and the eventual 'writing up'. Comber, (1996:8) claims that ‘questions about ways in which researcher biographies and subjectivities intersect with and affect research practices do not have neat answers’ She therefore suggests that researchers should aim for self-reflexivity. This, she explains, treats the researcher's position and interpretative frames as problematic and open to contestation. Apart from foregrounding where I explicitly influenced processes I, like Comber, asked participants to read through my first draft of the thesis and to provide feedback. This they did. In addition to providing written feedback, I met with three of the teachers to discuss their feedback.

As well as ‘self consciously contextualising the claims, description, interpretations, explanations of selections’ (Comber,1996:9), I now describe the strategies used in the intervention.

3.5.2.2 Strategies used in the intervention

Over the period of 18 months new issues and concerns emerged from the teachers that needed to be addressed more thoroughly. This required of me to be constantly open and sensitive to the groups' needs as perceived by me, as well as those raised specifically by the participants. In order to address these issues and initiate discussions around the topics, I provided relevant readings of a theoretical or practical nature or I designed tasks to stimulate alternative views or discussion. What follows is a list of the issues that were identified as needing to be interrogated, and the strategy that was used to stimulate reflection and discussion. These issues arose during the initial interviews with the teachers and in the focus groups.

Table 2: Resources used for intervention

Topics/ concerns	Strategies/ tasks	Purpose
Absence of race and class in TOP TEN results	Provided a diversity grid (Appendix F) which participants filled in and discussed	To make visible the importance of race and class (as well as gender) when discussing academic achievement of particular groups.
Absence/reluctance to talk about class issues	Also addressed by grid	To initiate a discussion on the role of class in desegregated schools
Lack of empathy with disadvantaged learners	Reading an article by Fullan (1999) on the need for schools to uplift poorer communities	To stress the importance of making school accessible and enjoyable for all learners and not just a few. To foreground the difficulties of making such shifts
Essentialising race, gender and culture and use of stereotypes	Prompted discussion on common stereotypes and ways to disrupt them. Asked each participant to be aware of stereotypes they might draw on.	To disrupt fixed views of people and to introduce the notion of multiplicity and fluidity.
Racist and insensitive jokes	Worksheet on humour (Appendix G)	To sensitise participants to the ways prejudice could be perpetuated through seemingly trivial remarks and so-called humorous comments.
Disproportionate number of black learners in detention	Obtained detention records and copied them. Organised interviews with learners, set up a meeting with management to discuss problem. Drew up a report handed to participants and headmaster.	To initiate reflection on the ways that the naturalised practice of detention was racist and gendered and to stimulate views on possible alternatives to this system.
Assimilationist practices and traditions (Xhosa evening, valedictory and prize-giving and rules and regulations of behaviour)	Summary of different approaches to multiculturalism and discussion on them. Discussion of Lisa Delpit's view of discipline.	To prompt reflection on traditions and practices that favoured white, middleclass learners. To think of alternative practices that are more inclusive and representative of the diverse learner body.
Difficulty in changing and making shifts	Gillborn reading, racism in real schools. Discussion on reading.	To provide examples of positive change.
Disempowerment of teachers and gender roles.	Discussion of staff meetings and ways of creating spaces for more open discussion. Reading on gender in the classroom (Dale Spender)	To get teachers to start to talk about gendered and institutionalised practices that worked against their identities as professionals.

It was hoped that through lively discussions, more awareness would be created as well as ideas and strategies for facilitating change.

3.5.2.3 Assessment of intervention

An essential aspect of intervention research is the need to evaluate or assess the impact of the intervention on the participants or the context. Pressley et al. (2006) believe that the more implementation data collected, the better the chance of explaining why interventions work relative to their conditions or why they fail. Evaluating the impact/success of the intervention in my research provided some challenges. Since the aim of my intervention was to encourage critical reflection of issues of difference, I needed evidence that my participants had engaged in critical reflection with the view of promoting increased equity in their school and classroom. While it was hoped that the critical reflection would ultimately lead to material changes, it was not part of my design to assess the material impact of this reflection. However I have included short vignettes at the end of this thesis to describe some incidents that occurred at the school after I had left, which particular participants believe were an indirect result of my intervention. (See Afterword).

I needed to have evidence of critical reflection among my participants. This I generated in two ways. Firstly I indicated shifts in the discourses of the participants. (See 2.5 for explanation of discourse). Shifts in language usually represent shifts in meaning and related shifts in subjectivities and identities. Therefore I firstly identified patterns of meaning through critical discourse analysis and particular reference to use of metaphors at the beginning of the intervention. Thereafter I traced shifts, disruptions and ruptures in those patterns in the transcripts of the 13 focus groups. These shifts and ruptures I took as indications of shifts in meaning. Additionally I identified essentialised representations of difference, and traced shifts that suggested a more nuanced

understanding of notions of race, class, gender, culture and language.

The other way of providing evidence of critical reflection was through the use of the second interviews conducted with the teachers. Here they were asked to assess and discuss what they felt they had achieved during the intervention, and identify particular shifts in understanding that they might have experienced. Since self-reporting is not entirely dependable, I needed to compare their own interpretations with those of colleagues as well as the shifts indicated in their talk.

3.5.3 Field notes

Notes and interpretations after each visit to the school were recorded, as well as each phone call or email received. These notes allowed for cross checks to be conducted (Janesick, 2000:393) with the entries from the teachers' journals (See 3.5.4) and with the transcripts of the focus groups. Notes were also taken after informal discussions held at the school. Each entry was dated and the events and contents of discussions included, together with my interpretations of the events. The field notes proved to be extremely useful, especially for clarifying the content of transcripts.

3.5.4 Journals

The act of journal writing is a ‘rigorous documentary tool’ which assists in focusing the researcher and participants on the project (Janesick, 2000:392). The teachers in the focus groups were asked to keep regular journals of their participation in the research. A few of the teachers were diligent and never failed to make an entry after a meeting, but many either forgot or only made occasional entries. I asked to read the journals on three different occasions and noted that most of the entries were summaries of the readings given, or else teachers had glued the worksheet or summary into their journal without any comment. I responded only to direct questions or comments that the teachers posed through their journals and not to their own reflections. This frustrated one of the participants, who wrote:

> I do not feel motivated to comment in my journal since it feels as though I am communicating with a void. I have learned how people think but I require feedback on my thoughts as to whether I am on the right track or totally irrational. I take the time to sit and formulate my thoughts -- surely time can be taken for comment.

I wrote back to this participant explaining that as a researcher I was not positioned to evaluate her thinking or actions but rather to create a space to encourage her to reflect and document these reflections.

A great deal of joking about the journals transpired as the teachers teased each other for not doing their 'homework', and they would jokingly send the 'perpetrator' to detention. The journals also became a standard joke in the group because the only two males who participated in the research were particularly prone to forgetting to write in their journals and were always trying to make elaborate excuses. This led to comments about 'typical males' and often served as a good icebreaker before meetings.

3.5.5 Observations

3.5.5.1 Classroom observations

At the first focus group, I informed teachers that I would be happy to observe any of their classes on request. Four teachers took up this offer, two language teachers, and two mathematics teachers. Two consecutive lessons in each of their classes were observed. Three of the teachers were happy to simply have me observe their classes in order to ‘get a feel' for the dynamics in the classrooms. One of the teachers, Alison, asked that her classes be observed as she was concerned that she spent a disproportionate amount of time on the black learners to the detriment of the white learners. She also encouraged discussion of the findings with the other focus group teachers with the idea of sharing what she had learnt from the observation (See 6.8).

3.5.5.2 Event observations

Invitations were issued to me by the participants to attend the following events that occurred at the school:

- Oracy Day, a contest of oral presentations
- The isiXhosa evening, which was an evening of celebration of the isiXhosa culture
- The Valedictory event, a farewell to the matriculants and their parents.

Attending the Oracy Day gave me an insight into topics that the selected speakers had chosen as well as the dynamics among the learners assembled in the school hall. Being able to attend the isiXhosa evening and the Valedictory was important as these events had been highlighted as being problematic to some of the teacher participants and I wanted to see the events for myself. I also wanted to see if any significant changes were made to the traditions, as the teachers who co-ordinated these events were both participants in the research and they might have taken the opportunity to implement shifts in their respective events.

3.6 VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

Silverman (2000) warns that it is not good enough to tell ‘convincing stories’ and that qualitative research must be valid and reliable. Kirk and Miller (1986 in Silverman, 2000: 34) argue that for reliability to be calculated, it is incumbent on the researcher to document her procedure. Miller (in Silverman, 1997:25) suggests that ‘bridging’ is a more appropriate approach to use in qualitative research than triangulation to achieve validity, because it uses several methodological strategies to link aspects of different sociological perspectives rather than discovering some ‘fact’ about a single social reality. In my research, validity was achieved by the use of multiple methods of data generation to achieve 'bridging'. For the intervention I used teacher interviews, focus groups, field notes and journals to link the various perspectives. In the case-within-the-case, I validated the information by using the learner interviews as well as the detention records. I also interviewed the teacher in charge of detention.

Furthermore, what was generated during these interviews was discussed during a focus group with the teacher participants. If a teacher disagreed with what had been said by a learner, he or she was asked to provide a motivation for this disagreement and the other teachers indicated whether or not they felt the 'dissenting' teacher had a point. Any such 'dissentions' are indicated in this research.

Reliability of data generated in the form of transcribed focus groups was achieved by the teachers having an opportunity to read through the transcripts to assess if they were accurate records of what had been discussed[12]. Their discussions during the focus groups of what was happening at their school were taken to be valid in the sense that there were never fewer than five teachers present during a focus group. If an observation or claim was made about the school by one of the teachers and no one disagreed or contested the claim, I took it as being an indication of validity. The difference in the group, in terms of seniority and range of subjects taught suggested to me there was sufficient representation to accept the validity of the claims. This referred to factual information about events, traditions, and practices in the school. My observation of events at the school also served to validate certain claims and comments. However, there were obviously contradictory views about more subjective issues such as whether or not the school was treating all learners fairly and whether or not the school had made substantial efforts to promote integration of learners from all race and class groups. I took as valid individual comments on subjective issues since I understand individual perceptions to be socially and historically constituted. Since my research focuses on the importance of understanding the value of difference and one of my goals was to generate different and often contradictory views of practices, I placed a high value on varied personal responses. The more contested views I obtained, the richer the understanding I gained of the complex nature of school desegregation/integration.

[12] I transcribed all interview data and focus group data. The isiXhosa transcripts were transcribed and translated by an isiXhosa colleague. A second isiXhosa colleague verified the translations.

To ensure that my interpretations of the data were valid, I obtained feedback from the participants on the first draft of this thesis. I attended to any suggested changes and concerns.

3.7 CODING OF DATA

References made to 'raw' data will be accompanied by a code that indicates the origin of the data. The codes are as follows:

Table 3: Coding of Data

FG 1; FG2, FG3…	Focus group one, two, and so forth
i1PH	Previous headmaster interview
i1A; i1MM; i1J…	Interview First (1) initial of pseudonym of participant
i2A; i2MM; i2J…	Interview Second (2) initial of pseudonym of participant
OA; OMM; OZ…	Observation (O) initial of pseudonym of teacher being observed.
Mtg1	Meeting with management about detention
FN (date)	Field notes and dates of entry
LFG	Learner focus group interview

3.8 OVERVIEW OF THE 13 FOCUS GROUPS

In order for readers to have some sense of the contents of each focus group meeting and a feel for the richness and intensity of what occurred in the focus group space, as well as a sense of the flow of ideas, a brief overview of the 13 meetings is now given

FG 1 involved getting to know one another and setting up ground rules for participation; a discussion of the main issues that emerged from the interviews ensued; the diversity grid (Appendix F) was introduced to assist teachers with identifying the top and bottom achievers according to their race, gender and class. The grid was discussed and many different views emerged about why some learners do well and some learners do not do well.

FG 2 involved discussion and feedback about the diversity grid. The first conflict in the group emerged from participants' difficulties in discussing issues of class. Some teachers remained behind after the session and an emotional discussion took place about the need to be honest and accept different views. One teacher cried as she spoke about how difficult it was to talk about issues of class and race.

FG 3 involved discussion of a reading by Fullan (1999) that had been given to teachers to read over the holidays. The rule of English-only in the school was discussed as well as Fullan's view that a school's major goal is to uplift a disadvantaged community. The recent Valedictory event at the school was heatedly debated. The identification of the school detention system was discussed as being unfairly discriminating against black learners, and for the first time this emerged as a possible focus for the group.

FG 4 involved feedback about participation in the research thus far. Discussions concerned teachers' discomfort with and difficulty in engaging with sensitive issues like race, class and culture. Criticism of the isiXhosa cultural evening was expressed. One of the teachers, once she had left the group, was referred to as 'sandpaper' because she was always 'rubbing things up the wrong way'.

FG 5 was a discussion of Gillborn's (1995) reading. An examination of the detention records was conducted, and some teachers indicated that detention was not an issue and that latecomers were skewing the results. The group questioned the use of 'British' traditions at the school and some of the things that had changed at the school recently. Debate about stereotypes and how male and female teachers were managed differently in the school took place.

Incidents of racism in the school were also discussed.

FG 6 involved discussions about the detention list. Since many teachers felt that the large number of latecomers on the list was skewing the results, I re-analysed the records and removed all the learners who had been given detention for latecoming. The results still indicated a disproportionate number of black and male learners. There was an indication from one of the teachers that she found the discussions uncomfortable and a bit like the Truth and Reconciliation (TRC) meetings. A racist incident that had occurred in a school in Cape Town was also discussed.

FG 7 involved coming to terms with the news that Alison was leaving the school and that Jenny had decided to leave the group. A general discussion ensued about black learners in white schools and some of the issues they faced. I reported back to the group on a presentation I had given at the LED conference in New Zealand about some of the findings emerging from this research. We decided to interview learners who were given frequent detentions as well as the management of the school, in order to understand the detention system and to suggest possible methods to improve the situation. We discussed what the primary focus of the meeting should be and I wrote it down and read it aloud to the group to check that I had represented their views accurately.

Two weeks later, a meeting with three representatives of the management of the school (headmaster, deputy headmaster, and the teacher in charge of detention) and all eight teachers was held In the school library. The request was made that the school begin slightly later in order to accommodate the learners from outlying areas. The request was refused. The meeting was intense, and the teachers who had been very vocal on the matter of detention in the focus group were particularly silent in this meeting. The day after the meeting, the deputy headmaster announced to the staff that they were not to be told by outsiders what to do in their school, and that they were to be ‘arrogant’ about their own ability to manage school affairs. A few teachers phoned me that evening to inform me about what had been announced.

FG 8 discussed the meeting held with management. Teachers were extremely vocal and were upset about the comment from the deputy. A long discussion ensued about the authoritarian nature of staff meetings and the teachers' lack of agency. Teachers also commented on their limited participation in the meeting with the management the previous day and how intimidated they had felt. A discussion about the role of sport in the school followed, and Suzie shared an experience she had previously had with management, which she felt had been mishandled.

FG 9 included a discussion about an oral that a black pupil had presented in class that satirised race issues in SA. A discussion about gender issues and the role of reading in academic achievement ensued. Teachers were given feedback on Alison's classroom observation and the group discussed gender and racial stereotyping. Also discussed was how different cultural groups might have different ideas about discipline and showing respect. The discussion included Delpit's (1995) *Other People's Children*. Teachers discussed a recent incident that had occurred in the school where press photographs had been taken of the soccer team. Teachers were informed that they had to ensure that the racial make-up of each team being photographed was 60% white. This was apparently to alleviate parents' views that the school was becoming 'too black'.

FG 10 included a discussion of the interviews to be held with the learners who were given detention frequently. Questions for the interviews were shared with the teachers and they commented on the questions and made suggestions about adding or taking out some of the questions. The issue of 'rocking the boat' and the implications thereof were discussed. Discussion about some of the school rules, the lack of dignity given to teachers, and 'talking up' in staff meetings followed.

FG 11 included me giving the group my written report on the learners' interviews and we discussed the findings. Teachers were also given a transcript of their own interviews. They seemed concerned at how 'incoherently' they had come across. We also discussed the need to present a summary of our discussions to the whole staff.

FG 12 included a discussion about the all-white Latecomers Committee. Discussions ensued about group work and the difficulties inherent in group work, as well as Outcomes-Based Education (OBE) and how to involve the whole school in reflecting on issues. An invitation to attend the isiXhosa evening at the school was given to me.

FG 13 focused on discussions about the feedback we wanted to give to the whole staff. The teachers found this idea very intimidating and were concerned that the critical insights they had gained would not be welcome at the school. Dates were chosen on which the teachers could be interviewed for a second time.

A week later we presented a summarised version of our focus groups to the whole staff, and at the request of the participants, we focused on gender issues and not on race. The staff responded enthusiastically as well as aggressively. Many male teachers spoke loudly and passionately, insisting that they never discriminated on the basis of gender.

Having provided a brief outline of the focus group discussions, I now discuss how the data was selected and analysed.

3.9 SELECTION OF DATA

The information generated by the transcriptions of two sets of teacher interviews, transcripts of group learner interviews, field notes, journal entries, transcripts of the 13 focus groups and of the meeting with the management as well as the detention records and observation notes produced an extensive amount of data. Bearing in mind that the ‘whole story exceeds anyone's knowing, anyone's telling’ (Stakes, 2000:441) and Silverman's (2000) advice to say a lot about a little rather than a little about a lot, **I** needed to identify criteria for selecting data. The criteria I eventually decided on were the following. Firstly I referred to the number of times an issue was raised as well as the response to

that issue by the other participants. Next I assessed which issues the teachers seemed to hold onto as well as the number of other participants who seemed interested in that issue. This was assessed by the number and length of responses by the teachers in the focus group. The amount of emotion and passion shown towards a subject or topic also served as an important criterion. Additionally, I looked for issues and trends that indicated patterns and continuities as well as ruptures. Lastly, I selected issues that had the potential of being taken up by the whole staff and management of the school.

Since all of the above criteria were considered important, issues meeting most of the criteria were selected. I also chose to disregard the journal entries from the teachers because of the inconsistent manner in which they had been completed.

3.10 ANALYSIS OF DATA

Fairclough (1992) argues that changing one's discourse practices contributes to a change in one's knowledge (including beliefs and common sense), one's social relations, and one's social identities. Shifts in the discourses of the group of teachers as they developed new knowledge and insights into the complexity of difference in their school were identified. Drawing mainly on the social and constitutive nature of discourse, a content analysis of interview data and transcripts was first conducted in order to identify major themes or categories for analysis.

Aware of the criticism that content analysis can ‘reify the taken-for-granted understandings persons bring to words, terms or experiences’ and ‘obscure the interpretative processes that turn talk into text’ (Denzil & Lincoln, 2000:640), certain themes were complemented with other analytical methods. These included aspects of discourse analysis, such as lexicalisation, transitivity analysis and the use of pronouns, metaphors and information focus as suggested by Fairclough (1992), Kamler (1997), and Janks (1997). In addition to the use of critical discourse analysis, Foucault's (1977:24) notions of power, the

'concrete systems of punishment' and the 'management of subjectivity' (Rose, 1989) were deployed to assist with the interpretation of the data. Table 4 provides more detail with regard to the selection of analytical methods.

Table 4: Data Collection and Analysis Techniques

Data Collection Technique	Analysis
Teacher Interviews	• Critical discourse analysis: lexical choice to describe difference; euphemisms and absences – de-racialised texts and essentialising of certain categories. • Information focus: which aspects of difference are foregrounded and which are excluded. • Use of pronouns to ascertain the use of 'us and them' constructions and how diverse groups are positioned in relation to the 'norm'.
Focus group transcripts	• Trace development of information focus. What issues are chosen and why? What happens because of the focus on these issues? How are conflicts managed? • Trace shifts in discourse and changes and developments in relations between group members. • Trace instances of reflection and of the content of the reflection as well as the silences around certain issues. • Analysis of metaphors: using metaphors to analyse attitudes and positions. Do the metaphors construct particular patterns of meaning? • Continuities and ruptures • What evidence is there of change in thinking? • What actions, both individual and collective (for example, in the group and in their classes) have occurred because of the intervention? • Are there shifts in relationships as a result of the intervention?
Learner interviews Documents about detention and discipline in the school.	• Text analysis: Information focus. • Use of technologies or mechanisms of control. • The construction and contestation of normalisation.

Final teacher Interviews	• Text analysis: information focus – are there traces of new discourses which suggest more nuanced interpretations of difference as being more fluid and less essentialised? • A content analysis to indicate what they have highlighted and foregrounded as being pivotal in their reflection. • What has been excluded? • Lexical and pronoun changes indicating shifts in power relations and attitudinal shifts.

3.11 ANALYTICAL TOOLS

My primary analytical tool is critical discourse analysis with a particular focus on the use of metaphors and lexicalisation. Janks (1997) explains that critical discourse analysis stems from a critical theory of language, which sees language as a form of social practice that is situated within a historical and political context. Social practices (including language practices) are a means by which existing social relations are reproduced or contested. Therefore when using critical discourse analysis, one focuses on 'specific linguistic selections, their juxtapositioning, and their sequencing' (Janks,1997:329) to examine issues of power relations and the positioning of subjects. Once positions are identified, one can determine whose interests are served by these positions, whose interests are negated, and the consequences of this positioning (Janks, 1997:329). In particular I will use Janks'rubric of key linguistic features (Janks, 2005b).

My reason for focusing primarily on metaphors is a result of the widespread and repeated use of metaphors during the teacher interviews and the focus group data. An analysis of metaphorical constructions enabled me to identify historically and socially produced meanings that had achieved prominence in the group. A focus on metaphors and lexical items also provides insight into subject positions that were constituted and contested by the teachers throughout the focus groups, and shifts in positions that occurred during the process of participation.

2.11.1 Use of metaphors

People's everyday language includes idiomatic expressions, local phrases and figurative language. While engaged in oral communication, they draw on the available linguistic resources constructed through ordinary speech, the media and popular culture. As Janks (2005), who drew on the work of Bourdieu (1991) and Gadamer (1976), explains, when people use language in the spoken form, the focus is on the meaning, not the form. In thinking of meaning one unconsciously uses the available discourse resources and so people 'rely on the common ways of "saying" in [their] communities' and these 'shared ways of representing truth, of being in the world, of thinking, of believing and of valuing, are the discourses [they] inhabit' (Janks, 2005:2). This is perturbing if one thinks that many of the older teachers currently in ex-Model-c schools were educated during the height of apartheid and that the language of racism and oppression forms part of their background. Unless explicitly challenged, expressions and 'turns of phrase' from the apartheid era would have occupied a substantial part of their understanding and identity during a formative period of their lives. Therefore many might unconsciously draw on apartheid discourses to make meaning of their current context.

Common ways of saying include metaphors and figurative expressions that frame and shape their understandings of the world. Because metaphors manage to describe conceptual ideas rather than discrete words**,** they are particularly useful in representing the cumulative effects of people's perceptions of reality. Bhabha (1994:141), in his discussion of the difficulty of representing the story of a nation, talks about the power of 'metaphoricity' to renounce the notion of singular representations. Metaphors contain a richness of imagery that captures the complexity of representation and limits the tendency to present interpretations as unitary and fixed.

Lakoff and Johnson (1980:3) argue that metaphors form a fundamental aspect of thinking and being. Metaphors not only represent or illustrate people's

understandings and meaning; they also influence how and what people think. In other words, what people think influences what they say and do, how they behave and how they perceive the world. People's conceptual system is

> fundamentally metaphorical in nature. The concepts that govern our thought are not just matters of the intellect. They also govern our everyday functioning, down to the most mundane details…Our conceptual system thus plays a central role in defining our everyday realities' (Lakoff et al., 1980:3).

Lakoff et al., (1980) suggest that people do not think in individual words so much as in chunks or groups of words. Often these chunks are structured metaphorically and they lead to general principles that involve whole systems of words rather than single words.

Metaphors not only represent or illustrate people's meaning; they also *shape their further understanding* of what has been illustrated and how they talk about that object, experience or process. Metaphors therefore provide people with ways of seeing the world, and metaphors can 'restructure perceptions or create a perceptual shift so that an object is "framed" differently, producing a new mental construction' (Weiner, 1992:12). It was hoped that during the focus groups, the participating teachers would explore metaphors other than the ones they regularly used so as to provide alternative ways of speaking about and therefore thinking about differences.

Metaphors also 'highlight and hide certain meanings' (Lakoff et al., 1980:25). They can construct and popularise specific meanings even when they are not true. The frequently-cited metaphor of a 'rainbow nation' in South Africa clearly illustrates this point. The image of a colourful unified rainbow foregrounds the positive aspects of the new democracy in South Africa. The unification of the different colours highlights the positive achievements South Africa while at the same time ignoring another aspect of the metaphor, the separateness and inflexible position of the colours denoting the lack of social integration and the growing separation between the rich and poor.

Despite the usefulness of lexical and metaphorical analysis for much of the data, it was insufficient as a tool to help make sense of the case-study-within-this-

case-study, the detention system at the school. For the data on detention, I needed something that helped to explain the meticulous control and regulatory systems put in place to discipline the learners constructed as deviant. This help was found in the work of Michel Foucault (1977) whose theories on disciplinary institutions provides an elaborate description and analysis of the details of regulatory practices. Foucault stresses the importance of details, as it was through the ‘meticulousness of the regulations, the fussiness of the inspections, the supervision of the smallest fragment of life and of the body’ (Foucault, 1977:140) that the means for regulation and inscribed discipline are provided.

2.11.2 Foucault and disciplinary measures

Foucault argues that an analysis of the ‘concrete systems of punishment’ (1977:24) needs to be viewed as a social phenomenon situated within networks of power in which the technologies of discipline produce a ‘body of knowledge that is accumulated and centralised’ (Foucault, 1977:231). Rather than analyse the 'truth' of the constructed knowledge, it is more useful to examine the ways in which truths are realised through concepts, rules, authorities, procedures, methods and techniques (Rose, 1989:Introduction). Instead of attempting to establish which 'truth' is truer, Rose suggests we *examine under which conditions* these 'truths' come to be accepted and normalised. Rose (1989: introduction) further explains that uncovering the histories of ‘our present certainties – about what we know, who we are, and how we should act’ (historical epistemologies) enables people to understand *how* they are socially constructed, rather than just acknowledging that they *are* socially constructed. In order to ‘reconstruct the epistemological field that allows certain things to be considered true at particular historical moments’ (Rose, 1989:xiv), he advises that the material and practical conditions under which explanations come to be formulated and accepted need to be described. Therefore my attempt to describe the disciplinary regimes at Model C Ordinary was an attempt to create awareness among the participating teachers and managers of their own historical epistemologies. This, I hoped, would allow them to recognise how the

conditions under which they operate produce certain explanations, which they can then reproduce or contest.

The Instruments of control and discipline at Model C Ordinary include hierarchical observation, normalisation, judgement, individualisation, and surveillance. Those students who are seen to depart from the rules or who choose non-conformity are open to punishment. Yet Foucault explains that it is not so much the act that is disciplined as the *individuals themselves*; 'by assessing acts with precision, discipline judges individuals "in truth"; the penalty that it implements is integrated into the cycle of knowledge of individuals' (Foucault, 1977:181). Often instruments of control work to regulate the bodies of the students. Disciplinary measures in schools such as regulations on punctuality, how learners should wear their hair, how they should dress, how and where they should walk, how they should greet teachers and how they should talk and laugh and smile, give teachers immense power over the learners' bodies. This power allows teachers to

> define how one may have a hold over others' bodies, not only so that they may do what one wishes, but so that they may operate as one wishes, with the techniques, the speed and the efficiency that one determines (Foucault, 1977:138).

Thus, discipline 'produces subjected and practised bodies, docile bodies' (Foucault, 1977:138) and I argue that the production of these subjects is gendered, classed and racialised at Model C Ordinary. Also, I argue that the subjects of the 'ideal learner' produced at Model C Ordinary are situated unproblematically within the specific culture and norms of the dominant group. Thus I attempted to uncover the details of disciplinary practices at Model C Ordinary in order to understand how and why certain practices came to be constructed as 'normal' and desirable, and how others came to be constructed as deviant and undesirable. This also allowed me to identify subject positions associated with constructions of normality/deviance and to see if and how these positions were taken up and contested.

3.12 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

All the necessary ethical clearances were obtained from the university and from the Department of Education, and all participants received information sheets clearly stating the purpose and the intent of the research. All participants were given consent forms that were signed and filed. A pseudonym was chosen for the school, and teachers were asked to choose their own pseudonyms. Learners were interviewed only once their parent or guardian had signed a consent form. The consent form as well as the information letter was translated into isiXhosa. However the ethics involved in social justice interventions include far more than obtaining ethics clearance certificates. People's identities, subjectivities and future trajectories are at stake; therefore I had to exercise extreme sensitivity when discussing my findings and not ever refer to the participants' real names. I also rewrote the description of the school after one of the participants who had read the draft felt that the school's identity was too obvious.

During the later focus groups when teachers felt more comfortable with each other and with me, they began to be more critical of each other, of the school and of the school management. This is what I had hoped would happen. However, since the final report was to be read by the headmaster who knew who had volunteered and could easily identify staff despite the use of pseudonyms, I decided to exclude some of the more critical comments from the final report. This was to protect the participants from any negative responses that could arise in their later dealings with the management. I was aware of the sensitive nature of many of the comments made during the focus groups and of the feelings of exposure which the teachers experienced. At times I felt as if I had opened the proverbial can of worms without a full understanding of the impact this would have on the teachers, their subjectivities and their futures in the school.

How much easier it was for me as the researcher and an outsider to contest the school practices as compared to those teachers working within the school was

brought to light when one teacher jokingly remarked:

> I think we must exploit Jacqui. We must exploit her. She can leave the school. We can't. She can leave and go sleep at night, we can't. We have to come back. She doesn't. Did you hear what she said, she's leaving us in the middle of the year, né?

This comment profoundly captured the massive responsibility a researcher has when working with people. While it may be relatively easy for an outsider to go into a school and start asking questions, create a level of discomfort, disrupt naturalised practices and then leave, this is not the case for those working within the institution. After having had their subjectivities and naturalised practices disrupted, they still have to fit in and contend with existing structures. They also have to make intensely personal decisions about the trajectories that they intend to follow or construct and the issues they want to take up or leave.

The ethical responsibilities of an activist researcher are immense. While the previous quotation intimated that my involvement in the research was purely academic, it was not. Like the participants, I too experienced intense emotions, the primary one of which was anxiety. While I was encouraged by the disruptions of naturalised practices and more critical views that emerged from the focus groups over time, I also became aware of the growing discomfort with which the school management viewed the intervention. This discomfort resulted in what was perceived by some of the teachers, as threatening. For example, one of the teachers had been asked after the meeting with management if he liked teaching in the school. He perceived this comment to be a subtle warning that he might not be re-employed the following year.

I was also concerned about the response of the headmaster to my findings. He had indicated that he was proud of the manner in which his school had dealt with desegregation and it was more than likely that he had not expected me to be critical and to encourage his teachers to be critical of an institution which he felt was exemplary. Also, the newness of his position as headmaster probably furthered his discomfort of the research gaze. He had had the idea that research involved someone coming into the school to observe and gather data and then leave. It did not include wanting the school to institute any changes. This

became apparent to me when he told me after the meeting held with him and his peers on the issue of detention, that research did not involve making changes. Research was to show how things worked and therefore he was displeased with what I had asked him the previous day. His concerns raised important ethical considerations in relation to my role as a researcher in his school, which went beyond the ethics clearance requirements for ethics clearance from the University Ethics Committee for Research on Human Subjects. While the headmaster was not questioning the permission he had given me to be in his school, it was clear that he found my presence destabilising. Although the staff on the project had requested to meet with management, and also insisted that I participate in the discussion, I had not realised the extent to which they would rely on me to speak on their behalf, in the face of their own silence, both external and self-imposed. On reflection to the headmaster's response, I was reminded that as a researcher, it was not my responsibility to effect change, and I decided to focus more on observation than participant observation. At the same time I became aware of how hard it was for management to subject the school to the outside gaze of a researcher and I valued their willingness to allow me to continue, despite their concerns

3.13 CONCLUSION

Having explained my choice of qualitative methodology and the case study approach used, as well as the methods of data collection and analysis, I turn now to the four data analysis chapters. Overall, the data analysis will show the complexity of school transformation and the difficulties faced by teachers who participated in the project to effect change.

The following chapters are organised in relation to the key terms in my research question: *Difference, Change and Reflection*. Each of these chapters has its own theoretical base. Chapter Four with its focus on the construction of difference at the school makes use of post-colonial theory to explain the

prevalence of apartheid discourses across all the data and the ways in which identities are interwoven in these constructions. At the beginning of the focus groups the staff had to come to terms with their own social investments and their own subjectivities in relation to the *Other*. In addition to postcolonial theory, the various approaches to multiculturalism are useful for providing a critical lens through which to examine the dominant practices at the school and to imagine alternative ways of dealing with desegregation.

Chapter Five, like Chapter Four, works across a full set of data. The theoretical frame in this chapter comes from the literature on institutional transformation. Again the emphasis is on the discourses, but this time metaphorical patterns are examined to shed light on the teachers' understanding of the dominant discourses relating to change that prevailed in their institution. The notion of thirdspace provides a lens through which to understand the epistemological and ontological shifts that the teachers experienced. The privileging of uncertainty and disorientation within thirdspace enables a more nuanced reading of the difficulties the participants experienced in shifting hegemonic views.

Chapter Six focuses on critical reflection as a means of effecting change. The metaphor of 'turn-around pedagogies' (Comber & Kamler, 2005) provides a way of conceptualising specific instances when shifts among the participants occurred. The physicality implicit in the notion of 'turn-around' provides a useful analytical device to capture the effort and impact of unsettling entrenched ways of being.

Whereas Chapters Four to Six work across the data, Chapter Seven mines a particular set of data to examine the inequities implicit in the detention system at the school. The notion of technologies of control (Foucault, 1977) is helpful in articulating the racialised and gendered ways in which groups of students at Model C Ordinary were positioned. So, too, is Foucault's concept of docility and deviance useful as a lens through which to identify the constructed binaries of the ideal and non-ideal student.

CHAPTER FOUR

CONSTRUCTIONS OF DIFFERENCE

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter discusses the construction of difference at Model C Ordinary. Using postcolonial theory as a lens it is possible to trace the cultural discourses which work to construct distinct binaries and essentialised representations of those constructed as different. Subject positions and identities of both learners and teachers are constituted and renegotiated in everyday talk and practices within the school. And it is these everyday 'banal' practices that work to discursively position certain groups of students negatively. These speech acts become so naturalised and taken for granted that they seldom get noticed or questioned and yet they are powerful in (re)producing inequality and influencing the identities of all involved. Students who are regularly identified and positioned as disruptive, non-academic and/or badly behaved, can take up these subject positions and internalise them, thereby impacting on their personal identities, or they can resist such subject positioning, which inevitably results in them enacting the very behaviour of which they have been accused. The teachers who draw on colonial and apartheid discourse to represent those students whom they consider not to belong to the school are also shaped by their choice of language. The reproduction of cultural, racial and gender stereotypes allow them to 'legitimise' their exclusionary practices, which in turn perpetuates the assimilationist ethos of the school.

In this chapter I examine teachers' spoken discourses across the data on the topic of difference in their school. I pay particular attention to their choice of metaphors, lexicalisation and pronouns that serve to *Other* certain groups and to position them as deviant. I also attempt to analyse how the hegemonic discourses work to position and shape the identities of the staff and students as well as the multicultural ethos of the school.

4.2 CATEGORIES OF DIFFERENCE

Various aspects of difference including race, gender, ability, culture, sexuality, and class were discussed during the interviews and 13 focus groups. Issues of race and gender dominated, while class, ability, and culture rarely featured. A count reveals that race or references to colour differences were mentioned 34 times. Gender was discussed 14 times. Ability was discussed once, sexuality once, and culture 7 times. Class was seldom mentioned explicitly. In a particular focus group where the participants were asked to determine how class issues impacted on academic achievement, distinct discomfort among many of the participants emerged. These participants explained that they felt awkward *prying* into such personal issues as where learners lived and their socio-economic circumstances.

Most categories mentioned were generally spoken about as single determinants, but occasionally the teachers spoke about black boys or white boys rather than simply black or white learners. The adherence to essentialised binaries was captured in Emily's contention that *children are different, you get boys and girls, they're rich and they're poor, they're educated and uneducated, they're individuals* (EI1). This notion of being one or the other denies the capacity of movement between and within categories and reduces identity to single categories. There were some indications that teachers believed people are all different (*It's not a black-white thing, I don't believe* and *even people of the same colour, people have different values and systems*, and even *we have different groups who believe differently* [FG 4]). However, a discourse of sameness prevailed, and a reluctance to identify specific differences was evident. This is discussed below.

4.3 THEY ALL LOOK THE SAME COLOUR TO ME

The discourse of sameness is an aspect of assimilationist ideology. While well-intentioned, this colour-blind approach nullifies differences and often the ‘same’ actually means that all the learners are perceived as being ‘white’ and ‘middleclass’. This colour-blindness or ‘absent presence of race’ (Ndimande, 2007) is illustrated in Sally's comment that

> I don’t have racism issues in my class at all. All racism issues they must take somewhere else. In my class, there are pupils; they all look the same colour to me (SI1).

Later on she indicated that in general in her subject (English) black boys did not perform well. I suggested that maybe, as in some American schools, they did not want to be seen to *be acting white*. Sally responded *then why are they in our white schools?* (SI1) While it is encouraging that she did not allow racist comments in her class, the implied racism in her question is troubling. Inherent in the pronoun *our* is the apartheid notion that the school belonged exclusively to whites and that any other race groups, referred to namelessly as *they*, attending the school were intruders without any 'legitimate' ownership.

Another teacher, Suzie, commented similarly:

> But I don't see them as blacks anymore, now to me they are just like pupils, and I don't even see a difference in colour when I speak to kids in the passage … I don't even see my Xhosa pupils as black. I mean I could have been black looking from the other side, I don't see myself, but it really does not, and they feel the same. I don't treat them different from the other kids (FG 3).

Here Suzie claims that she was colour-blind. Her use of *anymore* and *now* suggested that her position had shifted. Her black learners were now *just like pupils.* In other words, they were no longer 'different' or 'other' and they were the

same (as the white learners). Yet, the repeated reference to the black learners as a homogeneous *them* and *they* tended to belie Suzie's claim to not see them as different. When Suzie indicated that *she could have been black looking from the other side,* I believe she was suggesting a number of things. One, that the black learners did not see her as 'other' (owing to her fluent proficiency in isiXhosa) and two, that she herself had sufficient empathy and understanding of the black learners to see herself as 'black'. She might also be suggesting that she could just as easily have been born black and not white. Overall she seemed to indicate that she did not differentiate her students according to race.

In another reference, this time to class-blindness, Emily indicated that *no matter where you come from, the cream always rises to the top* (FG 2). Emily was drawing on the nature/nurture debate and suggesting that despite social circumstances, inherent talents will always be rewarded. However, the sentiments of equality are undermined by the elitist notion inherent in cream (a luxury item) as well as the whiteness of cream. Also, according to the academic results at this school, a disproportionate number of white students were positioned as academic achievers and very few black students mad the ‘Top Ten’ of each class.

These sentiments of equality and sameness are contrasted with the frequent stereotyping of black learners as deviant, disruptive and badly behaved. Additionally, the disproportionate numbers of black learners in detention as compared to the white learners suggests that despite good intentions and well meaning practices, racial inequality still existed at Model C Ordinary. (See Chapter Seven).

Apart from claiming colour blindness, some teachers indicated a reluctance to specifically name and identify issues of race. This was apparent in Jenny's comment where she hesitated (*so-called, well*…) when referring to black learners who had worked well in her class. She spoke about the: *AMAZING* work she had received from the *so-called, well, the Xhosa children* (FG 1). In another focus group, Jenny used the metaphor of *chocolates and marshmallows* to represent black and white people:

> I want to be very honest and that is why I said black because I don't even see colour. That to me is just so stunning that when my son was little, he didn't know the difference between black and brown. And his pre-primary teacher said to me, you son doesn't know the difference between black and brown because his best pal is a little Xhosa boy and I said to him, Thabo isn't black, you know. So, he has this big thing about black and white. He did not know about black, and we joke and we say chocolates and marshmallows, you know, if we wanted to speak colour, I don't know.

Her refusal to refer to the race of people and her use of the sugary substitute *chocolates and marshmallows* was a sweetened attempt to deny racial differences and ignore the prevalence that race plays in South Africa. The use of marshmallows and chocolates to represent the colours of pink/white and brown respectively objectified the learners into something edible and inhuman, and allowed Jenny to dismiss the importance of race in South Africa. She perceived her denial and that of her son to be '*stunning'* and while well-intentioned, was misguided. Using euphemisms to describe race tends to hide and trivialise the multiple issues at stake for people who are positioned as 'other' because of their race. Those privileged by their colour, language and background have been shielded from the harsh realities of being black in South Africa, and this is why MM replied, *where I come from, I know colour* (FG1). Implicit in this comment is the lived experience of someone who has experienced racial discrimination, and therefore his comment can be taken as a reproach to Jenny at the ease with which she was able to nullify and dismiss race.

Having discussed constructions of sameness and attempts to deny difference through 'colour-class-blind' ideology, I now examine instances where difference is articulated crudely through the constructions of stereotypes. Stereotypes used in everyday speech and repeated regularly, especially by those in authority, are not to be dismissed as banal banter. Rather it is the very banality of these speech acts that makes them so powerful. It is the everyday routine way of talking and acting that 'enables an internal orientalization [racialisation] to be (re)produced as a natural form of life' (Haldrup, Koefoed & Simonsen, 2006:175). They explain further that

> [i]t is in the small unnoticed words such as ‘us’ and ‘them’, ‘theirs’ and ‘ours’ naturally appearing in everyday talk that produces [marginalized people] as the Other (Haldrup et al., 2006:175).

Therefore an examination of stereotypes and pronouns reveals the exclusionary power of language as well as the fixity with which stereotypes are used. This fixed representation is what Bhabha refers to as an ‘arrested, fetishistic mode of representation’ (1994:76). This does not mean, however, that people who are positioned by stereotypes are incapable of changing or resisting.

4.4 ARTICULATED STEREOTYPES

During the interviews and focus groups, many stereotypes were articulated by the participants themselves or articulated as being prevalent in the school. Table 5 on the following pages illustrates the essentialised categories.

Table 5 illustrates the abundance (24) of racialised stereotypes associated with black (Xhosa) learners who were presented negatively in reductionist, essentialised ways. It is also interesting to note the frequent references (13) to the physical and verbal behaviour of the black learners. Most of this *unruly behaviour* occurred in the very public and organised space of the school assembly. The black students were described as *loud, noisy, over-excited, laughing, hooligan, ballistic cheering, disruptive, partying*. Underpinning these constructions of the students as disruptive is the school authorities' fear of loss of control as well as their recognition of the power of burlesque to make a mockery of rigid (and racialised) systems of control.

In addition to racialised construction, clear gendering occurred with girls being positioned as smart and capable as opposed to the slack, attention-seeking boys. While white boys were also constructed as having problems, it was the black boys who fared the worst. They had the racialised positions of being *badly behaved* and *sexualised* while at the same time being *poor at academics*. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that it was the black boys who formed the bulk of

the detention system at the school. (See Chapter Seven).

Table 5: Essentialised categories of difference

Black/Xhosa	White	Boy	Girl	Race & gender
[1]Black learners are noisy and loud (FG 4) (i1MM)	White learners are noisy (i1B)	Boys are better readers than girls (i1Z)	Girls are better at academic work (i1B)	Black males behave in a sexual way (i1A; i1E)
Xhosa learners are over-excited (i1Su)		Boys take more attention (i1Z;i1J)	Girls are better at languages (i1B)	White males have attitudes
They don't answer questions (in class) (i1Su)		Boys are slack (i1Z) (i1J)	Girls are mature (i1E)	Black girls work harder than black guys (i1Sa)
They don't want to react as an individual (i1Su)		Boys are immature (i1E)	Girls participate more (i1E)	Black guys are slack (i1Sa)
They laugh at things		Boys do things to get your attention (i1Z)	Girls are better equipped than the boys (at learning) (i1B)	White boys are just as bad (i1Sa)
Xhosa learners are total hooligans(i1Sa)				
Black learners are *scabengas		Boys need more attention (i1Z)		
Xhosa learners can be rude (i1Su)				
Black people can't be on time (i1a)		Boys show off (i1Z)		
Black children go ballistic (in assembly) (i1A)				
Gumboot dancing was public masturbating (i1A)				
Blacks behave badly (i1A)				

Black people like to have a party (i1E)				
Black people don't know how to save (i1E)				
Black learners stand up and cheer and dance and 'carry on' (in assembly) (i1 A)				
Black children tend to be disruptive (i1J)				
Blacks are not academically ambitious (i1Sa; i1Su)				
Black learners react to things (i1Su)				
Black learners don't know how to behave(i1A)				
Blacks don't trust each other (FG5)				
Seldom have discipline problems with the black kids (i1B)				
This is not Enjoli square (i1A)				
The townships are dangerous				
24 references to negative behaviour-	1 negative reference	6 negative reactions	5 positive references	Black boys- sexual & slack
		1 positive reference		White boys attitude and 'just as bad'
1 positive reference				Black girls workharder

The behaviour of the black learners was seen as obviously detracting from the valued 'capital' (Bourdieu, 1991) provided by the learners who knew how to behave, who did not cheer and *carry on* and who spoke in a subdued manner. The cultural capital that the Xhosa learners brought to this school was not only dismissed, it was also regarded as disruptive to the established 'norms of good behaviour'. Thus the binaries of appropriate and inappropriate, normal and abnormal behaviour are set up in distinctly racialised and gendered ways. In this context the 'ideal' learner is not the African child (Soudien, 1998:9). Table 6 demonstrates how the representations of black learners were in direct contrast to those ascribed to the ideal learner.

Table 6: Opposite poles of the binaries of ideal learners

Black learners	**'Ideal learner'**
Loud	Quiet
Noisy	Subdued
Rude	Polite
Over-excited	Restrained
Total hooligans	Docile
'Scabengas (isiXhosa for giant but used to refer to a crook)	Honest
Untrusting	Trusting
Disruptive	Co-operative
'Carry on'	Unassuming
Don't know how to behave	Well behaved
Academically unambitious	Academically ambitious
Can't be on time	Punctual
Don't react as Individuals	Individualistic

4.5 'US' AND 'THEM': MAINTAINING STEREOTYPES

Division was further constructed through the use of 'us and them' pronouns. Binaries between 'us and them' extended to divisions between management and

teachers, blacks and whites, the participating teachers and the rest of the staff, as well as male and female teachers and learners. However, Suzie was particularly distinctive in her repeated use of these divisive pronouns which Othered the Xhosa culture. Suzie, despite being a white Afrikaans-speaking teacher, was fluent in Xhosa and as such was regarded by the staff as having the symbolic capital to talk on behalf of the Xhosa learners. The simplistic notion that knowing how to speak a language makes one an expert in the culture of mother-tongue speakers is extremely problematic. Even if one is taught cultural beliefs alongside learning the language, those beliefs are taught as if they are fixed and unchanging without the dynamic interchange of the living community and context. Static constructions lend themselves to essentialisation, the primary material in the construction of stereotypes. Essentialised constructions deny the play of hybridity, of allowing people to be both westernised and traditional, of having traditional values while at the same following more westernised values. Additionally, people can demonstrate their knowledge of westernised practices without having to forego prior practices.

During Suzie's initial interview, her fixed views of the Xhosa culture were cemented in essentialised ways and framed in distinct 'us and them' terms.

- The Xhosa pupils you have now, they don't know their tradition so well. They've westernised so. They need to learn it (SuI1)
- It's the way they react. They never put their hand up…they don't want to react to something as an individual, but it must be always a group response (SuI1)
- They use their tradition when it suits them and they become a group and it's difficult to find the individual guy who's really the culprit (SuI1)
- They're more like our Western kids now. They are moving away from their traditions (SuI1)
- I mean in their tradition uhm, even if they, you know if they had to borrow, that's why if you give… if a Xhosa person asks you for money, then you actually just write it off and say fine I've actually given it to you, because when they borrow, if you borrow them, you actually, then your generations after you will just inherit your amount that you owe, so it will go on and on, but you never pay it back (SuI1)
- All those things about their reactions, their attitudes, how

> they are not answering and not wanting to be laughing at [by] one another but they can be warm and unembittered, where[as] our culture is more, (pause) they can be very straight and honest about certain things, on the other hand, they can act [so] well that they can blind you and tell you stories…and its not something that was normal to us (SuI1).

In Table 7 below, I categorise Suzie's comments by placing them in two columns, one which refers to 'us' and the second to 'them'.

Table 7: Binaries of 'us' and 'them'

They/their	Us/ours
Don't know their tradition	
Are westernised	
Need to learn it	
React	
Never put up a hand	
Don't want to react as an individual	
Use their tradition when it suits them	
They never pay (money) back	
More like …	Our western kids
Moving away from their traditions	
Not answering	
Not wanting to be laughed at	
Can be warm and unembittered	
Can be straight and honest	
Can act so	
Can blind you	
Tell stories	
	normal

7 negative auxiliary verbs= deficit 4 modals 'can be'= tentative 11 non-modalised verbs	Us = normal

The table illustrates a number of issues. The *traditions* of the amaXhosa students are positioned as diametrically opposed to the western culture which belongs to *us*; it is *our* (white) culture. Those who are moving away from their culture are becoming *more like us*. They are assimilating. While not explicitly stated, the word *traditional* tends to be associated with a notion of savagery and lack of civilisation whereas *westernised* tends to conflate with finery and

decorum. This binary between the uncivilised and the civilised is captured in Suzie's final assertion that *their behaviour is not normal to us*. What constitutes normality at Model C Ordinary is embedded in white middleclass practices. This is further illustrated by the absence of descriptors on the right-hand side of the table. The *us*, the white middleclass category, is literally unmarked, and as such furthers the notion that it represents the normalised, uncontested and therefore ideal behaviour (which has previously been narrowed down to being demonstrated as the behaviour shown by the white/coloured/Indian girls). Haldrup et al. (2006:176) posit that the language and hegemonic grammar of 'us and them'

> [c]reates and naturalises the Other in a process that designates 'them' and 'their' mentality as different from 'ours'. It becomes a sedimented dominant language that creates the continuous background for social and national exclusions.

Furthermore Table 7 illustrates that the amaXhosa learners are described categorically, without modality as *acting*, *blinding* and *telling stories*, all of which euphemistically indicate that they are dishonest and that they tell lies. Suzie recounts an example of this:

> I mean we had this little girl the other day, she was in tears, talking to (the teacher) at this hockey, when she came late for a, for a hockey match. She was in tears and her body was shaking, her brother of 25 had been in a motorcar accident, he died. To find out the next week she doesn't have a brother of 25 years old and she has an 18 years old brother and he wasn't in an accident. She used that./
> J: To excuse./
> Yes, because she was late. Now what I'm saying is, you sit with this sort of thing everyday and it's not something that was normal to us, you know to live with that everyday, not that kind of extreme.

To 'make up' the death of a 'brother' to excuse being late for a hockey match may sound extreme to many readers, but a few issues need to be explained. Firstly, the notion of family among amaXhosa is not the same as among Europeans, who rigidly apply the status of brother and sister to immediate siblings. In the Xhosa culture, the notion of brother extends beyond that of a sibling to any older male relative or man of importance in the community. Therefore when the learner spoke of the death of her brother, it might have been

a reference to another male in her family. It is interesting that Suzie does not deem it necessary to consult with the girl herself about the apparent lie, and depends on her own assumptions that the girl had used *extremes* and therefore has behaved in an *abnormal* way. In the event that the girl was telling a lie and that she had not witnessed any such accident, it would need to be questioned why she felt the need to construct such an extreme 'story'. What would the repercussions of being late at a hockey match have been and why did it matter to her enough for her to establish such a dramatic excuse?

Table 7 indicates that Suzie does concede that the black learners can be *warm and unembittered* as well as *straight and honest*. Both sets of positive adjectives are used with the modal auxiliary verb, *can be,* suggesting a more tentative, hesitant application of these attributes or a probability of finding such black learners. Therefore for Suzie whiteness embodies normality and blackness embodies deviance. This particular way of seeing the world associates whiteness with goodness and purity, and blackness with death and darkness; what hooks calls the ‘fantasy of whiteness’ (1996:37).

Looking beyond the fixed way in which Suzie discusses culture, it is important to acknowledge the importance of what Suzie raises about the Black learners' difficulties in negotiating the messy space between a 'traditional culture' and a 'westernised culture'. Black learners are often caught in a space between the two cultures that seem contradictory and antagonistic. The 'traditional' cultural practices learnt from their homes and their communities are not valued at the school, yet they may feel alienated by the Anglo-Saxon culture in which they find themselves. When learners do try to construct hybridised spaces where they draw on 'cultural understandings' of how to behave, (‘*they use their tradition when it suits them and they become a group and it’s difficult to find the individual guy who's really the culprit*), it is constructed as deviant. A more useful way of understanding these learners would be to acknowledge the difficulties involved in mediating between these two spaces and facilitate the process by explicitly discussing the complexity with them. This is where a white isiXhosa teacher could play an important mediating role for the learners. However for this mediation to work, it would require of the white isiXhosa teacher to have learnt

the language and culture for '*correct*' reasons, and to take on a habitus of the Xhosa learner rather than to maintain the habitus of an English or Afrikaans speaker. Suzie unproblematically positions herself as a cultural expert of the *Other,* and rather than assist her colleagues to understand the complexity the black learners face in trying to straddle different cultures, she uses her 'knowledge' to position amaXhosa as abnormal and deviant.

The following extract once more demonstrates how Suzie uses her 'knowledge of amaXhosa culture' not to further understanding among her colleagues but to advance the 'us and them' binary and strengthen her positioning of the amaXhosa as dishonest and deceitful.

> It's also got to do with the mistrust of their own people. It's part of their culture, it's very much there. They don't trust one another. For example, even if it's your sister or your uncle or whoever, you're not going to trust to leave money with them and you're going to get it back. They just don't trust one another because they aren't always loyal to one another when it comes to that. It comes from their culture and background, cultural background or whatever. You're not just going to leave your things. I know from kids in my class, they will not leave, if I have to send one to another class, he will not leave his kit or his school bag in the classroom, I have to put it on my table and then he will go. Because he doesn't trust the guy sitting next to him, his friend, which are all black kids, with his bag there, even if it's with his friend (FG5).

Suzie's text is characterised by a lack of modality (no auxiliary verbs such as 'may, can'; modal adverbs such as 'probably, perhaps'; conditional clauses, for example, 'if this were the case' and hedges including 'sort of', or 'something like').

She boldly asserts that:

- It's got to do (with their mistrust)
- It's part of (their culture)
- They don't trust
- They just don't trust
- It comes from their culture
- He doesn't trust the guy.

Such assertions suggest that Suzie was in no doubt about her understandings. She is confident that what she states is the Truth. I questioned her on these

generalisations to which she confidently replied:

> What I said now has come over years. I'm not talking about one class or one specific, **it's always been like that** (FG5).

Suzie's argument that *it's always been like that* epitomises the notion of fixity. This stereotype is 'an arrested, fixated form of representation that, in denying the play of difference constitutes a problem for the representation of the subject in significations of psychic and social relations' (Bhabha, 1994:75). Suzie disallows any differences within the Xhosa culture. In doing so, the 'culture once living and open to the future becomes closed, fixed in the colonial status, caught in the yolk of oppression' (Fanon in Bhabha, 1994:78).

Furthermore, Suzie's intention of learning isiXhosa is called into question as she appears to have mastered the language, not to promote understanding, but rather as a means of subjugating the *Other*. She demonstrates a distinctly colonial mindset in relation to the language of the 'natives'.

In terms of multicultural models, the stereotyping and binaries constructed disallow Model C Ordinary's staff to move beyond an assimilationist, or at best, a multicultural approach to integration. By constructing such distinct differences between students based mainly on race, culture and gender, the possibility of nuanced understandings, contradictions and ambivalence are greatly diminished, thus the possibility of developing critical multiculturalism in the school is practically non-existent. However, some teachers in the focus groups felt uncomfortable with Suzie's positioning of the Xhosa speakers as dishonest, and challenged her. MM said *'but a lot of things that are anti-African and pro-Western are reinforced in the school today by teachers, parents, and coaches. What message, what message are we portraying*?

He then continued, directing his comment to Suzie:

MM: I think you as a teacher have a very important role to play there, you can't just take the bag[13]. If you just take the bag, we are reinforcing that, ja, don't trust. Continue distrusting, don't just try and work it out. There might be a reason. It might be that, that kid's things have been stolen by a black kid but somewhere along the line we have to start; we are always talking about education, education but that it [is] a simple thing. Here we can say, hang on, we can't just take your bag in, we must look at the situation…there really is a need for that.
Emily: I agree so strongly with that, that the teacher has a vital role to play in a lot of things. It comes back to the same thing that the teachers are not given help to develop their own self-confidence…a black kid has told me I'm racist, how do I react? A black kid says you're picking on me, how do I react. We need to look at stuff like that as well.
Zand: I hear what you're saying. Maybe we can get somebody to help us to get...
Ali: I wonder to what extent teachers feel that they are being fair and not racist and that they don't exacerbate stereotypes of 'you're lazy and loud and uncooperative'?
Suzie: That comes from their background, where everything belonged to everybody. In the rural areas where they lived everything belonged to everyone 'cause it was never, you weren't seen as stealing because it belongs to everyone. And if that guy's going to leave it there then the next guy it's just as good for him to have it as anyone else. But now, the whole thing is that the tradition has got mixed up with the Western one.

The resistance illustrated in this extract is important because MM indicates the power that teachers have in reproducing inequity by ignoring stereotypes. Rather, he insists that teachers need to interrogate the construction of such a stereotype and directly challenge it as well as indicate why it is damaging. In saying this, MM illustrates how influential language is in constituting identities, beliefs and actions (Fairclough, 1992,2001). Ignoring a comment that reproduces discrimination and prejudice legitimises the speaker and the comment.

Emily's response opened up an important issue of white identity and illustrates the interrelatedness of identity and discourse. The existence of discourses of political correctness is constitutive of fearful white subjects who, afraid to say

[13] This is a reference to Suzie's claim previously that the Xhosa learners do not trust each other enough to leave their school bags in the classroom.

something that may be perceived as racist, are often reluctant to reprimand black learners or be seen to 'pick on them'. Such fears and concerns, unless addressed urgently will perpetuate notions of discrimination and unfairness.

Suzie's insistence that distrust of the Xhosa's is inherent in *their culture* indicates that she was not yet able to shift her position or reflect on the partiality of her knowledge of the Xhosa culture. The twenty years of investment in her subject position as a Xhosa expert and the symbolic capital she enjoys from this position inhibits her from reflecting critically on this issue. She is not ready to give up the power she enjoys in this position.

Having illustrated how the above constructions were resisted by some of the participants, I now continue to describe further resistances to stereotypes and to the distinct ways in which these resistances are framed.

4.6 CONTESTING STEREOTYPES

While some of the participating teachers used stereotypes unproblematically, others indicated their concern or directly challenged those teachers using them. MM contested some of the dominant stereotypes and insisted that it was a teacher's responsibility to interrogate stereotypes rather than perpetuate them by allowing them to be repeated without question. In the following extract MM tells how he discusses the issue of stereotyping with his learners:

> I have kids come into my class saying, yes its black kids making a noise but while we had this talk I point out, you have the taxis, I mean. The coloured taxis are noisy but you don't get branded, coloured people are noisy. In the class, we have white kids who come late everyday, they're noisy, they don't respect when others speak, and I say hang on, and if that is the case, we have to rectify it. One of the things that the girls in the class said was that it was their behaviour. They gave their reasons but I said fine, there are reasons but it's still not on. You need that but we only do that by education. It is so easy for us to sit and say ja, its black people they are noisy, that's the simplest thing and the problem is solved now. We need, I think as educators, we need to go a bit further but not only

> that, there's a lot of other things. We need to go further and why, why, and what can we do about it, how can we improve it? Not a case that it's 'alweer hulle', its again the white boys with attitudes and the grade 8's or grade 10's. So it's... that's so easy. It's the easy way to simplify the problem and then we leave it (FG 4).

It is interesting that MM challenges the other participants in the group to avoid taking the *simple and easy* way of ignoring stereotypical comments from the learners. Ignoring stereotypical constructions allows them to be perpetuated and reified. Because teachers are in influential positions, MM believes that they have an important role to play in deconstructing the ways in which learners are essentialised and positioned as *Other.* He described to the group an opportunity he had to do such a deconstruction. By challenging dominant constructions, he is disrupting and disordering the naturalised stereotypes and opening up a space for new constructions that, in turn, create new ways of talking about people. He allows the learners to give their reasons why they use stereotypes and acknowledges that *fine, there are reasons* but clearly signals that such usage is unacceptable (*but it's still not on*). Not only does MM encourage his learners to reflect on discriminatory practices, he also tells them gently and firmly in words they can relate to, that it was wrong.

MM seemed to be drawing on his identity as moral activist. Not only does he challenge his own learners, he also challenges the teachers in the focus group to *go further* and take on the challenge of educating learners against such ways of talking. In the passage below, MM describes how easy it is to be drawn into using a stereotype when he candidly describes how he sometimes has to stop himself from assuming that the black kids are making a noise in the passage. He describes how he has to remind himself consciously to *treat each incident on its merits*. This illustrates the discursive power of constructions to influence one's behaviour and one's thinking, and demonstrates how tempting it is to draw on existing discourses rather than to consciously reconstruct new ones.

> You know the black kids sometimes speak louder and they're probably more vocal but it's not only the black kids who make the noise. Because I had to stop myself on a few occasions, I go out of my classroom into the passage and you think its black kids speaking loudly and so on, but you find white kids,

> coloured kids that type of thing and you remind yourself, listen, you have to treat each incident on its merits, you know (FG 4).

MM's reflection draws attention to the danger of words and expressions becoming so naturalised that one uses them unthinkingly. This naturalisation process occurs when words or 'signifiers' become stripped of their history and are received as 'truths' (Barthes, 1972:124). Barthes (1972_ suggests that in order to disrupt this naturalisation process one must 'voluntarily interrupt the turnstile of form and meaning' and focus on each separately'. This is what MM was doing; he was denaturalising the 'taken-for granted' notion that blacks are noisy and questioning the history and initial construction of this notion as well as treating each case separately and *on its own merits*. In doing so, he is questioning the 'truth' of this commonly used stereotype as well as disrupting his own naturalised use of it.

While it was mainly the learners who were subjected to essentialised constructions of difference, a discussion during focus group 8 illustrates that the teachers themselves were also subjects of stereotyping. In this instance, the male headmaster draws on female stereotypes to discursively manage Suzie's problem.

4.7 COFFEE AND ROSES: STEREOTYPES ACCORDED TO TEACHERS

In the following extract from focus group 8, Suzie told the group about an incident when she went to see the headmaster the previous year as a result of being very upset about a false accusation. After hearing her for a few minutes, the headmaster sent her off to drink a cup of coffee. This incident clearly illustrates how stereotypes reveal 'positioning, purpose and values' (Misson, 1997:22).

Suzie had been accused of being out of her class when she should have been teaching. This was apparently reported to the headmaster. When Suzie heard of

the accusation she was angry, as she had been in her class the whole time.

> Suzie: I went into the office; it was about a year and a half ago. Obviously, I said the wrong thing but it concerned somebody in management and somewhere something didn't work out. I was sent straight to the coffee shop and got a big piece of cake, hmm, and told ,'now, listen relax have coffee at the local shopping mall, I'm paying the bill.' I came back [and] I was very upset. It had to be stopped just right there, and I went there, I came back because I actually just thought just go and think you haven't got, I mean just… When I came back I had a big thing of flowers, Simon, my husband laughed himself sick; he said this man doesn't know me because that's the last thing anybody would do to me. I want this thing sorted out, or just tell or just listen to me, or just chat to me. It's never been done.
> Alison: It's called D_E_N_I_A_L.
> Suzie: Ja, I don't think I, because I think he's actually married to a woman that would accept, that's the way to treat her, to do it, and I think he thinks every woman...
> Emily: Who the headmaster?
> Jacqui: He bought Suzie a bunch of flowers. And coffee,
> Sally: Maybe I should go and challenge him about you.
> MM: What did you get? Surely, you got something there.
> Suzie: I didn't. I didn't.
> MM: It's the school budget. We can't be spending [it] on people outside the school.
> Sally: Ja, that's true. Now we're all fighting about whose, who's going to get coffee.
> Suzie: And I tell you, about, I actually didn't have coffee or any cake, I bought myself a pair of shoes (FG 8).

Suzie's concern, which she had hoped would be taken seriously by the headmaster and sorted out, was instead dismissed and trivialised. The headmaster treats Suzie in a demeaningly gendered manner instead of viewing her as a professional whose problem needs to be managed professionally. He draws on a stereotype of an emotional, hysterical woman who needed to be calmed down and appeased with a bunch of flowers so that she could reason clearly. He does not provide a space to discuss the issue; instead the concern was silenced, and as Suzie says, *to this day*, *it has never been done*. He probably believes he has dealt with the incident appropriately. His gendered handling of Suzie's issue positions her not as multifaceted and complex, but predominantly as a woman who fits his static, essentialised category of someone who can easily be bought and appeased with some coffee and

flowers.

Suzie's comment that her husband *laughed himself sick* and commented that *buying flowers was the last thing anyone who knew her would do,* highlights Burbule's (1997) notion of recognising differences within set categories. While women share certain characteristics with other women, it is foolish and dangerous to ignore differences within the category of women and apply set ideas of 'every woman', 'every white', and 'every male'.

The teachers in this group laughed at the foolishness of the gendered representation and 'played' with the effects of categorical thinking. Suzie, while acknowledging that she was upset by the event, chose to exploit another gender stereotype and *buy herself a pair of shoes*[14].

This discussion led to other female teachers in the group commenting on how they were often interrupted by the headmaster while teaching class when he wanted them to proof-read a document or check a record. They were expected to stop their teaching and give their immediate attention to the headmaster. The two male teachers in the group seemed surprised to hear about this and commented that they had never been interrupted during a class and doubted that they ever would be (FN 25/02/2004). This is clear gender discrimination. Male and female teachers in the school were not afforded equal respect nor are they positioned equally in terms of their professional identities. Such patriarchal views can be ascribed to the white Afrikaner, the Anglo-Saxon and the amaXhosa cultures, all of which position women as inferior to men. If this is the cultural capital valued by the management of the school, the gendered treatment of the learners is hardly surprising.

A public discussion and dialogue resulting from the disclosure of a stereotype can have a powerful and influential impact on those discussing it. By disclosing and dialoguing, these teachers were able to see the narrow and fixed way in which a stereotype positions someone. Suzie, who herself uses fixed notions to

[14] This was done with her own money and not with any money given by the school.

describe others, was able to reflect on the limiting effect of such descriptions and would hopefully become more aware of the need to avoid the use of them in her own representation of her learners.

Having discussed the stereotypes at Model C Ordinary, I now describe another aspect of difference that appeared to concern many of the teachers: that of self-selected racial groupings.

4.8 RACIALISED GROUPINGS

Three white teachers referred to the racial groupings of their learners in their classrooms and on the playground as problematic. Brolox indicated that a walk through the playground at break revealed that, unlike what he had seen in the primary school where his daughter had gone previously, *if you walk through the school at break time, you can see groupings, specific racial groupings*. (BI1). Zander mentioned how the learners seemed to seat themselves racially in her classroom:

> Zander: They try to stick together, it's funny. It's funny. In the beginning of the year, before, I normally put them in order, just to um, to get them away from their friends. I said to them, "Oh, we are back in the old South Africa," because the coloureds are, now I call them coloureds, are there in the back and the whites, whities, are here…and then only then, did they, did they realise it/
> Jacqui: O.K. and did, did they move or did they carry on sitting there?
> Zander: Yes, no, they, I moved them...
> Jacqui: And did they come back...?
> Zander: But they tend, they tend to come, go back. Whenever there's an opportunity, they tend to go back.

Emily, too spoke about the racial groupings in her class:

> The black kids sit in the middle and the white kids around. The grade 11's and 12's, the white kids sit in the middle, the black kids around. I'm conscious, I'm continually talking about this thing, so I say to my grade 10's, "I want to know, why do all the black kids sit here and the white kids sit there and in my other class, is it a thing that you know me and you trust me? And

> (.....) said, “Yes it is, Ma’am, we feel comfortable sitting here, we don’t want to sit on the outside of the class.” So I am conscious a lot of the time [that] I don’t want to teach to a block of kids. Like my matrics now, I consciously, purposely, spend a lot of time walking around that side of the classroom because that’s where all the black kids are. I don’t want to teach this beautiful, pristine little group of white kids.

The words, *beautiful* and *pristine*, with the suggestion of unspoiled beauty, I believe, are used to derisively refer to the previous dispensation of an all-whites school. It is interesting that the learners themselves appear to feel far more at ease with the spatial binaries that they had constructed between *here and there*. Possibly they were choosing to sit within racialised groupings as a form of resistance to the desegregation of the school. It was the teachers who indicated discomfort and who *continually talk about this thing*. The older generation might see such stark racial division as an indicator that there are still racial divisions among their students and the discomfort of this pushes them to want to reorganise the students to display a sense of unification.

In the four classroom observations I conducted, I noticed there was some indication of racial groupings. However, the Oracy day that I attended in the school hall had obvious racial groupings. I wrote the following in my field notes:

> I stood at the back of the hall and the first thing I noticed was how racially grouped the kids were – whites sitting together, coloureds together and blacks together (FN 10/08/03).

Observations of these racial groupings highlight the dominance of visible differences. One's skin colour as well as one's gender is highly visible, and other differences, such as culture, language, ability, sexuality, and religion are not. While other social groupings might occur, these were not mentioned as problematic, and this once again highlights the dominance of race (and gender) as indicators of difference and the tendency to reduce every aspect of a learner to that of his or her race and/or gender.

4.9 MIXING

Linked to the notion of differences between the learners is the frequent metaphor of mixing and mixtures. An analysis of all the teacher interviews and

all focus group transcriptions reveal 17 references to mixing or mixtures. Ten are references to interracial mixing, 3 to mixed abilities of the learners, 2 to intercultural mixing, and 2 to gender mixing. Of the ten indications of interracial mixing, 8 of the references told of teachers enforcing interracial mixing:

- I specifically mix them (the whites and the Xhosa speakers) (JI1)
- I specifically mix them up, they weren't allowed to just get in order, whatever (JI1)
- We have a problem with the grade 9's; maybe it's the mixture we put them in (EI1)
- We mix them up (FG 2)
- There's a good mixture of black and whites (FG 5)
- In my black class there is no mixture (FG 9)
- I tell them where to sit, I say black and white have to sit together (FG 8)
- We mix them up, so that they are nice merry fruit salads, and it's incredible how much these children learn about each other (FG 2).

The metaphors of mixture succinctly captured in the image of a fruit salad are used to represent the differences of the learners but only in terms of race. Even though there are a number of differences between learners in terms of gender, abilities, class, personalities, languages, sexualities, and others, the metaphor attends only to racial differences. This reductionist and over-simplified representation of difference as race alone signifies the powerful foregrounding of race over other categories of difference. Issues of class, ability, and gender are rendered invisible and unimportant, and learners are represented primarily in terms of their racial identities. Homogeneity is based on skin colour, and any attempt to mix learners is reduced to mixing racial groups. It is therefore hardly surprising that the learners appear to *hate* and *not enjoy* being *mixed* and that this type of 'mixing' seldom occurs spontaneously and has to be constructed consciously by the teachers:

- You'll be shocked to learn how much they do not enjoy nice, merry fruit salads (FG 2).
- Do I stick all my kids into homogeneous groups; or do I have the nice fruit salad, which they hate? (FG 3).

The metaphor of fruit salad, unlike the image of the melting pot which was a popular metaphor used to describe the assimilation of multicultural groups in

America, suggests that the various cultural groups (different fruits) retain their shape and 'flavour' while still at the same time being mixed with other (fruits). This is similar to the rainbow image which is often used to symbolise South Africa's multicultural population, in that while the different cultures are in close proximity to each other, they remain different and untouched by their apparent shared space. Green & Mellow (1998) indicate from their study conducted in lunchrooms of public and private schools that there is more integration between the students in private schools because they live in similar neighbourhoods where they can meet after school and share spaces of intimacy. In the South African context, with the enforcement of the Group Areas Act of 1968 (Housing and Land) and the continuing legacy of that Act, there are limited opportunities for children and adults of different racial and social classes to socialise. Thus the opportunities for learners and teachers to get to know *Others* beyond superficial relationships is limited.

The only reference from the data generated in this project to spontaneous mixing between racial groups was from Brolox, who discusses the integration of his rugby players on tour:

> It's unbelievable how they mix. Yes, there is a tendency for the ouks in the bus when they sit together, to still have the black ouks together, and they speak Xhosa to each other; its nothing to do with a racial thing, it's more like, I think they sit together because Xhosa is their first language….But those ouks love each other; there's not a little bit of any, that they feel different to each other, I mean, in fact, the captain and vice captain are black people but they don't, they haven't been seen as black (BI1).

This unprompted grouping of people highlights a number of factors that come into play when people are given a choice about with whom they wish to mix. First, these learners share a number of characteristics: they are all male teenagers, they are in the first rugby team, and they are all away from their own homes. In this informal space of travelling on a bus and staying at a hotel, the fluidity of choice becomes apparent. In the bus, the Xhosa-speaking children mix so that they can speak isiXhosa to each other, whereas in the hotel, they interact more freely possibly because of their shared love of rugby and the team spirit. The teacher, Brolox, indicates the insignificance of race in this situation

and highlights the impact of sport and masculinity on group identities. This extract also suggests how sport can become a powerful unifying factor in integrated schools in South Africa and that, rather than deliberately mixing learners based on race, more effort should be placed on creating situations where learners will want to mix because of shared interests and common goals.

In an attempt to encourage the teachers to move beyond essentialised notions of difference and to take on a more nuanced understanding of the interface of race, class and gender, I asked them to complete a task. This involved them identifying learners in their own classes who were achieving academically, as well as those who were failing. They were then asked to complete a 'diversity grid' (Appendix F) which would be discussed at the following focus group. This task, mainly because of the identification of class issues, caused the participants extreme discomfort. The reasons for this are discussed in the section below.

4.10 STRUGGLING WITH THE SOCIAL CATEGORY OF CLASS

I had deliberately constructed the grid to include the concept of class because a complete absence of class issues was evident during the initial interviews where issues of race and gender seemed to dominate. The discomfort and frequent avoidance of discussions relating to class has been noted by Zwieg (2000 in Nesbit, 2006:175) who argues that in America, 'class remains one of the nation's best kept secrets' and that it is 'banished from polite company'. Likewise, Fussell (1992 in Nesbit, 2006:176) describes class as America's 'dirty little secret'. Nesbit (2006) explains that it is this 'invisibility' when linked with the apparent naturalness, which enables class inequity to be reproduced.

Various definitions of 'class' exist, and the role of education and schooling in the formation and reproduction of class is well documented (Althusser,1971; Gramsci,1971; Habermas,1972; Apple,1995). The definition used in this research leans towards that of Weber (1968) and Bourdieu and Passerson (1977), who define class more widely than being based on purely economic

factors. Weber says that class incorporates aspects of culture, values, politics and lifestyle. Furthermore he believes that life chances, status and life outside work influence one's class. Bourdieu et al. (1977) are of the opinion that one's position in an economic order is determined by various forms of 'capital' which include economic, cultural and social or symbolic capital. Acquiring and retaining capital is greatly influenced by one's gender, race, ethnicity and location; therefore class should be viewed as a societal rather than an individual notion. Which class one belongs to is often displayed and evaluated by certain class markers, such as one's dress, mode of transport, language usage, profession, earning capacity, material possessions, property ownership and access to resources (Bourdieu,1984).

I did not supply the teachers with any specific definition of class before they were asked to complete the grid, although I did mention that it includes aspects relating to income and living conditions. The teachers broke into groups and then fed back to the larger group. A discussion ensued about technology, and Brolox indicated that people who have access to technology at home tend to have...

> I won't say a better project, but a neater type of presentation which definitely influences you on the other side, you know (FG 1).

Here Brolox is acknowledging that learners who have access to computers gain certain benefits, and that their projects are graded more favourably than those which are hand-written. MM agreed with him and said the following:

> Can I just add, besides technology, the socio-economic class is the area where you stay also, I mean the availability of resources. There are libraries, well-stocked libraries, things that could help you with projects like that. Once I read a book, and the result of the study done, kids, learners of doctors and lawyers have a better chance of becoming doctors and lawyers in life. Workers' kids have a greater chance of not becoming successful with what they are and they just become another farm worker or labourer or that type of thing. The socio-economic class has a very broad base. It’s not only what we've got in our homes, it is also where we are staying and what our parents are (FG 1).

MM's argument indicates the multiple influences affecting class, such as where people live, access to resources, level of education of parents, material possessions and occupation of parents. The legacy of apartheid (Group Areas Act (1966) and 'Bantu Education') has thus ensured that class issues are deeply racialised in South Africa. MM also succinctly indicates how disadvantage can continue across generations. However, Suzie, drawing on the discourse of sameness, disagreed with him:

> But I think it shouldn't be a problem because in a school like this, where we have all the facilities going then it's not that that is the problem it is because you actually don't care or there is something about your attitude towards your work. Because there is a library and there is a computer room if you really want to go and do it on the computer (FG 1)

Resisting the notion that learners' backgrounds and social living conditions disadvantage them, Suzie is suggesting that the school provides facilities, and therefore everyone has an equal chance of achieving and making use of the resources on hand. She believes that if learners choose not to make use of these facilities, it is because of their own poor attitudes or lack of concern about their work. She denies the influences that the social, historical and political factors have on individuals. Brolox immediately challenged her:

> Bolox: Sometimes, if you look at the computers, yes, we do have computers available, but there is like quite a big crowd that desperately wants to be in there, but I don't think at the present moment, I don't think we can accommodate everybody, especially at project times.
> Suzie: But I think that everyone leaves, uh, wants to do it at the same time
> MM: Suzie you must think that besides the fact that the computer lab may be overcrowded and that type of thing, you have, you either have to stay in at break or you have to stay in after school and many of these kids travel in public transport and that type of thing, so there's the problem. It's fine to say we have the facilities but it would be much easier for me if I could be at home with a computer.
> Suzie: Oh yes...
> MM: And we have to, we have to take that into consideration. Fine there are instances where you can say but this learner is lazy but then you need to go and ask yourself why is this person lazy, why is he not making a plan…and it becomes another question, another question with its own answers.
> Suzie: I know that sounds wonderful, I wish I could do that but

> it would just take too much time to go to every learner's issue and say why's he got 8 out of 20 and why's he got 2 out of 10 and that sort of thing. There are all those reasons but you can't go into all those reasons.
> Jenny: I think the problem that we face is that our classes are so huge and that's why we can't get to everybody. We try, but there is always someone who slips through your fingers, as much as you try. (FG 1)

Both MM and Brolox are suggesting to Suzie that her construction of events is partial and that she is reducing complex issues to simple choices. It is never that simple: while the computers are *accessible to all,* many factors influence the learners' ability to make use of this resource. First, the number of computers is an issue, and second, they are only available at break and after school. Learners using public transport are restricted: they have to be on time for their bus/taxi or they would miss their lift home. Furthermore, they often have long distances to travel and cannot risk arriving home late for reasons of safety. They do not have the option of asking a parent to drive them home at a specified time. It is therefore simplistic and reductionist to claim that all users have equal access to the resources. It is clear that Suzie was not yet willing to reposition herself with respect to this issue, and she dismissed MM's and Brolox's reasoning by suggesting that it is idealistic and unrealistic, and that despite it being *wonderful* and her *wishing that she could,* it would *just take too much time*. Suzie has revisited an important issue but has simply re-hashed it and gained no more insight into the partialness of her knowledge. Clearly, this form of difference has become threatening and she is unable to hear other positions (Janks, 2002).

While teachers do have large classes to contend with and they cannot be expected to find time to focus on each learner, the lack of time can often be used as an excuse to ignore institutionalised discrimination.

After this discussion, MM became quiet and gave no more input for the rest of the focus group. The contentious issue of class was raised again during the second focus group when the teachers were given opportunities to complete the diversity grid with each of the classes they taught. They found this very difficult, and I received many phone calls during that week from teachers who questioned

the validity of including class in the grid (FN 17/09/2003).

During the second focus group, the strain required to keep things amicable was already showing. Towards the end of the meeting when some of the teachers had left, a few remained behind and the following dialogue ensued:

> Emily: MM, I'm very worried about you.
> MM: Why?
> Emily: You seem inhibited and I don't want you to be.
> MM. Inhibited? Oh. Okay. Ja.
> Emily: I think if we are going to learn from this, you need to talk. Sorry, to put my mind at rest, What's the matter?
> MM: It's true what you say. I have to speak otherwise this whole... It's just that...
> J: Do you feel uncomfortable?
> MM: No, it's just that, ag, I don't know, man.
> Emily: Do you think it is going to be a waste of time if you say something?
> MM: No, no. No. Up until now, I have said what I wanted to say, I haven't left anything unsaid. It's just certain things, um, you know, um, but you don't need to worry about me that things are going to be left unsaid. I've made a promise to myself to make sure that this thing works, I think my input is going to be very important. I mean for obvious reasons. So it's going to be important that I say how I feel. It's just that I shouldn't become too emotional.
> Emily: I know. I'm getting emotional now. It upsets me and I don't want, you know it's not a personal thing, if you disagree with what I've said, we should be big enough to… well I'm going to learn from this experience.
> MM: No. When I get emotional, it doesn't always mean that I'm in conflict with someone… Sometimes, it's just that someone has made something clearer for me or I can see why certain things happen the way they happen and um, the mist has gone and I can see and understand it better. So, it's not always a case that I'm in conflict with someone or in disagreement. But, jis, I'm exposing myself.
> Emily: No, no. So am I, look at me. I'm going to cry...
> MM: I just didn't think it was going to be, so, so…
> J: Close to the heart?
> MM: Ja..
> Emily. Ok, sorry.
> J: Thank you for that. I'm glad that you can actually talk about it as well.
> MM: Thanks Emily, but don't worry, we are still going to differ about a lot of things, but that isn't the reason why I will become the way I will become, Because I promised myself I am going to come here with an open mind and of course, we've got

> different backgrounds, we've got different histories and different socio-economic, so.
> Emily: It's hard though, isn't it?

Numerous issues emerge from this dialogue. The first is how difficult it is to discuss issues that are inherent to one's identity. MM had been discussing class issues and most members in the group insisted that class does not play a part in learners' achievements at school. They believe that factors such as the support system at home and whether or not parents are divorced, play a larger role in the learner's achievement. To support their cases, they cite examples of learners who have succeeded despite coming from poor homes. MM responded with the following:

> Maybe it's because of my past experiences or just my socio-economic background, but I think it does have an influence on learners' academic achievements at school. (FG 2)

MM's lived experience allows him to understand the significant impact of one's social context. Having had to live in a designated area while growing up and have his family suffer under the repression of apartheid laws, MM knows only too well how such things affect one's whole life. Few white teachers would have had any experience of this or ever had a need to reflect on it, and therefore they would be unable (or unwilling) to shift their belief that individuals can overcome difficult circumstances if they wish to. MM responded with the following statement, after which he kept quiet (his form of resistance) for the rest of the focus group until his dialogue with Emily:

> For me, the socio-economic is more important. But it doesn't mean that the home situation shouldn't be taken into consideration. Like most people mentioned, if you come from a stable home, it's going to assist, but like many things we are going to discuss here, it's going to be generalisations, and for me, it's more an exception to the rule. If a POOR kid with, that lives in a shack, has no parents, is a top achiever, that's the exception to the rule (FG 2).

MM could see that many of the teachers were not yet able to interrogate their own positions and to consider the role that class plays in learners' achievements. To admit to this required that the white teachers in the group

acknowledge the positions of material and economic privilege that most whites enjoyed during apartheid and are continuing to enjoy 13 years after apartheid ended. Some of the white teachers in the group were not yet ready to acknowledge openly their positions of privilege, and encouraging them to do so would only have resulted in bad feelings and strained relations. It would also have positioned MM as an outsider and jeopardised his working relationship with these teachers. MM therefore chose to resort to the 'safety of silence' (Ellsworth, 1989:105).

Another important issue that this dialogue raises is the burden placed on the person positioned as the '*Other*', in this case, MM, to represent an alternative view and to be the spokesperson for his whole class and race. Identified as a black man, MM acknowledged the critical role his input would play in the focus groups. Emily echoed the importance of his contribution: *I think if we are going to learn from this, you need to talk* (FG 2). While MM knows that he was critically positioned in this process, he also acknowledges how very difficult it was for him, and this extreme difficulty is captured in the expression, *Jis, but I'm exposing myself* (FG 2). The use of the word *exposing* suggests MM's extreme vulnerability and the defencelessness that he would experience in 'exposing' the practices that promote and sustain discrimination at his school. This is an extremely difficult and painful position to occupy. The pain of exposing racism is captured in hooks' comment, 'I find myself reluctant to "talk race" because it hurts' (1990:3).

Ellsworth (1989:108) suggests that some students of colour may feel resentment at having to educate white colleagues, while the white students may feel resentment about having to 'prove they're not the enemy.' While there was no sense of resentment from MM, there was certainly a strong sense of pain, intermingled with a powerful determination to rise above the emotional. Emily's concern and heightened emotional state indicated the difficulty of hearing others' positions and of altering one's own subjectivity or 'point of attachment from which one experiences the world' (Grossberg in Hall & Du Gay, 1998:101). While she was able to rationalise that *it's not a personal thing* and that one needs to *be big enough*, she finds it difficult. She realises that letting go of

certain positions and attachments is not easy as it causes one to confront one's contradictory, multiple subjectivities.

In summary, this chapter has attempted to illustrate that at Model C Ordinary difference is constructed primarily in terms of race and gender. Those constructed as 'Other' are mostly positioned as deviant and abnormal, and it is the black boys who are most penalised by the double subjectivity of race and gender. Female teachers are also subjected to gendered constructions. However, many of these constructions are resisted. The learners resist 'mixing' and choose to sit in racialised groupings whenever they were able to. Suzie, who was treated unprofessionally by her headmaster, decides to go along with his gendered advice and she takes time off work and goes shopping. Resistance is also illustrated in the focus groups, where some teachers contested the use of stereotypes and directly challenge those using them. Yet resistance does not come freely, and as illustrated in the final section of this chapter, it takes great courage and personal resolve to challenge deeply entrenched ways of speaking and ways of being. Such resistance impacts greatly on one's identity and often causes deep discomfort.

The chapter has also suggested that the use of stereotypes and language structures that '*Other*' groups of people have powerful effects on identities and actions. Unless these naturalised ways of talk are critically examined, the opportunities to move beyond assimilationist and multiculturalist ways of managing difference will be limited. Despite the difficulty inherent in discussing racial differences, it is an essential aspect of dealing with our apartheid past. As Ndimande (2007:142) argues, 'We cannot continue to live as if [our society] is colour-blind when in fact race was the fundamental historical legacy for black oppression, including the denial of quality education to black folks'.

The following chapter describes how the teachers perceived change through an analysis of the metaphors they used when discussing shifts that had taken place and were taking place in their school. Enabling and constraining discourses as well as shifts in practices are discussed as well as are strategies that teachers (and learners) use to resist practices they regard as unfair.

CHAPTER FIVE

CHANGE

5.1 INTRODUCTION

Moving from an assimilationist and multicultural framework towards a more critical framework requires that the teachers make shifts in their thinking, their beliefs and ultimately, their practices. But change is difficult, messy, frightening and slow. This chapter describes some of the changes the teachers had already made to accommodate their changed classes and how they understand change. It also describes an extended metaphor of movement used by many of the teachers when discussing the institutional reaction to any change. Since movement occurs through both space and time, it is a useful metaphor to describe the difficulty involved in shifting entrenched beliefs and practices. Naturalised habits, deep-rooted fears, social investments, and a lack of institutional commitment make change difficult and unwieldy. The past 15 years have seen major curriculum and structural changes in South African education, resulting in teachers having to undergo further training and make major shifts in their teaching practices. Many of the teachers felt that these changes had been overwhelming. The following expressions capture the extent of the changes as experienced by the participating teachers in the past 13 years:

- We do everything differently now (i1Sa)
- Loads of things have changed (i1E)
- It's just changed so much (i1J)
- We've been through a period of dramatic change (i1A)
- Education in SA is taking place at a very fast pace (i1A).

5.2 WHAT TEACHERS HAVE ALREADY CHANGED AND WHAT THEY WOULD LIKE TO SEE CHANGED

Teachers were asked what had changed in their classrooms and school during the previous 13 years. The text below indicates that four teachers referred to curriculum changes and the advent of Outcomes-Based Education (OBE). The

curriculum and methodological changes are apparent in the following comments:

- I now give the learners things to do (i1Z)
- I use the jigsaw method,(i1Z)
- I have to record things (i1M)
- We give less homework now (I1A).

Some teachers referred to changes with regard to the learner profiles in indicating that things had improved at the school:

> In terms of race there is more tolerance and learners can now take the Mickey out of each other. Race doesn't matter any more (i1B).

At the initial interview Brolox felt that race didn't' matter. However after various readings and discussions during the focus groups, he shifted this position (See Chapter Six). Another teacher commented on the changed lifestyles of the learners:

> Years ago there were many more mommies at home and that made a big difference (i1A).

Despite the gendered nature of this comment, this teacher was indicating her awareness that many of her current learners do not have the same support structures that her previous learners had received. Two teachers indicated specifically that they felt insufficient change had occurred in the school. One teacher commented astutely:

> But at the moment as I'm sitting here talking to you, the only conclusion I have reached, is that people still want to retain the status quo and I don't think, I honestly don't think and I hope I'm wrong, the same I hope I'm wrong about Theo Cronje and the rugby, you heard about that, I just wish it's not true, but anyway[15]. I also hope I'm wrong about the staff but my gut feeling is that people will rather hold on to what they have than change. (i1MM)

Later he added,

> This is still a white school and the only change is that they have opened their doors to keep this school open. They have opened their doors to black learners and keep the school open but other than that, I don't think so. (i1MM)

[15] This is a reference to a sporting incident which was clearly racist.

The original metaphor of ‘opening doors’ can be traced to the Freedom Charter (1955) which declared, ‘the doors of learning and culture shall be opened.’ It can be said that all public schools in South Africa have ‘opened’ their doors to all South African learners in the sense that schools cannot easily refuse to accept a learner, but issues of class, location, language, gender and ability ensure that schools are not really open to all (Fiske et al. in Chisholm, 2004 ; Soudien, 2004). Even if public schools are open in the sense that they allow learners of all races to attend the school, it does not necessarily translate into the school and institutional practices being open (being open to and committed to) change. Therefore, although schools are not permitted literally to close their doors to learners, it is difficult, if not impossible, to ensure that teachers and practices do not retain fixed notions and traditions that prevent many learners from fully engaging and benefiting from all that the school has to offer. In this sense, therefore, the ‘openness’ of the doors belies the closed nature of these schools to many of the learners. This is an example of what Lakoff et al. (1980:10-13) refer to when they argue that metaphors can highlight certain meanings while hiding others. The opening of doors to black learners can hide the closed way in which these learners are treated when they are inside the institution, and therefore what is needed is

> openness that goes beyond the opening of doors; an understanding that meaning itself is open and that attempts to close it are attempts to disempower other meanings (Janks 1993:15).

A second teacher told me that very little had changed in terms of the values of the school. This is what she said:

> We just carry on and this is the school we’ve been teaching at for years and years and our student population has changed completely and we’re just doing the same old thing that we used to do when we were completely white or entirely white. We cherish the same values; Derby days are considered to be important in the whole life of the school (i1A)

Alison’s view supports MM’s point that the cultural, linguistic and symbolic capital of Model C Ordinary had not shifted in the last 15 years. The language, values and culture of the school have not adjusted to incorporate resources

brought in by learners of different race, language, class and cultural groups. This refusal to shift what was currently viewed as the only worthwhile social capital in the school is exactly what is meant when educationalists refer to assimilationist approaches which retain the material and social interests of the dominant class.

In terms of what teachers wanted to see change, two teachers indicated that they would like to see changes in the attitudes of the learners. One felt that she 'wanted to see more respect for what the school believed in' and the other teacher wished for the learners to have a 'stronger work ethic'. One teacher felt that for real change to occur there needed to be a change in the representation of staff in terms of race.

5.3 MOVEMENT OF CHANGE

How the teachers responded to these changes and how they perceived the school management to have coped with ongoing change will be discussed in terms of the extended metaphor of movement and its opposing binary of stagnation that appeared regularly in the teachers' conversations. The sense of movement, with its connotations of progression, was inherent in comments such as the following:

- Moving with the times (SAI1 x 2)
- Moving along (FG 3)
- Going with the flow (MMI1 & FG 4)
- Having to move on (BI1 x2)
- Running smoothly (FG 4 & FG 8)
- Need to go further (FG 5)
- Being at sea (AI1).
- Life is thrusting us forward whether we like it or not (AI2).

In the first four metaphors, movement is associated with making progress, being goal-orientated, reaching somewhere and keeping up with current trends. What is lacking in these metaphors is a sense of agency. Apart from ascribing movement to the intangible subjects like *the flow*, *the times*, and *life*, there is a sense that the subjects are being moved along and that they themselves have no agency in affecting where they go, the speed at which they go, and whether

or not they want to go. It is as if they unquestionably move along because it is the appropriate thing to do. In addition to this, the sense of moving with the flow suggests a predetermined path to a predetermined destination. What this path or destination leads to, however, is left unarticulated. What seems apparent is the lack of pressure (Evans, 1996) that is being exerted on the school to make significant changes. This pressure would need to be exerted from governmental structures as well as from the district and school management.

While some of the teachers indicated that things were *running smoothly* at the school, the lack of direction and vision inherent in the metaphors of *being at sea* and *being thrust forward* suggest that not all the teachers in the group feel confident about the direction in which the school is being led. This lack of confidence is extended by the occasional references to an impending disaster associated with words such as *chaos* (AI1, FG 4) and *teetering on the edge of chaos* (FG 3). One of the teachers, who commonly described events at the school as being 'chaotic', believed that while the chaos was *scary*,

> [i]t was also exciting and if managed carefully, could result in something wonderful (FG 3).

The potential of transformation that this teacher sees in this space she refers to as *chaos* is what hooks calls ‘radical openness’ and Bhabha sees as the ‘beyond’ (See 2.4.1). Entering into this space and engaging with the dissent and conflict is what is needed for true transformation to take place. This is what Gillborn (1995), Evans (1996) and Fullan (1999) refer to when they indicate the potential of conflict to transform entrenched assumptions and beliefs, resulting in second order change (Evans, 1996). Rather than conflict being avoided, it needs to be recognised as a productive force (Kostogriz, 2002). Controversy and conflict need to be seen as opportunities to create, ‘teachable moments that can build respect and understanding among different groups’ (Kezar & Eckel, 2007:24) However, the courage and commitment required to take this leap are often overpowered by fear. This fear has resulted in the teachers and management of Model C Ordinary resisting change and ignoring signals of resistance. Holding onto the myth that everything is *running smoothly,* staff and management at the school resist, ignore and silence those who challenge the status quo. As such, management is perceived to be:

- Clinging to old ways (MMI1)
- Caught in old ways (MM1 & FG 3)
- Getting nowhere (MMI1 & FG 3)
- Forcing yourself into a corner (MMI1)
- Being in a little box (MMI1)
- Staying the same with same people and same ideas, an old school in a new SA. It's so sad (MMI1)
- People want to hold on (MMI1)
- There's a reluctance to change things. They want the pupils rather to adapt to the system we have. They are reluctant to change that.
- The headmaster holds onto the power thing.
- We so want the school to change because the school has to change. We cannot stay the same because we've taken a different type of learner in.
- The system has changed, the laws have changed, but the people's mindset hasn't changed.

The verbs *clinging*, *holding on*, *being caught*, *staying*, capture the rigidity and intractable disposition of the management of this school as well as intimate the inherent desperation that accompanies such beliefs. While the teachers in the group recognise the urgency of making appropriate shifts in their thinking and their practices to accommodate the new and different, they identify that this urgency is not shared by those in power at the school. The management *(they*) have not moved into this space but are clinging onto the old, same beliefs, traditions, values. The *old* refers not only to the previous political tendencies (as in old South Africa) but also is suggestive of ideas that are no longer relevant, are out of touch and are therefore inadequate. The old, rather than imparting wisdom and structure to the new, seems to impede new growth, new ideas and alternative practices. The social investments and possible losses involved with change (Evans, 1996; Fullan, 1991: 1999) are too great.

Also apparent are metaphors that suggest that the teachers attempted to resist *going with the flow* and tried to gain control over where they were going. The metaphors pertaining to this are the following:

- Tried to pull ourselves back (FG 3)
- Holding the ship (AI1)
- Steering (AI1)
- Steering a fine line (FG 4)
- Fighting upstream (MMI1)
- Rocking the boat (FG 8).

While the images of steering and holding the reins are familiarly associated with maintaining control and direction, the image of fighting upstream and the more deliberate metaphor of rocking the boat suggest deliberate attempts to resist the dominant flow. These images of resistance against institutional dominance appear only rarely in the data and are usually associated with accompanying difficulty such as

- Being forced into a corner (MMI1),
- Going nowhere
- If you challenge them, you get nowhere (FG 3).

These spatial metaphors suggest that the teachers are aware of the institutional inertia (Gillborn, 1995) that exists as well as how their own positioning (personal and professional) is at stake when they choose to resist dominant discourses and practices. Furthermore they emphasise the critical role that teachers' identities play in any institutional change (Van Veen et al., 2005) and the need to examine what the intended change means to the individual participants (Evans, 1996).

Another apparent obstacle that stands in way of change is fear and the lack of forums or spaces for engaging with issues that require change.

5.4 FEARS

The apparent reluctance on behalf of the management to engage with alternative views or to allow a space where critical perspectives are encouraged is further illustrated in the fears expressed by the teachers. Table 8 below illustrates the source of their fears and explains their disinclination to vocally resist practices they regard as discriminatory. I have categorised the fears into three sections but this does not mean that they are not closely related. Of

particular concern is the repeated reservation about *standing up in staff meetings*. The teachers in the group appear to feel strongly that disagreeing with what is said during staff meetings was not something they could do easily or freely. Some teachers indicated that they are disempowered and that their professional identities are not recognised.

If teachers are to become change agents in their school and drive transformation, they need to be positioned and recognised as capable professionals and encouraged to confront any practices that might discriminate against staff and learners. This would include confronting colleagues and management at forums such as staff meetings. In Model C Ordinary this appeared to happen seldom. Differentials in power relations, gender, status, age, length of service, levels of education, language and personal preferences colluded to silence many teachers and position them as mere recipients of instructions who are denied opportunities to engage meaningfully in the work they do as teachers. The ethos of staff meetings and levels of interaction and debate, as well as the power given to all staff members to contribute to proceedings can reveal the openness of school management to make shifts and engage with controversial issues. Model C Ordinary appeared to have a management who discouraged engagement at meetings and who avoided controversy. This can be seen from the following extract:

> He decides on what issues he wants to pursue: “okay, let’s wrap it up because we’ve got enough of what’s going on here.” That is the flavour in the staffroom. You deal with certain issues and if you raise one it’s up to his prerogative whether he allows a discussion. Sometimes he does, sometimes he actually jots it down in a meeting. And at that moment there’s nowhere you can raise something on the staff meeting again. (FG 8)

It appears from what this teacher is saying that the headmaster sees it as his sole prerogative to select topics to be discussed at staff meetings. Teachers are positioned as passive receivers of directives and are not given space to question or raise issues. The headmaster’s position of power seems extreme and as indicated in the final sentence of the above extract, there were no other forums in which to contest issues. Agreeing with this sentiment, another teacher said:

> We are not empowered. We are not empowered. We just come to school and do your thing do, you go home. You are not involved in decision-making, you are not involved. Your involvement is as far as what management tells you what to do and what not to do. What's acceptable and not what's acceptable and that. How does that leave you? Teachers' morale in general is low, in this, not as low as in the township schools but in another way. (FG 8)

The intensity of these sentiments is highlighted by the repetition of *we are not empowered* and *we are not involved.* The lack of agency and recognition afforded to the teachers leaves them feeling demotivated and uninvolved, and foregrounds their identities as workers rather than as professionals.

Table: 8: Teachers fears

External fears	Individual fears	Interpersonal/ institutional
Fear of the unknown (FG 1)	Fear of exposing oneself and making oneself vulnerable (FG 1)	Fear of the effect that challenges would have on one's relationships (FG 3, FG 4, FG 7)
Fear of allowing the Xhosa learners to speak Xhosa which would enable them to gossip about the teacher (FG 3)	Fear of being seen to be subversive (FG 7)	Fear of conflict and confrontation (FG 3)
Fear of those who are different to us (FG 3)	Fear of being labelled as trouble-makers (FG 7)	Fear of disagreeing openly with someone (FG 4)
Fear of letting go/lacking control/ the impending chaos (FG 4)	White teachers fear being called racists (FG 5)	Fear of standing up in staff meetings (FG 4, FG 6, FG 8, FG 9)
Fear of being knocked over in the corridors (FG 10).		Fear of confronting management (FG 7)
		Fear of pushing people further away from one (FG 7)

As with the learners, teachers are subject to and subjected by the practices of the headmaster and his management who draw on authoritarian discourses to disallow controversy and produce the notion that challenging issues wastes time

and prevents effective management of the school. Therefore those who attempt to ‘disrupt’ the normal flow of authority are positioned as annoying and subversive. Therefore they choose silence.

Another contributing factor to the teachers’ disinclination to openly resist either the management of their colleagues is the resulting effect the challenge might have on relationships. As can be seen in Table 8, the fear of disrupting personal and professional relationships is a repeated concern of the teachers:

> And I think we, often as teachers, because we are teachers, we think and we want it all wrapped up nicely. So maybe the thing that we all come to a decision and we’re all happy is not necessarily right, maybe it just makes us feel good. Now we’re all going to leave and we’re all friends with everyone. But we don’t have to agree. I can disagree with something Zander says but it doesn’t mean I hate Zander. But that is not the ethos of the school. I don’t think it is, of the staff of the school. The staff in the school are more, you’re my friend and I’m going to favour you and I’m not going to say anything because I’m going to offend you and anyone, but you can’t just be like that. You have to be given courage to become like that and you’ve got to be trained and you’ve got to be shown and it’s a big distinction. And one has to be brave. It takes me saying, ”MM, I disagree with you,” and you’ve got to have confidence in me that tomorrow I’m still going to have a cup of coffee with you, and I’m still going to talk to you. It doesn’t matter that I disagree because it‘s the issue, not the person. And that is a big culture in the school that is here, you know, and people are scared to talk up in meetings because they're scared, ”If I disagree with …then she’s going to give me 6 extra periods or I disagree with Mr … and he’s going to cut my budget, you know, you know, there is going to be a way. He’s going to stand and, “Ja, okay,” but my departmental budget is going to be gone (FG 4).

Emily highlights the potential that disagreement impacts on personal relationships. Openly contesting practices can also jeopardise the teachers’ professional and social relationships. Emily believes that the 'ethos' of the school is such that one has to make a choice between two conflicting positions: one can go along with the dominant view, which would result in feeling *good, happy* and being friends with everyone. Alternatively, one can disagree and take an ethical or moral stand. However, this is not done lightly because one stands a chance of being ostracised and *out of favour*. In addition, one can be *punished* by being allocated more classes to teach or having budget cuts. Therefore

challenging naturalised and dominant practices positions teachers as ‘betrayers’ who are ‘disloyal’ to the school. The authoritarian ethos in the school, the rigid structures and strict control, as well as the negative material consequences of contesting hegemonic practices, provide explanations for the tendency of teachers to *go with the flow* (See 5.3) as well as their reluctance to critically question dominant practices in their school. Additionally it explains the teachers' lack of agency demonstrated during the meeting with management as well as their fear of being positioned as too controversial in the feedback given to the whole staff.

The fear that teachers would be materially and socially disadvantaged by *talking up in meetings* or by disagreeing with popular choices results in a lack of agency. Emily indicates that it takes *courage*, *bravery*, *training* and *confidence* to be able to place one's professional identity before one's social subjectivity, and she implies that this is not happening at their school. Instead, teachers forego their professional agency in order to hold onto their personal friendships. While perfectly understandable, this does not allow for diverse opinions and instead entrenches fixed practices and beliefs. The complexity of straddling contradictory identities and institutional structures as described by Emily is what Epstein (1993) and Gillborn (1995) refer to as the micro-politics of the school and demonstrate the effects of a ‘power-laden site’ (Canagarajah, 2004:120). Implementing change requires an acknowledgement that schools are ‘not rational places where people can reasonably be expected to act in selfless ways if it is for the good of the school’ (Gillborn, 1995:95).

In the following extract, MM discusses his experience at his previous school where he stood up to the school management on issues he felt strongly about. Yet having to *fight* and regularly *defend* one's position eventually exhausted him, resulting in his resignation from that school. He recounts the exhaustion and frustration:

> …unfortunately that the school I come from, uh, if you always speak your mind you are going to make enemies, whether you are speaking the truth or whether you are speaking... and uh, I don’t know if I am ready to, to spoil certain relationships. I think I get along well with everybody on the staff, and I don’t know if

> I'm ready to put that on the line for something that I don't know, that I might be convinced about but everybody else is not. That I feel strongly about, but everybody else is not. And I can feel strong about certain things, I must be realistic. Also, there are certain things I'm not going to change. Or that might take a very long time to change. So I don't think I've reached that stage and I've had a very, got close to a very in-depth discussion with one of the staff members and I had to stop along the way because I felt if I take it any further that, it might, uh, harm our relationship (pause). It's fine to be honest and to be open and, but I don't know, um (FG 4).

His description indicates the tremendous personal cost involved in trying to persuade someone to shift entrenched views. The militaristic image of *making enemies* suggests how deeply embedded people's views are and how often people are prepared to go to great extremes to *defend* their positions. The military metaphor links to Emily's comment above that it takes *bravery* and *courage (*attributes often ascribed to soldiers*)* to resist dominant practices. Having to defend a position can cause intense hostility and can ultimately *spoil a relationship*. MM acknowledges that despite his intense investment in certain issues (such as equality and justice), he knows that others' positions are not easily shifted and that forcing a shift might harm a relationship. MM's multiple and contradictory identities of activist, colleague, friend, and fellow professional placed him in an uneasy space. His ongoing struggle between these different positions is evident and he finally chooses, at this moment, *to be realistic* (rather than idealistic) and to accept that *things might not change* or might take a *very long time* to change. Accepting this, MM chooses to position himself primarily as a colleague and friend and to subordinate the activism for another time and place. This illustrates Canagarajah's (2004) assertion that negotiation of multiple and often contradictory subjectivities takes place in relation to changing discursive and material conditions.

5.5 STRATEGIES TO RESIST DOMINANT DISCOURSES

Despite feeling disempowered and disallowed to contest issues publicly, the teachers found other means to voice their resistance. Knowing that direct methods of challenging management are risky, they discuss alternative

strategies. One is *canvassing support* before a meeting, although this might be risky. One teacher explains:

> You basically need to get a support group to canvass, but the danger is how you need to challenge with the knowledge that your support group will support you all in whatever way, and I'm not convinced that you are going to have that support (FG 8).

What this teacher recognises is that while it is relatively easy to commit to supporting a point of view; it is not always as easy to maintain that dissent in the space of authority and power.

Another strategy teachers use is to *involve other teachers perceived as powerful and credible* and *bring them on board*. This is what they believed happened at a meeting where it was suggested that the number of detentions given to learners be recorded on their term reports. The teachers in an unusual show of support of each other, indicated that they did not think it was fair to record DT sessions in a report. The unusualness of this kind of challenge was evident in one teacher's reaction to this:

> I was, I was, I was, I'm telling you I was shocked, [and] surprisingly, I enjoyed the fact that teachers voiced their opinions and they said no. It was a good feeling, it was empowering (FG 8).

Discussing further why the *meeting worked*, one teacher discussed the reasons for the success:

> Sorry, you know why that meeting worked? Cause, what you're saying is absolutely right and this is what takes so much energy at this school. It's like playing Survivor, you've got [to] outwit, outplay and outlast, okay. The reason why the meeting worked it's because Mary[16] raised the issue. Mary was the one. Mary is perceived, and she is, she's very intelligent and the head trusts her creditability and she raised the issue and she disagreed with it. She said I don't agree that it should be on and that everyone went (noise of exclaiming). And that's actually, I think, why that meeting worked (FG 8).

This extract raises the important issue of power and credibility. Certain staff members are afforded more power than others because of various attributes:

gender, age, years of service, personal characteristics, skills, leadership and types of knowledge as well as personal friendships. In addition, certain people are more powerful because of their alliances with those in power or with their perceived acceptance of the authority. Still discussing Mary, the conversation continued:

> Emily: And Mary works with the reports. So, it was a credible person that stood up…
> Alison: I agree with what Emily is saying and I think it helps a hell of a lot if you are knowledgeable and you can convince people. What you're saying about hmmm, about Mary.
> Emily: She's also very non-threatening.
> Suzie Hmm, yes, ja.
> Alison: But what does that say? That only non-threatening people are allowed to raise an issue?

Realising that some people have more power than others do, the teachers suggest that they can involve certain teachers who they believe have the power but also who *feel like we feel*. While this does not directly give the teachers agency, it does allow them to have their views heard and possibly considered albeit it in a roundabout manner. Mary has obviously been able to work with the politics of the staffroom and challenge the headmaster without threatening him. This demonstrates that schools, like most social organisations, are 'arenas of struggle' (Ball, 1987 in Gillborn, 1995:94) and essential to affecting change, is the need to recognise the central role of power and politics. To bring about a change in reality 'requires an engagement with the forces that shape the routine interactions inside schools' (Gillborn, 1995:99).

The teachers' lack of agency and their technique of resorting to silence was clearly apparent during a meeting I arranged with the whole group and three management staff. While the teachers had been vociferous and highly vocal during the focus groups on the need to change the detention system, they were markedly silent during the meeting with management. In the meeting that lasted for approximately 90 minutes, 46 of the utterances were made by the 8 teachers present. This was in contrast to the 128 utterances from the 3 male members of management. In total, 66 of the utterances came from me. Even though the

[16] Pseudonym

meeting had been called by the focus group and the group had agreed to discuss certain issues, the teachers seemed to feel threatened and disempowered by the presence of management. This raised various ethical issues.

Two other teachers confirmed my sense that the teachers felt silenced. One phoned me on the evening after the meeting and indicated that she *felt that the group had let me down and that a lot of what I said should have come from the teachers themselves* (FN 11/03/04). Another teacher said:

> But at last week's meeting, what was apparent for me [was that] at times *I felt* like *Jacqui was the only one*, like *she was the voice for us*. Fine, *I tried* and *Emily tried,* but it seems to management that *there was Jacqui*. You know *we've come a long way,* and *I just didn't want them to think* that it comes from *someone out the schoo*l. Maybe that's the impression *we left at this meeting*. *I felt at times* you know*, I wish that* we could contribute more *I just thought* if it's going to be a *person that leads the movement for change*, it should *come from inside*. (FG 8)

An examination of the pronoun use in the quotation above reveals interesting positioning of the different actors at this meeting.

Table 9: Pronoun categories from meeting with management

I /me	**Jacqui**	**We**	**Them**
Apparent to me	Jacqui was the only one	We've come a long way	management
I felt like	Voice for us	We left the impression	Them to think
I tried	There was Jacqui	We could contribute more	
I didn't want them	Someone out the school		
I felt			
I wish			
I just thought			

The table reveals two distinct subject positions for the speaker, MM: one as an individual (column 1) and the other as part of the research group *(we*). I (Jacqui)

am positioned as the *voice* (disembodied and powerless) representing the group (us) yet being disempowered as an outsider, someone who was there temporarily and who does not have to contend with the material and emotional consequences of challenging management. And *them* refers to the three staff members who represented management (the headmaster, deputy and head of the detention system).

A transitivity analysis of MM's talk reveals that the verbs ascribes to himself as an individual (*felt, tried, didn't want, felt, wish, thought*) are predominantly mental processes. This highlights the intense strain and anxiety that MM experienced as an individual who desires to position himself powerfully but is unable to do so in the authoritative presence of management. The verbs ascribed to the group (we) such as *come, left, could contribute* are more material, suggest that the solidarity achieved by the group enables them to be more powerful. However, both positions seem to cause MM frustration. He knows that as an individual it is difficult to drive substantial change yet he feels that the group have 'buckled' under the surveillance of the management. He is reluctant to destroy the solidarity of the group and therefore hedges his criticism with words such *as just thought*, the conditional, *if*' and the modal, *should* (come from the inside). While MM is justified in feeling that the group did not keep to their stated intention of challenging the management on the unfairness of the detention system, he is also able to recognise the immense difficulty that the group faces in challenging the management of the school face to face. While it is relatively easy to identify what needs to change in the 'safety' of the focus groups, it is another thing to publicly resist the force of the three white men who represent the management's position. A real reason to fear public resistance was illustrated the following day when one of the managers indicated to MM that he had thought that he (MM) was happy in the school. The implication of this was that, had he been happy, he would not be challenging anything. MM indicated to me that he viewed this comment as a threatening one.

Therefore resisting dominant practices at the school is not without realistic fears and constraints. Resisting in more subtle ways, however, can sometimes be equally powerful. One of these ways was through the use of humour.

5.6 USING HUMOUR TO INDICATE RESISTANCE

One strategy of resisting dominant discourses without alienating relationships is through the use of humour. As Janks (2002:18) argues, 'Jokes…circumvent reason; allow us to confront our fears and hidden wishes and to laugh'. Therefore challenges that are constituted in the form of humour are not perceived to be as threatening, yet can be very powerful in highlighting issues of concern. Humour also provides us with insight into our own identity investments. Jokes reveal 'faultlines in the social structure' and 'expose the way power relations are naturalised' (Misson, 1997:11-12). MM in particular, was extremely adept at using humour to expose issues without giving offence.

Jokes can also be used to lighten the mood and yet still challenge existing ways of thinking. An example of the use of such light humour was seen when MM, after having directly challenged Suzie to disallow stereotypes to be reinforced in her classroom, realises the intensity of the group discussion and lightens the mood, while retaining the focus on stereotypes. He refers to a request on the intercom the previous day for learners to perform the duty of car guards because the staff needed to enter a black township for the funeral of a learner's family member. He believes that asking for car guards when going into a township reinforces the notion that townships are dangerous and unsafe places. This was MM's comment:

> If I need car guards in the township, I'm not going to announce it on the intercom because that just reinforces that whenever we go there, that's why we don't want to go there, and no white teacher is ever going to visit MM because he's too damn scared (FG 5).

MM jokingly positioned himself in the third person and as living in the township (which he didn't) and suggests that none of the white teachers would visit him if he were to live there. Despite his direct jibe at the fear of whites, he softens it by including himself in the '*That's why we don't go there'*. Positioning himself within

the humour achieves two outcomes: firstly he candidly exposes how this stereotype would reinforce fear, and in turn, prevent people across the colour line from visiting each other and developing friendships. Secondly, it 'reminds people that there are alternative perspectives' (Misson, 1997:15). This is important because the fear that most whites have of going into a township prevents friendships across racial and class groups. This in turn creates ignorance and fear which fuel stereotypes and miscommunication. Therefore when there are opportunities for whites to visit townships, it is important that they are not tarnished with stereotypes and essentialised perceptions.

In another show of resistance, MM makes a joke of a comment by Brolox that succeeds in causing laughter, and in doing so, he articulates an unsayable stereotype:

- Brolox: But Jacqui, I would go to a black lawyer, without even questioning. I would, would let him defend me in court without even thinking that way.
- MM: Because lawyers are, they can get you off the hook, they know how to lie, that sort of thing and black people are good at that type of thing
- Brolox: You're silly, I would (laughter) I would...
- MM: I'm saying maybe that is the reason.
- Brolox: I would go to a black coach, any occupation, a black minister, doesn't matter, but if it comes to a doctor, I don't know why. (FG 5)

In saying the unsayable, that many whites believe that most blacks are dishonest, MM is exposing a commonly held, yet seldom openly spoken, stereotype. Having it out in the open allows one to begin to interrogate it and to question one's own position with respect to the stereotype. It is also worth noting that the stereotype appears less offensive coming from a black person that it would have from a white person. Being positioned as an insider allows MM to joke about a racial stereotype whereas it would have been considered out of bounds coming from a white person who had not had to endure racial taunts. While everyone laughed at this comment, no one in the group was prepared to unpack Brolox's discomfort about going to a black doctor where he might need to have the private space of his body examined and touched by black hands. The reasons for his discomfort were left unarticulated.

Another example of the use of humour, this time by the learners in the classroom, reveals the potential of certain jokes and humour to create spaces for talking about and therefore dealing with sensitive issues such as race and racial stereotypes. Below is a description by Sally of humour that her learners used:

> One of the white girls in the class asked a black learner to put her file in the cabinet that was near to him. He responded that he was busy, to which she retorted, "Ag, you're a racist."
> "I'm not racist" he replied, "I love all white people." And then they laughed.
> "One day you're going to work in my house," he said.
> “I'm going to make you my gardener" she carried on.
> "Oh no" he responded, "I'll be in Australia by then." (S1I)

In this example, the learners can be described as being ‘risqué, transgressive and politically incorrect’ (Janks, 2002:10). In discussing politically sensitive issues such as racism, racial stereotypes and immigration, these learners are ‘flirting with the 'forbidden’ (Janks, 2002:10). They play with issues of racism and class roles, and the humour is achieved through the reversed use of labelling and counter-labelling. The white female calls the black male a racist, and he ironically counters the charge with the commonly used phrase, *No, I'm not, I love all whites.* The charge of racism is generally levelled against white people and less often against blacks, and racists often defend their racist attitudes by saying things like, "I'm not a racist, I have many black friends." Here the male is using this generalised type of response to defend himself against the female's tease. Second, these learners are joking about racialised, classed and gendered constructions of employment. In South Africa, many black women find employment as domestic workers and black men work as gardeners. These jobs are notoriously underpaid and undervalued. Once again, humour is achieved by the reversal of racial stereotypes, yet with the maintenance of gender stereotypes. The black male indicates that the white female would work in his house as a domestic worker, and she, in turn, indicates that she would employ him as her gardener. The black male learner saying that he would be in Australia, is a direct comment on the number of white South Africans who have immigrated to Australia. By reframing and repositioning 'fixed' notions of gender

and racial stereotypes, these learners are making social issues visible, and offering alternative constructions to the set ways of thinking.

However not all use of humour was as constructive. On my third visit to the school, I was in the staffroom with one other black member of staff who was formally dressed. Another staff member came into the staffroom, saw this man and whistled, saying, "Your mother will be proud of you, as today you are dressed like a white man" (FN 26/08/2003). While possibly well-intentioned, this supposed use of humour is offensive and demeaning. Unlike the previous example where there was a repartee between the participants, this was one-sided and unexpected. The recipient was caught off guard and did not have an opportunity to respond. Also the framing of the 'humour' as a 'compliment' places him in an awkward position: if he acknowledges the 'compliment' of being well-dressed, he would be supporting the use of a racial marker as a sign of being well-dressed. This would require of him to adhere to an ideology of racial supremacy. However if he resists it and comments on the racist nature of the comment, he would be perceived as 'unable to take a joke' or to being 'oversensitive'.

While humour can be a useful strategy for highlighting sensitive issues, it needs to be used tactfully and with care. Likewise it is important that repeated stereotypes and 'humorous' comments be critically examined

> for what they are doing, for how they are positioning us and the people whom we are addressing in the terms they dictate, and for the way in which they are providing us with ideological valuations (Misson 1997:22).

The use of humour can be an effective and powerful strategy to resist dominant discourses and create a space that is non-threatening, while at the same time challenging.

Fears, institutional inertia and fixed views disincline the teachers to outwardly resist practices they might regard as discriminatory or unfair. The learners on the other hand, despite having even less power in the school than the teachers, seize opportunities to display their resistance. An example of this is provided in

the following extract discussed by the teachers about the recent Prize-giving event the school had hosted.

> I have been very aware of who and what we are and how well we are doing, particularly in the light of the prize-giving and the valedictory celebrations and the sports prize-giving that we had. We have been teetering on the edge of chaos because some of us want to be British, some of us want to be English, some of us want to be a little less structured, and then we ended up being a little bit of obviously British with our togas; we ended up being a little bit of South Africa by singing the national anthem; we also ended up being a little bit [of the] American school Model C where we actually had the kids taking initiative, and then we got really scared as management and staff of the school. Then when we eventually became African as well, then wow, we were complete when we were in the staff room having an analysis of how well this went we tried to pull ourselves back, and you talk about conflict (FG 3)!

The stimulus for this discussion was an extract (Fullan, 1999:1-28) the teachers had read in preparation for the focus group. One of the arguments Fullan (1999:1) makes is that the main purpose of a school is to uplift the less advantaged. Alison does not believe that her school is achieving this, and she articulates the discomfort and fear that many of the teachers experienced during the recent prize-giving service in which some black learners had spontaneously broken into song and dance. This had not been well received by the majority of staff members who *tried to pull things back*. Alison indicates that many of the teachers had felt fearful because it was generally perceived that the whole event had *got out of hand*. Alison, however, thought the event was *wonderful*.

The school takes every opportunity, such as the prize-giving and the valedictory services, to market itself to the parents and to promote the *good name of the school* in order to attract *the right kind of learners.* The perceived market, or the market of *those who belong at this school* (as is said often at assembly') is distinctly racialised and gendered.

The annual prize-giving at any school has great symbolic value because it celebrates and publicly honours the learners who have achieved academic merit in the school. Alison had mentioned in her initial interview that when black learners achieved a position in the 'Top Ten' (the top 10 academic achievers in

the grade) which was called out once a month, there was a strong reaction from the other black learners who loudly cheered and supported their colleagues. The headmaster was displeased about this. He spoke to the black learners to tell them that their behaviour was racist and that they should stop cheering so loudly when a black learner's name was called. Alison had asked her class to explain the reaction of the black learners:

> Well, I don't think that it's racist. I actually discussed it with my own class. I said, "Tell me why this happened, anybody, anybody got any explanation why this happened this morning?" and the black children said it is because they have struggled so hard to achieve in so many years, so when somebody makes it into the Top Ten, it is the result of far more work, far more effort, FAR MORE than it is when any white child gets up there (AI1).

The reaction of support and solidarity that black learners feel for their fellow black learners when they achieved well is understandable. Not only are the instances rare when black learners are placed on the academic list, but their fellow black students know the many obstacles that had been overcome to obtain this achievement. In addition to this, there is the tradition of praise-singing among the amaXhosa. Praise singers or 'iimbongi', are recognised in their communities and are valued both as eulogisers and critics (OpenAfrica.com). The praise song is usually a 'highly emotional enactment, praising the features or characteristics of a person, usually a chief or very important person, and it tends to exaggerate somewhat' (OpenAfrica.com). While the students might not be engaging in actual praise singing as such, they came from a tradition where achievements among people are usually praised and celebrated in a public and emotional manner.

The annual prize-giving is an opportunity for celebration; it has great symbolic value and is traditionally marked by many traditions in the ex Model-c school. As explained by the teachers (FG 3), first, the entire school, apart from the prizewinners, is seated in the school hall. The prizewinners' parents are also invited to the function, and the formality of their dress reveals the status that is placed on being invited and being seen at such an event. Once parents and learners have been seated, the music *Pomp and Circumstance* by Elgar begins to play, marking the entrance of the staff dressed in full academic gowns. This

was the reference that Alison made to the staff wearing 'togas' and being British because it is the Model-C school which is most frequently shown to epitomise British private schooling. The learners who will receive prizes then follow the staff. They are divided into their grades. Usually the learners formally follow the staff down the school aisle in a quiet, sombre manner. It appears that on this particular day, the matriculants were allowed to choose their own music on which to enter (the reference to the American taking of initiative). While they were given a choice of music, they were expected to uphold the tradition of walking slowly down the aisle. During this particular prize-giving, a group of black learners veered from this tradition and began to dance and sing as they entered the hall (this was the reference in Alison's extract to their being African). The reaction from the parents and staff was mixed, and according the MM, was divided along colour lines:

> MM: With the kids coming, certain staff members weren't impressed with the disruption and the untimely and inappropriate behaviour. But I then specifically looked at parents and staff members, besides some of them not singing the National Anthem. When the matrics came in, the first group was the white group. The noisy group, the happy and the singing group were the blacks. They came in and they changed the mood. I looked at staff members, and I looked at the white parents, and they, you could see the surprise on their faces. They were caught by surprise 'cause this is not happening at Model C Ordinary. But then I looked at some of the black parents and they were smiling and they were unaffected and that shows our diversity. Now how do you deal with that? Do you criticise them? I mean…
> Alison: We're scared of it.
> Emily :Ja, we don't know to…
> MM: You know, and some people were saying… Ja, I think that's enough. And it comes from, we keep people different from ourselves, at a distance. We exhibit helpful behaviour to those similar to our selves (He's reading from his journal where he has quoted from the Fullan article). And once the line that divides us, is the colour line. And it's a culture line.
> Alison: It is colour and culture.

The table below categorises the adjectives ascribed to the white learners and their parents and to the black learners and their parents.

Table 10: Reaction of parents to the prize-giving

White learners	White parents	Black learners	Black parents
	Surprised This is not happening	Changed mood Noisy Happy Singing	Smiling Unaffected
		Inappropriate	
		Disruption	
		Untimely	

The words, *disruption, untimely and inappropriate* capture the strong disapproval by the school management and many staff members. The implied criticism in these words links up to the often-mentioned description of black learners as *hooligans* (See 4.3). Hooliganism extends the notion of lawlessness and unruly behaviour with a sense of ill discipline, and as argued by Dixon & Dornbrack (2007) these ways of talking are strongly embedded in the socio-historical context of apartheid. Rather than understanding that this behaviour is culturally appropriate, the staff at the school position the black learners as unruly and ill-disciplined. However the learners are instilling their own cultural meaning into an event that was meant to honour their academic achievement.

In the extract above, a sharp distinction is drawn between the two groups of learners: the first group are the white learners, and the second group, the noisy, happy, and singing black learners. Whereas the white learners are not attributed any kind of emotion, the black learners display a sense of intense enjoyment. The black parents seem quite at ease and they, too, display their enjoyment of the practices of the learners. This is contrasted with the reaction of the white parents who express *surprise* at this unusual behaviour shown by the learners. Their surprise might have been caused by the disruption of certain norms and the expectation that a prize-giving is to be celebrated in a sombre, deferential manner. The *noisy, happy* learners are challenging the normalised celebratory

practices and are *disrupting* traditions. School traditions such as a prize-giving are often associated in the public's eye with a 'maintaining of standards'. Certain types of behaviour, such as refraining from excessive emotional displays and portraying detachment when receiving a prize, have colonial roots and represent middleclass and Eurocentric values. Many white and middleclass parents see embodied physical reactions such as dancing and singing as disrespectful and disruptive, and favour notions of 'self control' and 'self discipline', especially of one's body.

The staff's reaction to the event, as seen in the extracts above, suggests that the majority of the staff were unhappy with the learners' embodied behaviour, and feel the need to *pull back*. Alison (in MM's extract above) candidly confesses to *being scared* about the event. The fear is possibly created by the staff's sense of losing control, of their fear that the fee-paying parents (middleclass and predominantly white) would take fright and remove their children from the school. This would result in serious financial difficulties and might lead to job losses. The teachers' fears were not unfounded: many middleclass parents, fuelled by media reports about the dropping of standards and unruly behaviour in ex-Model-c schools, are placing their children in private schools. Thus the diminishing pool of parents able to pay school fees has to be shared among a number of public schools in the suburbs.

The fear of the unknown, the fear of creating 'wrong' impressions, and the fear of breaking with set traditions prevents these teachers and their management from realising the potential for constructing something new and possibly more meaningful to students. The magnitude of emotion generated with the coming together and 'touching' of conflicting cultures is succinctly explained by Bhabha (1994:207), in what he refers to as a 'moment of panic' which, he says, occurs at the 'margins of hybridity, where cultural differences 'contingently' and 'conflictually touch'.

The prize-giving in this school could become a truly hybrid, multicultural event that showcases the rich differences in the school. Hybridity could be achieved by the prize-giving event becoming 'neither one nor the other' (Bhabha, 1994:25)

but rather, a *combination* of various ways of acknowledging and celebrating success. There does not appear to be a willingness among the school authorities to 'descend into that alien territory…which may lead to conceptualising an international culture, based not on the exoticism of multiculturalism or the diversity of cultures, but on the inscription and articulation of culture's hybridity' (Bhabha. 1994:38). Instead, the opportunity was passed over and the fixed, polarised prize-giving ritual was maintained.[17]

In summary, this chapter has explored how the notion of change is understood by the teachers in the group. It appears that two primary constraints limit resistance to accepted practices. One is the fear that teachers feel on a personal, interpersonal and professional level that resisting current practices would result in loss of some kind (Fullan, 1991; 1999; Evans, 1996). The second is the hegemonic authoritative discourses that have become legitimised among the management of the school. Contradictory views and multiple understandings of events and practices are disallowed. Despite this, teachers still find various strategies to display their resistance. However, since these resistances are often shut down, they appear insufficient to shift dominant understandings. The insistence of consensus, closure and singular meanings work against the formation of a thirdspace which requires a toleration of ambiguity, openness, disorder, and destabilisation.

The students, however, have the required mass and passion to resist practices they feel are unrepresentative and they make use of opportunities to demonstrate their resistance publicly. This is where the potential for real change exists. Teachers who feel they cannot sacrifice their professional identities by openly challenging management need to take up these issues in support of the students, and as recommended by Gillborn (1995) include students in bringing about positive change in their school

[17] The valedictory event that I attended later in the year was tightly controlled and rehearsed. Learners were repeatedly coached on how they should enter and exit from the hall and warned that any deviations would result in severe punishment .One teacher reported that the learners later referred to the event as sterile and clinical and almost devoid of meaning for them (i2B).

CHAPTER SIX

REFLECTION

6.1 INTRODUCTION

As argued in the literature review chapter, reflection takes a conscious effort and a deliberate undertaking to rethink occurrences, experiences, values, attitudes, and practices, and to reflect on how these might work to discriminate against certain learners. The process of reflection, if it is to produce some meaningful results, needs time, energy, and preferably some structured format within a devoted space. It also requires of participants to interrogate their assumptions and beliefs, and consider how these underlying beliefs might produce unjust practices. Considering the heavy workload and stress that usually accompanies teaching, it would be almost unreasonable to expect teachers to reflect regularly upon their own and their institutional practices. The teachers who participated in this research were no exception. When asked about their current reflective practices, most of them indicated that they would 'chat' to some of the other teachers during break or possibly discuss incidents with their spouses. Only one teacher (i1A) indicated that she regularly stood back in her own classroom to look consciously at things from another perspective.

Like most teachers, the participants in this study had to cope with heavy teaching loads, many students per class, and huge administrative loads. These factors result in a sense of exhaustion and overwork. Metaphors construct a powerful sense of physical fatigue and depletion. In their comments, these included:

- being worn out (i2A, FG 12)
- running thin (i2A)
- feeling burdened (i1A; i2A; i1B; FG 10),
- disciplining the class
- dragging learners along.

References to being overburdened suggest that the teachers are 'carrying' more than their fair share, that they are, in a sense, feeling overloaded and abused. Expressions such as being

- extremely tired and frustrated (i2A),
- rushed (i2A),
- product orientated (i2A),
- having to contend with high noise levels in the class and school (i1E; i1SA; i1Z; i1J; FG 8; FG 10)

indicate that these teachers are struggling to cope with the heavy demands of teaching. The physical and mental requirements needed to maintain their professional positions disallow any spare energy or time for what one teacher refers to as the *luxury of reflection* (i2A). For this to change, a dedicated time and space needs to be constructed to allow for reflection to occur, where teachers can be given an opportunity to step out of the rush and pace of the everyday labour of teaching in order to engage in critical reflection of their own and the institution's practices. Also they need to have some kind of input for their reflection, and in the interest of stimulating critical reflection, an impetus or catalyst to rupture deeply entrenched ways of thinking and being.

6.2 TIME AND SPACE TO REFLECT

On Thursday mornings at 8:15, while the rest of the staff attended assembly in the school hall, the eight teachers participating in the research met in the school library around a small wooden table for about an hour. As the teachers strolled into the tranquil space each Thursday, some carrying their cups of steaming coffee, the choral singing of the learners could be heard faintly from the hall down the passage. While there were certain occasions that required some teachers to miss a focus group (such as being away on a sports tour or being present at assembly to hand out prizes) the attendance was high. The pleasure that the teachers gained from participating in the group is evident in the frequent references to *enjoyment* and the associated synonyms of *being happy* and *loving it.*

- I'm enjoying this group. I think it's opening up things that we perhaps always felt but never spoke about and wouldn't have thought about any further and it gives a chance to speak what you feel. (FG 4)
- Really I enjoyed it in a sense that people said what they wouldn't otherwise say if they knew you in the staffroom. It was a good exercise. (i2SU)
- I know I have missed a couple of your meetings but what I been in I've been very happy with. I'm finding it very interesting. (FG 4)
- Ja, I've thoroughly enjoyed, enjoy being in the group (FG 4)
- I love being here. I've really enjoyed it. (FG 4)
- I'm acutely aware of a heightened sense of awareness that's happening in my whole way of being a teacher because of the fact that this group has come about.

Based on the above comments, the space created by the focus groups became, for some teachers, a space of pleasure. This pleasure possibly emerged from the sense of safety and trust that developed in the group. It became an informal space where teachers could contest and question dominant practices in a safe arena.

6.3 A SAFE SPACE

The safe space of the focus groups is contrasted to the staffroom, where Alison feels she would have been 'attacked' had she said the same thing.

> If I had said in the staffroom yesterday what I'm saying now, I think I would have been shot down. But I decided I would say it in this, what do you call this group, folks, I thought our prize-giving was wonderful. It actually showed how diverse we were, but the management of this school is not comfortable with that (FG 3).

The fact of Alison articulating counter-discourses to those legitimised in the staffroom would have caused a barrage of responses, and the possible conflict and 'injury' made it unthinkable for her to say them in the staffroom. However, having raised the topic during the focus group, a space is created for a heated discussion about what happened at the prize-giving**.** The communal and dialogic nature of the focus groups allows alternative views to be expressed and

sensitive issues to be contested, rearticulated, and in the process, resignified. Some of the teachers begin to question taken-for-granted practices and reflect critically on assumptions made by singular interpretations of a 'right' way to celebrate achievements. By reflecting on the event such as the prize-giving they are able to raise important questions about whose interests and values are being represented by the current practices and whose interests are being negated. By asking these questions the teachers are opening up the possibility for imagining something different; they are beginning to understand that multicultural education can offer hope for change and that they can explore alternatives to a system that fails many.

The regular meetings with the group seemed to strengthen the teachers' sense of trust and support, as can be seen in the following extract in which one of the teachers admits openly that he felt scared of the conflict that was going to be caused by the discussion with management over the issue of detention. Emily was quick to reassure him that he was not alone and that the whole group was there to support him.

> MM: I'm scared. I'm sitting here, and I can say what I want to because I, I have grown to trust everyone around this table.
> Emily: Take comfort in the fact that you're not the only person. We are a group and we're supporting you. We're supporting each other in this (FG 7).

This teacher had indicated to me in his second interview that he had grown to trust the other teachers in the group, but that it had not always been like that:

> If I look at the first three sessions then there was definitely like a brick wall, but now I can see that they've changed and that, that willingness to listen also, you know, listen to black people and hear what they've got to say (MMI2).

The simile of a brick wall illustrates some teachers' initial reluctance to change their views or listen to alternative views. The brick wall also suggests a protective barrier that some teachers put up when sensitive issues of race and class are discussed. The brick wall is suggestive of Fanon's (1967:9) notion of a 'white man sealed in his whiteness'. Fanon's metaphor of whiteness powerfully captures the sense of claustrophobic entrapment that is solid and impenetrable

and creates a reluctance and fear to look outwards and beyond. Being 'sealed in' prevents an infiltration of outside influences, thus ensuring that what is contained within is left untouched. However, MM believed that the focus groups had enabled some teachers to listen to the views of others (MMI2).

For one particular teacher, the focus group became a space of personal interrogation of stereotypical thinking. He used this space to question his own practices in terms of racialised thinking.

> Brolox: You are going to go to a white doctor without asking too many questions. It's not an opening up session here, but I was just going to tell what I would have done. If you, I, would go open eyes to a coloured doctor, an Indian doctor and to a white doctor, but I would have some reservations before I go to a black doctor. I'm talking from a personal point of view.
> Jacqui: Why ?
> Brolox: Maybe its because, was he long enough in the field, was the study, you know, I doubt, I'm honest now when I say, where with an Indian and a coloured and a white doctor, I won't have that same reservation, I would feel, but it's a personal thing, you might all feel different to that. They did, and this is true that guy who got fired. They appointed a white physiotherapist and a black physiotherapist en die wit fisiotherapie [white physiotherapist] was fully booked, he couldn't even move his backside where[as] the black physio, he almost had to beg players to come to him. They didn't want to go to him, the black players, they all lined up in front of the white physiotherapist. I don't know why.
> Brolox: I would go to a black coach, any occupation, a black minister, doesn't matter, but if it comes to a doctor, I don't know why.
> Emily: Don't you think, in SA, we have had a lot of questioning people's credentials, and people have gone up. I also wouldn't feel comfortable going to a black doctor, but not because they are black but because they're black but has the guy been to India and got it.
> Brolox: From Medunsa, is Medunsa the same as...
> Emily: There has been a lot of publicity about that.
> MM: But how many white doctors have done that?
> Emily: Exactly (FG 5).

For Brolox, the space created by the focus group and the topic of discussion allow him to interrogate his own assumptions and beliefs and to try to make sense of why he feels so reluctant to be treated by a black doctor. He begins to explore possible reasons for this. He is demonstrating the quality of open-

mindedness (see 2.3) as he looks for reasons for his beliefs. While internalised racism is not identified as a possible reason, white superiority is intimated, since both Emily and Brolox question (and draw on the 'public general knowledge') the validity of a black doctor's certification. Their reasoning is illogical as fraudulent certification occurs among all race groups. Brolox tries to reason further that he is not alone in his (racist) beliefs and that even black people are racist. But this 'reasoning' does not suffice as an explanation for his reluctance to allow a black person the intimacy required of a doctor-patient relationship. Fanon (1967) offers a plausible explanation. He argues that since colour is the most obvious outward marker of race it is made '*the criterion* by which men are judged, irrespective of their social or educational attainments' (1967:119). He goes on to provide the following illustration:

> We had physicians, professors, statesmen. Yes but something out of the ordinary still clung to such cases… I knew for instance that if a physician made a mistake it would be the end of him and of all those who came after him. What could one expect, after all, from a Negro physician? The black physician can never be sure how close he is to disgrace. I tell you, I was walled in: no exception was made for my refined manners, or my knowledge of literature, or my understanding of the quantum theory (Fanon, 1967:117).

The belief of white superiority is so deeply engrained in people's minds and bodies that it disallows them to accept that a black doctor could be as clever/intelligent/worthy/capable as a white one. And as Fanon (a psychiatrist) indicates at the end of the above quote, no matter how educated or how refined he was, he was always perceived first as a 'Negro'.

Even though Brolox was unable to name racism and white superiority as the cause of his discomfort, the disclosure of his prejudice was valued by MM who later cited it as a turning point in his relationship with Brolox.

6.4 A SPACE OF DISCOMFORT

Not all participants found the space of the focus groups reassuring and comforting; for some, it was a space of discomfort caused by the topic of discussion and the conflict and disagreement it generated. As Nieto (2004) notes, racism and discrimination are never easy to discuss and therefore teachers often avoid discussing them. Nieto goes on to argue that to be anti-racist means to make racism and anti-racism explicit. Schools often fail to deal with racism and discrimination because they cause discomfort. Even though we may not be guilty of racism we are all responsible for it, and we all have a responsibility to confront it. The discomfort experienced by Jenny during some of the focus groups is captured in the metaphor of *sandpaper* that she ascribes to Alison after a particularly intense discussion:

> She's just like sandpaper, always rubbing us the wrong way (FG 4).

Being rubbed by sandpaper is not a pleasant experience and the implications of being exposed and rubbed raw suggest severe discomfort. There is also the sense of fear of exposure or fear of learning things about oneself that might not be pleasant. Sandpaper removes damaged layers and is a necessary process for resurfacing an object. Metaphorically, set ways of thinking are being stripped and the resulting exposure causes annoyance and vulnerability. To rub someone up the *wrong way* implies a deliberate attempt to irritate or cause discomfort, and Alison's questions appeared to have this effect on Jenny, who did not remain in the group for long and left after a few sessions, citing a heavy workload as her reason for leaving.

Jenny was not alone in her discomfort; Emily, likened the focus groups to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) that had allowed perpetrators and victims of political crimes during apartheid an opportunity to confront the past in order to achieve a sense of closure and reconciliation. For most participants, the TRC hearings were emotionally harrowing, and Emily's comparison of the focus groups to the TRC hearings suggests that she experienced the focus groups as

a form of inquisition where she was forced to deal with issues of guilt and remorse.

Zander acknowledged the discomfort she felt in the discussion of certain issues, but insisted that it was a necessary process for creating awareness and insight. She indicated that the initial issue she had raised (in the first interview) about gender differences in terms of achievement had been superficial. She continued to explain that the probing and questioning *by people like Alison and MM* facilitated her movement to *the next level.*

> But if I wasn't part of this group, I would not have gone past, you know, past that level. And I really do believe that we need someone like you (MM) and Alison. They do ask difficult questions, they do say things that cause me sometimes, to often, to think about stuff, to think differently than we do. So, we do need you, MM. Um, and I know sometimes it's uncomfortable. (Pause). But we need it. And I'm sure I'm going to get out [something from] this group after this year, something else that I've never expected to get from this and that there will be some growth in myself. I mean, I had a chat, with MM. We still must continue that chat, we can do it during the exams when we can have a cup of coffee. I was very surprised at what he said to me that day 'cause I didn't't see myself that way and he still owes me answers, but I need to know that so that I can look at that to see if it is true or not and then I can go back to him and say, to react on that. So yes, I enjoy being here (FG 3).

Zander, although acknowledging the difficulty involved in being asked certain questions and disagreeing with how others perceived her, believes it was a necessary process for growth. Her four repetitions of the verb *need*, suggests that she sees this uncomfortable process as necessary for her own growth and development as it provides the insight and distance that allows her to see things differently. The spatial and movement metaphor of *going past a level* evokes Bhabha's (1994:7) notion of going 'beyond' which he explains is to be part of a 'revisionary time, a return to the present to redescribe our cultural contemporaneity.' This vacillation between the present, past, and future breaks fixed boundaries and allows a re-creation and re-presentation of the past that, in turn, relocates the present and the future. Moving to another level suggests a change in depth and a consequent change in perception. Changing depth

implies going below the surface in order to obtain a richer and more layered, nuanced understanding.

Zander also acknowledges the powerful impact that other people's perception of oneself has on her own identity formation. However, she refuses to simply accept MM's perceptions without first *looking to see if it's true or not* and only then does she *go back to him and react on it*. For her, the focus group allows not only a reflection of past events and beliefs but also becomes an opportunity for personal reflection.

6.5 A SPACE FOR GROWTH

The three participants who were the most critical of the practices in their school used metaphors of growth to describe the effects of reflecting during the research. Alison, in her final interview, made five references to growing and growth:

> On this [the increased level of honesty and intimacy with other people in my working relationship], I lack terribly. I really do. Hopefully, I will *grow* to that again with others, but this group kind of facilitated it on a level where I've been with the school for 5 years and all of a sudden there was a rapid *growth* (i1A).
>
> Having someone looking at this with me and saying 'you know what, this could be happening and that could be happening. This is actually what I see and therefore this has been overlooked and that's been missed out on'. It was like a major *growth* point (i1A).
>
> And if I really am going to respect diversity then I need to say that if I am going to be a white teacher in a black cultural setting then I need to make some changes and not just stay with what I thought was a good idea or with what I was comfortable with…and trying to *grow* in understanding and intimacy with one another so that we can learn from one another (i1A).
>
> I think when we were actually try to expose to management, some of the things we were aware of, we actually just got ourselves up against a brick wall and we discovered that their agenda is completely different to what the group had then

grown to (i1A).

> Jacqui, you coming to visit me in the classroom; it's amazing how that was such a *growing* point (i1A).

Alison applied the growth metaphor to herself and the group. The importance of personal relationships was highlighted in terms of pleasure and she described her growth in terms of her increased ability to reflect on issues that she had previously *overlooked and missed*, and of which she had subsequently become more aware.

Two of the growth metaphors were used to describe the group. Alison indicated that an increased level of *honesty and intimacy* was apparent among the group members and that the group had *grown* to a level of critical insight that was beyond that of the management of the school. Owing to the increased reflection and critical input, the group was at a level of awareness where they could plainly see the unfairness of the detention system and were willing to *expose it to management*. However, Alison describes this attempt as finding themselves against a *brick wall* which they could not penetrate or go beyond. The refusal of management to engage in attempts to adjust the detention system reveals to Alison the extent to which the group had grown and moved. Growth is therefore ascribed to increased levels of awareness of practices that unfairly discriminate against certain groups of learners. The activity in the growth of the group is contrasted to the inanimate brick wall which possesses no capacity for growth.

For Zander, growth was associated with change and moving out of *one's comfort zone* where it is easy to *cruise along.*

> For me, I did it yesterday. I realised it is much easier to be, how can I say, if you want to cruise along, join a homogenic group cause then you are in a comfort zone and everything goes, nothing disturbs you, nothing maak jou vere regop staan [causes your feathers to stand up]. But diversity actually brings the change and the growth and the challenges and one can actually learn a quite lot from each other if we can, have to just get past that barrier, that FEAR, fear (FG 2).

Zander's comment about diversity bringing change is significant. The differences among the teachers, in terms of race, gender and political awareness and

backgrounds are what enabled varying and often contradictory perspectives to be heard. It allowed a space where alternatives could be explored and negotiated and where sedimented beliefs could be disrupted. This sense of disorder and disruption is never easy and it is bound to 'ruffle one's feathers' but as Zander argued, it can be a tremendous opportunity for growth if one can get past the fear.

The final reference to growth was captured in the following metaphor when MM in a telephonic conversation once the research had been completed told me the following:

> At a staff meeting where 10 new teachers were present, the headmaster told the new teachers that they were to ensure that learners looked them in the eye to show respect. Brolox stood up and said that they should keep in mind that in the Xhosa culture, looking in one's eyes directly is rude and that black students often looked down in order to show respect. MM indicated that he was so pleased with Brolox and even went to him afterwards to tell him that what he had said was excellent. MM completed the narrative with the following: *Jacqui you* have *planted a seed* (FN: 18/01/05).

Here the image of *planting a seed* suggests that the intervention of the focus groups provided a stimulus or gave rise to a new way of thinking. MM was implying that Brolox would not have said what he had before participating in the focus groups. A new awareness and a more critical stance on normalised practices in relation to the values of the dominant group had been *planted* in Brolox and had grown (and being a seed had the potential to grow further) resulting in Brolox's public contestation of a singular way of showing respect. Brolox shared with the new teachers not only that Xhosa people can show respect in a way that is different to English people, but he also shows that there are multiple ways of behaving, which can be equally valued and appreciated. The power and position obtained from being a white male and both the rugby coach and head of department, enabled Brolox to contradict the headmaster in the public space of the staffroom without any retributions.

Having discussed how the space of the focus groups was perceived by the participants and commented on some of the issues that were raised in this space, I now turn to more specific examples of individual reflection. I have

chosen to discuss those extracts that selected participants identified as significant to them. In these incidents, the teachers commented explicitly on their awareness of a shift that had occurred in their thinking, and each one commented on how significant this shift was, as well as expressing their surprise at its occurrence. I referred to the incidents as 'turn-around' moments: a notion borrowed from Comber and Kamler (2005) in their research with literacy interventions for at-risk students. They explain that a primary finding of their research is that '*teachers need to turn around to students* and their families and *see them differently* in order to have an impact on their literacy achievement' (2005:9). So, too, did the teachers in the focus group need to turn to those learners whom they viewed as *Other* and *see them differently* in order to shift the practices and discourses in the school which had *othered* them in the first place. This is no simple task. It requires a

> physical and embodied turn by the teacher -- literally moving to see [the child] in different contexts with a new lens. Second, it implies a research-based turn -- moving to a more informed, sociological analysis of diversity (Comber et al., 2005:9).

In order for *turn arounds* to happen, teachers need to acknowledge that their understandings of the world and realities were (and are) framed by their personal histories and lived experiences. While each frame is unique to an extent, frames are constituted within a socio-historical-political context in which certain ideologies, values, practices and social conventions exist. These are often represented in the dominant discourses within those communities on which the participants may draw both consciously and unconsciously. Critical reflection, (Carr & Kemmis, 1986, Gore et al., 1991; Hatton et al., 1994) (See 2.3) requires that participants examine how historically and socially produced ways of talking and thinking may result in practices that discriminate against certain groups of people. Such personal reflection requires what Dewey (1933) referred to as *open-mindedness* (See 2.3), hooks names *radical openness (2.4.1)* and Soja believes requires *inquisitive nomadism* (See 2.4.3). Not all of the participating teachers were able (or willing) to develop these qualities. Some were open-minded with respect to certain issues (such as Sally and Emily) but not to others, while some teachers, for instance Jenny, found the focus groups extremely threatening. In an email to me after the fifth focus group she indicated

that:

> I was wondering whether we're supposed to talk about such detailed stuff about our school…. Also about MM, I feel he takes stuff too seriously, sees things into our meetings and at the school, as if it's personal, maybe it is because we don't experience life the same way as he does. (FN 01/011/03)

Clearly the critical discussion about the details of the school (it was about the stereotypes that got reproduced during the annual isiXhosa evening at the school) made Jenny uncomfortable as well as the frank comments made by MM. Jenny's last comment indicated her awareness of personal experience framing our thinking, but she was not willing to take this further, and told the group in the following session that she no longer had the time to attend the meetings.

Unlike Jenny who 'turned away', Brolox revealed an immense capacity not only to acknowledge the limitations of his (and the school's) own framing of events, but also to critically examine the epistemological basis of the dominant beliefs. Brolox's reflection can clearly be termed a *turn-around* as he was able to see events through a different lens as well as to make a more informed analysis of the situation.

6.6 BROLOX'S TURN-AROUND MOMENT

The first extract describes Brolox's turn-around moment/point where he articulates his realisation that the detention system at their school has a disproportionate number of black students and that this cannot be *natural*.

When I first interviewed Brolox, I was struck by his confidence. He had wanted to examine the issue of the Top 10 pupils being girls, with number one in each case being a boy. For him, research was clinical and objective, and he expressed a desire to help me with designing a test to determine why the girls performed better than the boys. He had the following to say:

> I would like to, if I can help you further in, in the research and have like a work out exercise that I will work out, no problem, which I will give a particular class and just purely test it, just like

> almost like have a clinical test. Mark it, look at the results, and just see what the results are actually telling us there, just like clinical, like that we don't, I'll try to be as close as objective as possible.

In order to determine how reflective Brolox was, I asked him what he did if something bothered him in his class. His response was the following:

> I follow the policy of the school. I'm, you can speak to the children as well, and maybe they can give you an answer, but I'm very open-minded if it comes to little things. But there's five, five non-negotiable rules I'm very strict on. They are clearly visible (written and pasted up in the classroom) in the class and there we don't negotiate. They know. They also know what the consequences are.

I probed further, asking him whether, if something had happened in his class that worried him, he would think about it and maybe talk to someone about it. He immediately responded:

> A major thing I believe that we three [pupil, teacher and parent] are together in a thing. I mean they know also, the kids, they know that if there's a major problem, which from time to time happens, that I can't sort out myself, that the parent will know immediately.

Brolox's quick, confident response at this early stage suggested that he saw no need to reflect on issues because he had definite strategies for dealing with problems. He also had confidence in the school's procedures for dealing with problems.

In terms of difference within the school, Brolox's views at that time suggested that there was harmony and unity in the school and there was no need for concern.

> Now there's a much more like relaxed relationship between the groups and also where we used to have these racial fights, it's almost entirely disappeared. You don't get that anymore. *They* are more tolerant, I would say, than a couple of years ago, although I mean you still get the groupings during break, but there's much more tolerance*. They* know still they're different, know *they're* different. But it doesn't really matter anymore that much. I can say that in all honesty, I mean it's clear for anybody to see… But there is also, *those okes love each other;* there's not a little bit of any, that *they* feel any different to each other, I

> mean, in fact, the *captain and the vice captain are black* people, but they don't, they *haven't been seen as black.*

Strongly visible in Brolox's transcript are indications of an 'us and them' binary. He refers to the black learners in fixed and homogeneous terms (*they are tolerant, they know they are different, and how they mix*). He twice refers to the 'tolerance' of the learners and to the harmony among the different race groups and believes that the race differences are not an issue. He unproblematically states that the black students are *not seen as black* and appears uncritical of the notion that the students have to cease to be seen as black in order to fit in. Using a discourse of harmony and concord, he believes that black students who have assimilated white norms are fully accepted and even *loved*. It appears that students who have been able to 'disguise their blackness' and act like the white students are the ones who create harmony and engender tolerance. There are no indications that the white learners had changed or that they needed to. Whiteness and white behaviour appear to be the standard against which learners are evaluated, and if black learners can 'act white', they are accepted and cherished. Brolox has clearly framed his view of difference in an assimilationist paradigm.

Brolox did not respond in his journal after the first session or the second session; however, by the third focus group, he had read the Fullan extract and he was eager to tell the group the following:

> I did DT (detention duty). I sat and I looked at the group doing DT and I'd say that close on 95% of that class was black, and they're not even 50% of the school. Now it's either that we're too much of a Western culture still, and we put emphasis on things that are not issues in the black community as such. It was just like, I looked at them, and I thought, "Yisee, you can't all be that evil. Is it because you're louder that you're in here? What is the particular reason you're in here?" I mean by nature, we're all the same, you know. Ek het nou philosoofies begin dink daar*. [I started to get philosophical there].*

Brolox, who had sat through detention many times before, appears to recognise for the first time that there are disproportionate numbers of black learners. It appears that Fullan's argument that there is a moral purpose in education, which means making a difference in the life chances of all students, as well as his

advice that ‘you cannot achieve moral purpose unless you develop mutual empathy and relationships across diverse groups’ (1999:2) had stimulated Brolox to reflect more critically on the learners in the detention group. Rather than blame the learners, Brolox recognises that the problem lay with the staff and management (*we*) in which he includes himself. He also recognises that the school has not shifted from its *western culture* despite the presence of many other cultural groups attending the school, and that this could result in a mismatch between values. Inherent in this recognition is the acknowledgement that there is a limited understanding of what the black communities value and deem important. Brolox is recognising that norms and values differ from community to community and it might be unjust to punish someone who is acting in accordance with his or her own values which are dissimilar to those valued by the institution. His reflection raises the importance of being sensitive to the ways in which our histories and socio-cultural discourses frame and structure our thinking and our perception of others. Brolox is learning to see the students differently (Comber et al., 2005).

It is significant that Brolox is looking for answers; he is questioning a practice that until recently had seemed so natural, and is beginning to examine the ideology and internalised biases that inform our thinking, as well as the possibilities that there are multiple realities. In trying to make sense of the disparities, he works through possible reasons, including the use of stereotypes, which are powerful in shaping people’s ideas and actions. It can be argued that Brolox is ‘privileging uncertainty’ and ‘inviting contestation’ (Soja, 1996:107), essential elements of thirdspace (see 2.4.3).

Brolox’s comment that by *nature we are all the same* indicates his ability to connect to his learners from a point of shared humanity and empathy, and to acknowledge that from this perspective, we are the same. In debating this issue, Brolox was transforming knowledge and being transformed in the process of sharing this with the group (hooks, 1990).

Brolox was not finished, and continued reflecting on his experience:

> Being the majority–95%– and this in itself is not a good booster for them and you feel, “Yisee, we are the baddies” and you can’t really make them loyal by doing that.” I don’t know how a school like us [can] be proud and say we’re disciplined, and there was 135 pupils in DT. It’s just not *natural!* Reading through this powerful creation of yours, Jacqui, is like reading a good novel or seeing a good film. In the early part, I felt sad and disturbed, which was painful, but at this stage I begin to see that there is hope. I'm getting quite seriously excited. Golly, you're good, girl! It's your whole opus that is moving—the writing, which is skilful, and also the whole concept, what you wanted to find out and how you set about it, and at this stage anyway, what you achieved, what is possible.

Brolox is able to occupy the subject position of the black students who had been positioned as deviant, and in so doing he is problematising the hegemonic position of many of the white staff. It can be said that he was doing what Spivak calls for when she asks that

> The hegemonic discourses, and the holders of the hegemonic discourses, should dehegemonise their position and themselves learn how to occupy the subject position of the other (In hooks, 1990:49).

Brolox is reflecting on the effects of this discrepancy, and positioning himself as one of the pupils, even using the pronoun, *we are the baddies*, and empathising with their situation and how it affects their identities and loyalty towards the school. The *naturalness* of the detention system as well as the *naturalness* of the majority of the students being black has been disrupted and disordered. Brolox had ‘begun to see the world differently’ (hooks, 1994:49) and has begun to question the normalised constructions and meanings of detention. In terms of reflection, it can be said that Brolox was engaging in critical reflection as he questioned practices within his school that were unjust and discriminatory, and was ‘attentive to the institutional and cultural contexts in which he teaches’ (Zeichner & Liston, 1996:11).

In focusing on Brolox, a white male teacher in his 40s, I have attempted to indicate a shift in his thinking that all was harmonious in the school. While it can be argued that being aware of something does not necessarily change the situation, I suggest that because Brolox had been teaching in the school for 18

years and is in a position of middle management, he has both the position and power in which he might influence a shift to make the detention system more equitable. (See Afterword).

It was mainly due to Brolox's impassioned comments that the issue of disproportionate numbers of black students in detention became the primary discussion point in the following focus groups and eventually led to a meeting between the group and the management on ways to address this discriminatory practice.

I will now discuss Emily's turning point. Emily, the youngest teacher in the group, was a vibrant, passionate English teacher who attended all the focus group meetings. Her commitment to the research project and to improving her practice was always evident, as was her desire to work towards achieving justice in the school. Her turn-around moment was not particularly dramatic but was none the less significant in that she 'confessed' to having had strong beliefs about issues relating to class and had felt that class was insignificant in the learners' achievements.

6.7 EMILY'S TURNAROUND MOMENT

Emily had phoned me during the week when I asked the group to complete the diversity grid and had indicated that she believed that it was, in a sense, a waste of time. However, during the discussion of the results from the diversity grid, she commented on how the evidence she had obtained contradicted what she believed, and that, despite her previous insistence that class had no effect on achievement, her results showed otherwise.

In the first focus group I asked the teachers to discuss in groups of three or four, how the use of the grid might enable them to obtain a deeper understanding of the differences among their learners. Emily reported back for her group:

> We looked at socio-class and achievement 'cause if you've got someone who comes from a say low socio-economic class,

> you, let's say as, as teachers, our frame of reference is very different. 'Cause I grew up in an apathetic, white middleclass home, with a mom and a dad and an ouma and oupa and a dad who went to work. So if you've got a child that actually has to work to go and earn food, you get into conflict with things like DT. You know the child has got DT on Friday afternoon, but the child knows she has to work. That's how important it is. So I think if one, and also with their performance, do you have children, is the child driven by the fact that he comes from a low socio-economic class, I want to do better, or does he have an apathetic attitude, oh well, I'm hopeless, I'm just going to continue the way I am and it doesn't help. So, that would be quite an interesting correlation (FG 1).

Emily's first comment indicates that differences between the class location of teachers and learners might result in different *frames of reference.* However she does not pursue this line of thought and continues describing her own family as a point of reference. She describes her family in racialised and gendered terms within traditional family structures and having a male breadwinner and an attitude of apathy. The assumed link between family composition and class is interesting, and in the discussion that ensued during focus groups 1 and 2, this assumption was articulated frequently by other teachers in the group.

> It is often more a case of how *much support have they got* than which income level of socio-group they belong to. That's so important. One person who comes from a *weak support* group and she is at the bottom (Emily, FG2).

> So what I basically did, I drew up these and I said to the children, I am part of a survey and we just want to have a look and see what kind of *support system* you have at home, you know, who looks after you, what do yo*ur mom and dad* do, where do you live (Alison, FG2).

Many of the comments referring to 'support' were based on a normalised Western notion of a traditional family consisting of a mother and a father, and families that veered from this traditional structure were often framed within a discourse of disapproval. There also appeared to be an assumption that single parents were less able to provide necessary 'support' than married parents, as well as the assumption that learners from working-class homes were generally less supported and more likely to be dysfunctional.

> One thing I highlighted was the fact was that some, you know, obviously just as Alison said, support system at home. The

> support system, *some parents are divorced*. I've got a boy who is one of the *bottom achievers* in *the class who stays with a white family*. He's a Xhosa boy. If you close your eyes, you will never know that this child is a Xhosa-speaking person, and it's amazing. And then I've got a girl who also has done very well *but then* she is a single mother in grade 11 (Jenny: FG 2).

Jenny seemed to deem it important to isolate the case of the *Xhosa boy who does not sound like a Xhosa speaking person* who was one of the bottom achievers despite staying with a white family. It was suggested that he, like the girl who had *done very well* despite being from a single family, were exceptions. The issue of *support at home* overshadowed discussions about living conditions, access to resources, and parity between home and school practices.

Emily felt very strongly about the need to stress support from the home and what she referred to as *family dynamics*. Ignoring socio-economic factors, Emily described individual influences as more relevant. To illustrate her point that individual support was paramount, she constructed a contrast between two scenarios.

> I got to a point where I thought that family dynamics is more of an influencing factor than socio-economic class because someone can be a single parent family living in Upper Hilton, their mother can be the Dean of the medical faculty, but she can be beaten up by her boyfriend and never be at home, whereas you can have a lady who lives in Ekhaya Township ext 55 who works as a char and she sits with her kid. She may not understand the homework, but she may sit there and motivate the child which might inspire the child. So that for me was a problem.

Emily is suggesting that a child from the working-class environment who has a mother, who supports her, would be better off than the child from the middleclass environment whose mother gives her child no support, and she concludes, *family dynamics is more of an influencing factor than socio-economic (FG2).*

While it can be argued that learners who have caring adults to support them will be more motivated than those without that support, there are flaws in this argument. A wealthy, well-educated parent is likely to have transmitted the

cultural capital that is valued in most Model-C schools as well having access to materials, resources and technology that can assist learning. While the mother *may never be at home*, she is more likely to have the economic capital which allows her to employ a tutor or send her child to extra classes. Additionally, her children are likely to have access to computers, the Internet and other material resources that will contribute to their learning. Additionally, the well-educated parent's attitudes and aspirations for her children as well as her 'time, money, confidence and educational know how' (Connell, 2004:228) enable her to engage meaningfully and assertively with the teachers and the school structures. The mother who works as a char is unlikely to be familiar with many of the school practices, to own a computer, and to live close to quality resources. While the motivation and support she gives her child are essential, they alone cannot support the child sufficiently to enable him/her to excel in a learning environment that assumes that all learners have equal access to resources. Another important aspect that Emily does not acknowledge is that her scenario is likely to illustrate exceptional circumstances and not the average. And while exceptions can always be found to illustrate a point of view, it must be acknowledged that an exceptional case does not illustrate what the majority experience. MM points this out to her lucidly in the following comment:

> MM Jacqui, can I just add something here. Um I said that I find for me, the socio-economic is more important. But it doesn't mean that the home situation shouldn't be taken into consideration. Like most people have mentioned the fact that if you come from a stable home, its going assist and so on, but like many things we are going to discuss here, its going to be generalisations and for me*, it's more an exception than a rule when a rich kid gets the lowest mark in the class. For me, that is an exception to the rule. If a POOR kid with, that lives in a shack, has no parents, is a top achiever, that's the exception to the rule*. For me, I'm looking, it's fine we can make those, we can make references to those examples and stuff like that, but most of the time we are going to generalise in the group.

Emily's turning point came when she had completed her grid and was calling out the names of her top three achievers. She acknowledged that her previous view that individualised support was more influential than communal and socio-economic factors was flawed. A confession of embarrassment and a powerful expression of disgust accompanied her realisation: *Yuk, I wish it wasn't like that*

*but that's from my, in my classe*s (FG 2).

While Emily did not overtly identify socio-economic factors for these boys, except that they were middleclass, she comments on issues and practices that are distinctly Eurocentric and classed:

> What is interesting for me, and I when I tell the names of my top, everyone is going to laugh because and I was embarrassed because it is so contrary to what I said about socio, my top three are: *[Calls out name of 3 white English or Afrikaans boys' names*]. They are, they middleclass to upper-class boys, are good looking, physically good looking, physically they have, they've got wonderful self-concepts of themselves. I mean (name)….. entered into Idols, (name)……is Mister Personality and (name)…….. you know they are potential councillors , senior councillors, so, ja, and they are the top achievers (FG 2).

She attributed the following factors to these boys, which she indicates was contrary to what she had previously said. Her top three achievers were the following:

- white
- male
- middleclass
- good looking
- have wonderful self-concepts
- have leadership qualities
- are popular.

These factors are not overtly connected with class, but a close examination reveals that many of them are embedded in middleclass values and practices and are attributes valued by middleclass societies. Being 'physically good-looking', while not a direct link with class, does suggest that these learners have access to products which enable them to groom themselves (skin treatments, hair gel, and gym contracts). In addition, their confidence and the 'self-esteem' which often accompanies good looks and having access to resources to enable them to 'look cool', allow them to publicly exploit these attributes in events such as 'Idols' and 'Mister Personality'. They are perceived to have the potential to become senior councillors in the school. This implies that they are displaying leadership skills and that they have 'cracked the code' in terms of desirable behaviour. The kinds of desirable behaviour valued in an ex-Model-c school

(and certainly in Model C Ordinary, especially for boys) are usually based on middleclass values and practices such as being assertive, confident, taking a stand on issues, being able to argue a point, looking someone in the eye and many others. These practices are so naturalised in middleclass homes that most middleclass children acquire them with ease. Children who have acquired alternative practices, such as appearing more modest, looking down when a person in authority speaks and not overtly exploiting their physical looks, could be perceived to possess fewer leadership skills and be less 'popular'.

Therefore Emily's turn-around moment is a realisation that one cannot hold onto a fixed belief and insist that it is correct even when there was evidence to the contrary. Emily, once she had read out her table, realises that what she had identified in her class contradicted her previous beliefs, and she is courageous enough to acknowledge this to the group. Therefore she can be said to have made a ‘research-based turn’ (Comber et al., 2005) and is able to make a more informed analysis of the role that class plays in reproducing inequity.

The third turn-around moment is that of Alison, a mathematics teacher who, along with MM, was the most critical and outspoken in the group. Alison’s 15 years of teaching and her profound desire to keep learning more so as to improve her teaching practice enables her to maximise any opportunity for self-reflection.

6.8 ALISON’S TURN-AROUND MOMENT

> Jacqui, you coming to visit me in the classroom, it's amazing how that was such a growing point.

I have interpreted Alison's *growing point* as a turning point because of the comments she made about the major effect my classroom visit had on her subsequent classroom management and on a *realisation* of the impact of her management style on her levels of stress.

Alison had asked me to observe her classes because she wanted to know if her

teaching and management style tended to favour one race group over another. She had previously indicated to me that she felt that in an attempt to assist the black learners more, she was perhaps giving black learners a disproportionate amount of attention and therefore possibly ‘short changing’ the white learners. In order to gain some perspective on the division of her attention, I drew up a table (Appendix M) which I ticked during the observation of her grade 10 and 11and 12 mathematics classes. I decided to examine both race and gender and therefore made columns for white boys (WB), black boys (BB), white girls (WG) and black girls (BG), as well as a column of the type of question/ attention given.

The results of these observations are interesting. In the one grade 11 class, there were 21 learners made up of 14 boys and 9 girls. Alison was teaching the parabola and was using an overhead projector to illustrate the graph. I sat at the back in an empty desk. Alison introduced me to the class as a visitor who was coming to observe her teaching. I was struck immediately by how noisy the class was; two white boys at the back of the class chatted incessantly throughout the lesson, and a black boy on one side of the class drew on the bookshelf next to him for most of the class. Alison continued teaching up front, explaining the x- and y-axes. Many of the learners were simply staring ahead, not taking down any notes. Alison addressed a question to the whole class: 'Why are these lines not equal?' She received no response. She then asked a volunteer to complete the equation on the overhead sheet. A black boy went up and wrote the correct answer on the sheet. Alison called on one of the white boys to keep quiet, and a group of white boys parroted, 'Quiet, Oliver.' The rest of the lesson continued in a similar vein. The results of the observation checklist in terms of the race and gender of the learners who were addressed individually were as follows:

- White boys: 14 questions posed to them by Alison eliciting responses and only one correct answer given; three instructions to pay attention or keep quiet.
- Black boys: two responses, both given voluntarily.
- White girls: four questions eliciting responses and two instructions to pay attention.
- Black girls: three responses, two of them elicited from Alison. (FN 12/03/04):

At the end of the class, Alison told the learners what homework to do, and one

of the white boys said loudly, 'You can't give us homework,' to which another white boy responded, 'Shut up'.

In the other grade 11 class of 24 learners, the lesson proceeded in a similar way to the grade 10 class. When Alison asked one of the black girls, 'Asezile, what have you done?' There was a loud response from the class. Alison then asked her partner, 'Sensa, what should we do with this sum?' A white boy shouted out, 'Her name is senzaNI,' with a loud emphasis on the 'NI.' Many learners in the class noticed this and started to comment on names and joking about some of the names; for example a white boy said, 'senza kakka.' Alison did not hear this. Another boy commented on the name 'Oliver' saying that it meant 'cut polony.' Alison allowed the bantering and commented, 'Isn't it fun to discover the meaning of your name?' A white boy immediately responded by asking Alison what her name meant. Alison brought the attention back to the work by asking who in the class could tell her the distance between two points.
The results of my checklist for this class were as follows:

- White boys: four elicitations and each received a response.
- Black boys: three questions posed to the teacher and one hand that was up was ignored.
- White girls: three volunteered answers, one learner had a hand up and was ignored.
- Black girls: one was asked to answer on the board, and she refused; the other elicitation received no answer (FN 12/03/04).

In the grade 12 class of 24 learners, tests were handed back, and Alison commented that there were stars in the class. She called out the names of three white boys, two white girls, and one black girl. This class was much quieter than the other two classes observed. I made the following notes:

- Two black girls chatted intermittently throughout the class; one of them was the 'star' pupil.
- Two white girls chatted intermittently throughout the class.
- One white girl sat in the front row and went over her test while Alison was explaining new concepts on the board.
- One white boy sitting in front of me chatted to his friend throughout the lesson.

Two comments that I had noted in my field notes were:

- Alison seldom moves away from the front of the class.
- In all three classes observed, distinct racial and gender groupings are evident. (FN 12/03/04)

I discussed the findings with Alison after the classes, and she was very interested in the amount of time that she spent on white boys. This is particularly significant because Alison had thought that she was focusing on the black learners, at the expense of the whites. However in practice, most of her focus and attention was being given to the white boys. Spender (1982) explains that sexism (and I believe racism) are so pervasive in our society that teachers are often unaware of the extent to which it controls their behaviour.

Alison suggested that I show the findings to the members of the focus group the following week and that we discuss them as a group. When I did, Alison said, 'Jacqui and I laughed because of all the energies I expended on Friday, most went to the white boys; how boring!' She then went on to explain the strategy she had used during the week to deal with the high noise levels and to encourage a change in her own patterned responses to the learners. She explained to the rest of the group what she had done in class on the Monday following my visit:

> Friday was a bad day, Jacqui saw me on a bad day, which was good. On Monday, I came in, and I actually decided, you know what, I'm not having another one of these. I've got a couple of weeks here and I've got to make life smooth. So, I said that every boy in the class had to find himself a girl and every person of colour had to find a white partner. They screamed at me, 'Ma'am, what's the matter with you?' I said, 'Ja, there is something wrong with me', I've just decided this is what I, I want to do and**...** you know, they couldn't do it. Very few of them could, and I said, 'Okay, let me help you.' Maybe I got them all uncomfortable. In one case, I haven't succeeded because the racist aura this one person radiates is so bad that no one could come near. So, I chose the weakest girl [*according to academic results*] to go with this guy because she's actually got tremendous talent (FG 8).

By physically adjusting the seating and spacing between the learners, Alison felt that she was addressing two issues: one, she would break up racial groupings, and two, she would break up gender groups in an attempt to force the learners to talk less in class and concentrate more on their work. She was also physically taking control of the group and was asserting herself and indicating to the learners that she was in charge and that she would no longer tolerate the lack of discipline and respect she was receiving.

When I interviewed Alison before she left the school, she returned to the issue of the classroom observation and relayed a discussion she had had with a colleague about it and the effect it had had on her. This is what she said:

> Cause I remember saying to (……) that the way that I was formatting groups or group work was quite effective by just by what we were talking about. Who you are? Who [do] you ask questions? How do you put people together? Do you allow them freedom? What is your racial diversity? And she said to me, "Now what has changed then in the way you're doing it?" And I said to her that I am just so aware whether I am allowing the blacks to be together. Whether I am allowing the whites to be together. Whether I am creating groups that are made up of different levels. Pushing people all the time to come out of their comfort zones. And she sort of said to me, "Well is it necessary as a Maths teacher?" And it's amazing how it is so integral to the whole thing about educating. That's really what you're trying to do. You're trying to get people to get on with other people. And it kind of made her aware of the validity of what this group was about because it was impacting on me in that kind of way (AI2).

The above extract reveals how strongly the classroom observations and feedback I gave affected Alison. She was questioning a number of issues she had not questioned before about her own management style and how the choices she made with respect to the seating of her learners influenced the general ethos of the classroom. Rather than simply essentialising learners as blacks and whites, she was asking questions about the interplay of race, gender, and ability, and about how the construction and management of those issues could affect learning and issues of identity. Alison's question, *How do we put people together*, raises the complex nature of a teacher's work. Teachers do not simply teach content, they are also involved in various processes of identity and

relationship formation, and these processes are critical in a post-apartheid environment. As Alison said, *'That's really what you're trying to do. You are trying to get people to get on with other people*.'

Alison was identifying the essential and powerful role that teachers can and must play in post-apartheid educational spaces. She was acknowledging that it is insufficient to teach only the subject Mathematics; she also needed to orchestrate and manage racial, gender, and cultural relationships between the learners. She needed consciously to construct, at times, spaces in which learners were pushed out of their comfort zones and forced to interact with learners who were perceived as different to them. She needed to challenge stereotypical comments and to question unfair practices. In addition to this, she needed to unlearn her own patterns of behaviour that might unfairly discriminate against certain learners and contribute to her own sense of weariness and exhaustion.

In the extract below, Alison indicates that the observation and feedback had made her realise how *difficult* her classes had become. A lexical analysis reveals an overriding sense of fatigue and exhaustion. This fatigue and overwhelming tiredness that Alison experiences in her classes is contrasted with her ideal class where she feels she could be *fair, pleasant, and fairly liveable*. The strong contrasts between Alison's lived reality and that of her wished-for reality are highlighted in the columns below (Table 11):

> The day that you were visiting me in the classroom, I was not aware of how difficult my classes actually were. I wasn't. I've been doing it like this. I've been carrying all the tension and the noise and the chaos in an effort to try and create an environment which is fairly pleasant, fairly liveable, where people can feel free to be who they are. And that I would try and humour, is the word I suppose, through every situation. And I knew that I was seriously into imbalances*. That some people were pulling the Mickey out of me and getting all the attention and some people were getting all the teaching and some people were getting all the discipline* but I was definitely not aware how complex and plain and simply difficult those days had become. I was really convinced that I was leaving at that point. So I actually thought it would be really valid to see it without me trying to always be fixing every thing. So, you

> coming into the classroom when I haven't engineered anything and made people sit in places where I could discipline them. Cause I am not a natural disciplinarian. I prefer people to be comfortable, and I still believe that teenagers or youngsters can handle that kind of freedom. But I know that it got me into *big trouble* and *wore me* out completely, and perhaps didn't create the best learning opportunity in terms of having a quiet environment where instruction and mathematical learning was really happening. But to me, it was always about every classroom situation is about the relationships between themselves and also with me. And if they are doing the wrong thing then they must actually have the freedom to be doing the wrong thing. To be writing on the desk and on the walls. I can't imagine it being any other way, being a rigid disciplinarian. And yet, I know it is not really conducive to learning, having that amount of noise in the classroom. But it really made me think very, very strongly of what I always thought was a fairly comfortable style. I mean, it *took its toll*. I *was extremely tired and frustrated* and I suppose to use the phrase, *like running thin* (AI2).

The physical labour involved in teaching is evident in the number of words pertaining to the effects of teaching on the teacher's body *(carrying the tension, imbalanced, trying to fix things, completely worn out, took its toll, tired, and running thin*). This contrasts with the absence of references to the physical in the *wished for classroom* where the relational and emotional aspect of teaching are foregrounded. The repeated use of the words *free, freedom* and *comfortable* describe a setting that is conducive to teaching and one that is enjoyable both for the learner and the teacher. This idealistic setting, however, seems to remain in the realm of fantasy for Alison until she decides to take a more controlled approach to her management style.

Table 11: Contrasts between the reality and the ideal classroom

Lived Reality	Wished for Reality
Carrying tension and noise	Fairly pleasant, fairly liveable
Chaos	Free to be who they are
Imbalances	Want people to be comfortable
Some people getting all the attention, some people getting all the teaching, some people getting all the discipline How complex	Teenagers handle that kind of freedom
How plain and simply difficult	Mathematical learning was really happening
Trying to always fix things	Quiet environment
Got me into big trouble	Have the freedom to do the wrong thing
Wore me out completely	Fairly comfortable style
To be writing on the desks and walls	Good relationship between teacher and learners
Not conducive to learning	
Amount of noise	
Took its toll	
I was extremely tired and frustrated	
Running thin	

During the second interview I asked Alison to elaborate on the changes she had made in her classroom as a result of my observations.

> Jacqui: You changed your seating arrangements. But did you change anything else? Obviously, your awareness was heightened, but was there anything else that you felt that you'd changed?
> Alison: I tried immediately to be more structured and to have the classroom quieter and more controlled at learning times. I didn't tighten up that much immediately on whether they've done homework or not. I still had random checks, but there was an atmosphere more conducive to concentrated focus. I

> suppose that's what it was all about. It was easier for me as a teacher, but I was always scared of that, that if it was easier for me as a teacher is it really, necessarily, great for the kids. So I made people sit with people they did not know and weren't comfortable with, and I just said to them that this is good for them to do that, and it is probably good for me and it's good for the whole class 'cause it was going to make us all quiet and more focused. That is really what it was all about but deep down within myself, because it was easier for me, I started thinking I am allowed to have that permission to make things easier for myself, but it felt strange. I'd say that all the classes actually accepted it as being necessary and of benefit, and there was no resentment at all. I had actually in the beginning of the year started that. I tend to make lots of changes. If anything, I push people out of their comfort zones very regularly by allowing them to become chaotic was one of their comfort zones and then pushing them out of it again. The big thing is how much learning is happening as you go from one to the other and I would say the learning was heightened by greater discipline.

Alison's turn-around moment occurs because of her realisation that her management style in her class is negatively influencing both herself and her learners. In order to adjust this, she shifts the learners to different spaces and applies stricter discipline. The difficulties associated with managing a group of multicultural teenagers had become so naturalised for Alison that she has to give herself *permission* to accept that it could be easier without her being a poor teacher. She makes a powerful mind-shift to accept responsibility for changing her classroom and for making both teaching and learning easier for herself and the learners. In doing so, she reclaims the classroom space as her own.

The ontological shift that Alison makes requires of her to imagine an alternative space, a pedagogical space which is pleasant and enjoyable, unlike the chaotic and noisy space in which she currently teaches. In imagining this different space, yet understanding the physical constraints of the real space, Alison is able to take the 'real-and-imagined' (Soja, 1995) and construct an alternative space which results in a positive shift for her and her learners. Alison's transformed pedagogy allows her to take up a new subjectivity, one that is more assertive and more in control, and she is confident enough to share this publicly with the other teachers in the group so that they too could learn from her

experience.

6.9 CONCLUSION

This chapter has examined the role of critical reflection in encouraging teachers to identify how naturalised practices at their school were implicated in structuring and reconstituting inequalities. These naturalised practices, what Brookfield (1995) calls the 'conspiracy of the normal' become so commonsensical and part of everyday life that they get taken for granted. Brookfield explains:

> The subtle tenacity of hegemony lies in the fact that, over time, it becomes completely embedded, part of the cultural air we breathe. We cannot peel back the layers of oppression and identify any particular group or groups of people actively conspiring to keep others silent and disenfranchised (1995:15).

Implicit in the need to recognise inequality is the identification and acknowledgement of how historically constructed subject positions and discourses continue to shape and frame our thinking and our actions. The process of critical reflection is complex and slow, and it often requires not only sufficient space and time, but also relevant input to allow participants to reframe their thinking.

This chapter has also identified particular moments where the participants recognise and articulate how the process of reflection has been significant for them. In all three of these accounts, it can be said that the reflection was triggered by a task or reading given to the participants. In the case of Brolox, the reading and discussion of the Fullan extract encouraged him to consider the fairness of the detention system at the school. Emily's turn-around moment was prompted by the completion of the diversity grid, and Alison's rethinking of her management style came as a result of the observation of her classes. Describing turn-around moments of the above three teachers allows one to examine the complex issues involved in making shifts, and the importance of having an audience for whom one can describe the significance of that moment. This emphasises the argument that reflection is more likely to occur within

groups (Osterman et al., 1993; Calderhead & Gates, 1993; Pollard, 2002).

Now that the reader has been offered a cross-section of the various and complex issues facing teachers at Model C Ordinary, the following chapter is presented. Unlike the previous chapters, this chapter provides an in-depth examination of a particular practice at the school, the detention system. It demonstrates the powerful material effects of historically constituted discourses that continue to discriminate against learners in racialised and gendered ways.

CHAPTER SEVEN

DISCIPLINARY SYSTEMS AND NORMALISING RITUALS

7.1 INTRODUCTION

The detention system at Model C Ordinary is in many ways emblematic of the complex issues teachers face when managing difference in a post-apartheid school. An examination of the intricate 'machinery' (Foucault, 1977) constructed to manage the learners who appeared to challenge accepted practices reveals the ethos and values that prevailed in Model C Ordinary at the time of the research, and the racialised, gendered and classed nature of these values. This chapter focuses on the specific disciplinary measures employed by the school in their detention system, and the attendant effects on the learners and staff.

7.2 WHY THE FOCUS ON DETENTION?

The teachers' concerns about the detention lists being *full to the brim with black children* was raised by Alison in her initial interview. She expressed a desire to understand the reasons for their detention other than transport and latecoming and *why there are far more black children than white children in our detention lists* (Ai1). As the researcher, I was already aware of the problem of disproportionate numbers of black learners being placed in detention at my son's school, and had wanted to pursue the matter further. However, I was reluctant to take it up in the context of the research because it was 'my' issue, and I had invited the teachers to bring *their* issues to me for examination. When the issue resurfaced during the third focus group, I was presented with a 'legitimate' reason for pursuing it.

During the third focus group, in response to Fullan's (1999) article, Brolox began to question the fairness and 'naturalness' of the high number of black boys in

detention. It was particularly significant that the issue was raised by Brolox, a white Afrikaans-speaking male, head of department, and senior coach of the first rugby team. By virtue of his involvement, he held a powerful position in the school. His charismatic personality and good humour made him popular and he was well regarded by the whole staff.

How the issue of detention came to be discussed was interesting. During the third focus group, the teachers were commenting on an extract from Fullan's (1999) *Change Forces: The Sequel.* The focus of this extract was on teachers and schools having a moral responsibility to improve the life-chances of all learners, especially those who had been or were disadvantaged. Brolox's response to the extract was the following:

> It just triggered something off which I feel quite strongly about, that there is a gap between the disadvantaged and privileged people … but to me, instead of the gap narrowing, it's almost getting wider and wider because of the fact that technology develops so quickly. (FG 3)

This then led him to reflect on the historical positioning of Afrikaners during the Boer War in South Africa and how, as a group, they had decided to shift their disadvantaged position in relation to the British:

> We as a group, we as a class, were the lower class, but we as a class, as a group, we are going to look after ourselves and they started pulling together and eventually got the power, whatever. You know, it's almost like the group mustn't wait for other people to uplift them, they must come together and uplift themselves, and say, okay, we are going to rise above the situation. We are not just going to accept that, to get out of where we are (FG 3).

Possibly spurred on by the issue of group disadvantage, Brolox proceeded to tell the group about a significant realisation that had occurred to him the previous week. *While I was doing DT*[18]*, I sat and looked at the group that was on DT, and I would say that about 95% of that particular group was black and they're not*

even 50% of the school (FG 3)(See Section 6.6). Brolox's statement was also

[18] 'Doing DT' meant supervising students who had been given detention.

significant for another teacher, MM: *I just wanted to echo what Brolox was saying. The exact same thing went through my mind. It's nice to hear someone else say it* (FG3). Up until this time, it was mainly MM who had raised contentious issues, and therefore it was comforting for him that other members in the group were also reflecting more critically on practices in the school. Not all the teachers believed that the detention system was unfair, yet having it raised as a concern by a few teachers persuaded the group to agree to focus on it in order to understand the disparities and provide possible ways of improving it.

7.3 DETENTION DATA

Detention at Model C Ordinary thereafter became a central discussion point during focus groups 5 and 6, and resulted in a meeting with the school management to discuss possible strategies to make the system more equitable. In order to obtain facts about the detention system, copies of a detention system document and permission from the headmaster to examine the file on detention records were obtained. The file was not allowed to be removed from the office but copies were allowed to be made. Because access to a copier was difficult and each copy had to be paid for, I had sufficient funds to pay for 43 pages of records and therefore started at the beginning of the file with grade 8 and copied the first 10 pages of grades 8, 9 & 10. In addition to this, I obtained all the other official documents pertaining to school discipline and also held focus group interviews with learners who had been identified as frequenting the detention system.(See 3.5.1)

In total, the data obtained about detention included the following:

- A handout to teachers about the detention system
- A handout to learners about the detention system
- A list of non-negotiable classroom rules
- Grades 8, 9 and 10 detention records (43 pages):
- Grade 8: 28/02/2003–10/10/2003
- Grade 9: 14/02/2003–05/09/2003
- Grade 10: 14/02/2003–10/10/2003.
- Transcriptions of focus groups 5 and 6 in which the

teachers discussed the causes and issues surrounding detention
- Field notes about a meeting with headmaster on 25/02/06
- Transcription of the meeting held with management on 11/03/04
- Transcriptions from the three group interviews with learners.

It is argued below that the technologies of control applied by this school were racialised and gendered, and that they shaped the ethos of the school as well as the identities and practices of learners and teachers. This serves to reinforce essentialised and fixed views of difference and to impose homogeneity (Foucault, 1977).

7.4 TECHNOLOGIES OF CONTROL

7.4.1 Record keeping

Model C Ordinary had constructed an elaborate and highly controlled system of dealing with discipline issues. Each learner was given a sheet outlining the three-level intervention detention system (Appendix I) as well as a copy of the non-negotiable classroom rules (Appendix J). Teachers were given a copy of rules for the detention system in a teachers' copy (Appendix K) and a senior teacher, whom I have named 'Butch' for the purposes of the research, was tasked with monitoring the system. He had been relieved of some teaching duties and other administrative responsibilities in order to cope with the heavy administrative load of keeping records of 'detainees'.

A copy of such records can be seen in Appendix L (all names of learners have been removed). All records were filed under grades, and the file was kept in Butch's office. The detention records included the following information:

- The learner's grade level, surname, first name
- Who placed the learner in detention,
- The reason for their placement in detention, and whether they attended the detention session,
- The teacher on duty
- The date of detention.

Learners were placed in detention after they had been given three ‘dates’ by any staff member. According to the records examined, dates were given for the following reasons:

- Being late for school
- Being late for class
- Talking during a test
- Misbehaviour
- Homework not being done
- Disruptive behaviour
- Bunking (being absent from school without a written reason from a parent or guardian)
- Being disrespectful
- Not having books in class
- Missing match practice.

Hardcopies of all the lists were kept in a file, and Butch maintained the electronic lists. He also regularly produced statistics based on the detention records. When requested by management, he would supply a record of individual learners for disciplinary investigations. During a meeting organised with the core teachers and three members of management, I repeated what the teachers had discussed in our previous meeting, that they felt that the primary reason for having detention was to encourage desirable behaviour in a fair and consistent manner. Butch interrupted me saying:

> Butch: Just to add to it, the primary aim of DT is that it’s also recording.
> Jacqui: Ok, so keeping records. What is your main reason for keeping records?
> Butch: Repeat offences, and pick up patterns.
> Sally: And also, if there’s a hearing or parents are called in, it’s not just rebellious, and we’ve got something on paper.

Butch saw the *primary* aim of having a detention system as the need to keep records to ‘pick up patterns'. These patterns, once identified and recorded in print, became evidence that could be used in a disciplinary hearing against a learner and could result in the suspension of that learner. In other words, the records of misconduct made the individual ‘knowable, calculable and administrable, to the extent that he or she may be differentiated from others and evaluated in relation to them’ (Rose, 1989:143). These ‘systems of truth’ (Rose, 1989:4) produced mainly by one teacher, were not easily contested despite

learners indicating inaccuracies in them. For example, one learner interviewed indicated the following:

> I find that you don't really know that you were ever late on a certain day but that date is written…. if you do say something there will be other offences that will come up…the teacher will dig [for] other offences (LFG).

Foucault (1972:52) argues that while 'it's not possible for power to be exercised without knowledge, it is impossible for knowledge not to engender power'. Butch's written records constructed knowledge about individual learners' 'deviance' which enabled him to exercise power over these learners so that his knowledge 'reach[ed] into the very grain of individuals, touch[ed] their bodies and insert[ed] itself into their actions and attitudes, their discourses, learning processes and everyday lives' (Foucault, 1972:39).

Management suggested at one staff meeting (a few weeks before I started my research) that detention results be recorded on learners' end-of-year reports. This suggestion, however, was met with outrage from the staff, who felt that having such details on one's report card would unfairly prejudice learners. The teachers discussed this incident in a focus group meeting and felt victorious that they, as staff, had managed to overturn this suggestion. As one teacher commented,

> The outcome was amazing and another [teacher] indicated, I was, I was, I was, I'm telling you I was shocked; surprisingly, I enjoyed the fact that teachers voiced their opinions and they said no. It was a good feeling, it was empowering (FG 8).

The surprise indicated that the teachers did not often have opportunities to voice their decisions and receive the support of the whole staff. Possibly their surprise also indicated dissatisfaction about the immense amount of time and effort put into record-keeping and 'moral accounting' (Foucault, 1977) as opposed to the more constructive tasks associated with teaching. This was suggested by comments made during the focus groups that Butch seemed to spend a considerable amount of time walking around the school and working on these records.

The keeping of meticulous records provided staff and management with ready

data to provide reasons and 'proof', if needed, for the suspension of certain learners. Rose (1989:7) refers to such records as the following:

> Documentation of the psyche which enabled the elements of any individual life that were pertinent to the authorities to be assembled into a dossier, enshrined in an archive, or transmitted to a central places where the traces of individuals can be compared, evaluated and judged.

The following extract from focus group 8 describes the immense pressure a teacher was put under to disregard his/her own positive experiences of a learner that challenged the 'truth' that had been recorded in a dossier about this learner:

> I taught Thabo (pseudonym) last year. A form was sent around by Butch, his thing was to get rid of this child because he's such a problem and I couldn't write a negative thing about him because in my class he was fine. I'd given him two [detention] dates but that was way in the beginning of the year. Hmm, he sat right under my nose, he got merits, and Butch actually questioned me. He actually said, 'Are you sure? Have you got the right person? Why does he behave like that in your classroom?' And I said, 'I don't know.'

Sally, an experienced and senior female teacher who had interacted with Thabo every day for a year, was interrogated about her inability to write a negative comment about him. She was even questioned on whether or not she had 'got the right person' and about why he behaved 'like that in your classroom'. Butch was querying Sally's integrity and her professionalism, and this interrogation could be understood as a form of pressurising (bullying) Sally into writing what Butch wanted to hear, that Thabo was a troublemaker. Butch had a fixed and cemented view about Thabo that did not allow him the flexibility to be different in different circumstances and with different teachers. Clearly Butch perceived the power of the written document to surpass that of the spoken word. His records had situated Thabo into a 'network of writing' (Foucault, 1977:189). This network of writing inscribes the learners into a 'mass of documents that capture and fix them' (Foucault, 1977:189).

One of the main reasons why many black learners were given detention at Model C Ordinary frequently was that they arrived at school late. Because most of these learners lived very far from the school, they were totally dependent on public transport such as minibus taxis and public buses. When I discussed this

informally with the headmaster and with Butch (FN 25/02/04), they both claimed that public transport was available and that the bus company had been phoned and it had been verified that the bus times were congruent with the school starting time. Based on this, they believed that the learners were able to arrive at school on time but that they missed the early buses and chose rather to catch later taxis. Therefore, they felt justified in punishing those learners who were late more than three times in a term.

During focus group 6 we discussed the disproportionate number of black learners in detention. Many of the teachers believed that the primary reason for the disproportion was that most learners were in detention for latecoming, and since latecoming was construed as an incontrovertible offence, it was not seen to have any racialised connotations. While this notion needed to be questioned, (public transport was notoriously unreliable) the view that this was the only reason for the disproportionable numbers in detention was incorrect. Therefore I did a count of all learners excluding those given detention for latecoming, for grades 8-10, as listed between February to October in 2003. The count revealed the following:

- Black boys: 352
- White boys: 248
- Black girls: 146
- White girls: 99

Considering that black learners constituted between 40-50% of the total learners in the school and black males probably constituted about 50% of this total, it is clear that disproportionate numbers of black males were placed in detention for reasons other than latecoming. This blatant racialised and gendered disparity should have been cause for serious concern. White boys were also victims of gendered practices in the school because their numbers were significantly higher than those of either the black or the white girls placed in detention.

7.4.2 Surveillance

In addition to the meticulous record-keeping, surveillance at Model C Ordinary was a frequently used instrument of control. Learners were placed under observation from the time they arrived at school. A 'latecomers committee' was positioned at the entry gate of the school to record learners who did not enter the school before the bell rang. A discussion at one of the focus groups revealed that this committee comprised only white learners and that no black learners had been selected to partake in the latecomers committee. (The committee was constituted of grade 11 learners who had been short-listed on the prefect list but who had not made the final selection). This had many implications for those being identified as latecomers.

This is what some of the learners had to say about the surveillance at the gates:

- Sometimes at the gate, most people don't know you; so one can easily write someone else's name or someone write your name on the detention list (LFG).

- And then when I arrive at school, just because he is used to me being late, he just writes my name on the list. I know the date; for example, on the 20th,I wasn't late but he (Butch) would just tell me that I was late on the 20th or the 5th and I would say, "I wasn't late." He would say my name is marked on the list, and there are people at the gate who know this: then it would be my word against his word (LFG).

- If you look at our school, I mean the guy who's controlling the detention is always out there to capture, not to rectify mistakes, but to capture people out, so I wouldn't say it's fair (LFG).

Learners also experienced individualised surveillance. One learner said,

> I was told, 'I am going to watch your every move' He (Butch) nails you for the first thing you do. He waits for you, it's almost like he's ambushing you.

The references to *nailing, ambushing and capturing* imply a discourse of combat with extreme disparities of power relations. The purpose of the controlling gaze seems to be to catch the learners out rather than to ensure general maintenance of discipline. This sense of deliberate targeting of individuals is illustrated in the

following comment from a learner who indicated that while he was walking down a passage he was called and asked if he had shaved: *I mean he (Butch) specifically called me to look to see if I had shaved.*

According to these learners, the individualising was strongly racialised:

- Honestly speaking, I think it (being in detention frequently) is because we're black. In most cases it's black students. When you enter, the first person you meet is a black person in detention (LFG).

- Yes, it's my colour because I'm black … a white person has an advantage because he is white and the schoolteacher is also white therefore that person's chances of going to detention are not the same as mine. Mine are very high. The white students can be silly in class but some of the things will go unnoticed as if that was not so bad but if you do something it will turn out to be something serious (LFG).

- But you go for little things. Blacks and white alike, but I'm not trying to be prejudiced, but it's worse for the black kids. A white kid can, for example, smoke dagga in school and a black kid also do it. You'll find that a white kid will be given a second chance but a black kid will be expelled the first time. And they would say that they were making an example (LFG).

The teachers in the focus group also discussed the inequity of punishment and applying different standards to different learners. All of the teachers at the meeting indicated that punishment was meted out inconsistently at their school, and learners and teachers alike were treated inequitably. Two of the female teachers gave examples of white male learners in their classes who had behaved disrespectfully. One male learner had called the teacher a 'bitch' and the other male learner had made a sexual reference to his teacher. Both these teachers reported the incidents to the headmaster and yet nothing was done to the two boys in question. The teachers believed that the reason for the lack of punishment was that both boys were first-team players, one for rugby and one for soccer. One teacher said the following:

> I can see also where that attitude is coming from because if you're a first-team [player] here at Model C Ordinary – you have certain privileges…[you are one of] the untouchables (FG8).

Despite having inscribed rules for disciplinary structures at the school that were made available to staff and learners, the predominantly white male hierarchy at the school had the power to implement discipline as they saw fit. It appears from the teachers' comments and the statistics that detention was often applied in gendered and racialised ways. Some white male teachers appeared to possess extreme power in the school. This power was often displayed in the discourses of control exercised on the learners. This is what some of the learners had to say about Butch:

- We told the teacher in charge of discipline that we have long taxi queues but still our names are written in the detention book. We tried to talk to him, and he said he would organise something, but he never did. (LFG)

- If they could just take away the man who is in charge of detention, all of us would be motivated. (LFG)

- When you go to the teacher in charge of detention he would just be angry and ask your name and also give you a Saturday detention that you didn't know, just for asking and seeking the truth about detentions. (LFG)

- He wants me in detention. (LFG)

- He can write other people's names on the list even if you didn't write it yourself. He did that to other people even if they did not commit offences. (LFG)

- It's as if he likes seeing us in detention (LGF).

These comments illustrate what Foucault (1972:125) describes as power that exercises itself through dividing practices. Butch's position of power enables him to isolate learners whom he thinks have broken school rules, and place them in detention, dividing them from the other learners. These 'deviants' are then placed under an additional gaze of the teacher on detention duty in a specified classroom space on a Friday afternoon where they were expected to write out the school rules. The power exercised over these learners can be said to 'gain access to the bodies of individuals, to their acts, attitudes and modes of everyday behaviour' (1972:125).

7.4.3 Labelling and discursive naming

Some learners explained that they were labelled and identified as troublemakers, and this increased their chances of being given detention. The regular labelling and naming of learners discursively position them as *usual customers*. As one learner explained,

> If you take a look around, I've been to detention 5 or 6 times this year. So there's a pattern that goes out and involves your regular customers, and teachers start expecting that this one's going to be in detention and they end up in detention. You've got your good crew and you've got your bad crew (LFG).

Learners are discursively labelled as wrong-doers, and this naming becomes so naturalised that the learners and teachers came to expect and accept this as the natural state of affairs. As one learner argued, *he is used to me being late, and he just writes my name on the list* (LFG). Another male learner explained that *just by your reputation; see my reputation is not good. It's just by my reputation that they just put me in detention* (LFG). A female learner said, *they just know you by name*, and she claims that when you are known by name, they will even *make up* offences such as *you didn't tie your hair* or *your shirt is not tucked in,* in order to ensure that your reputation as a frequent detainee is maintained (LFG). Such is the power of discourse. Youdell (2006:36) elaborates:

> …the schoolgirl and boy, the gifted and talented student, the student with emotional and behavioural difficulties, even the teacher, is so because he/she is designated as such. Indeed, while these designations appear to describe pre-existing subjects, it is the *very act of designation that constitutes the subject*, as if they were already student, teacher, gifted, emotionally/behaviourally disordered, and so on (italics in the original).

Discursive constructions shape the learners' subjectivities and their ways of being. Language not only represents one's thoughts and actions, it also shapes one's thinking, behaviour, and very sense of who one is. Language shapes people's subjectivities:

> The new languages for construing, understanding and evaluating ourselves and others have transformed the ways in which we interact …our thought worlds have been reconstructed…our very sense of ourselves has been revolutionised. We have become intensely subjective beings (Rose, 1989:3).

In one instance, a black female learner explained that she and her friends were named as the 'impossibles':

> We were given the name here in the school together with other kids I was with in another class. They said we were the *impossibles*. Once you have *given me a stigma that I am impossible then I will be impossible*. The year will end and I would just say I am impossible, so what if I don't do it, it doesn't matter. So here in this school learners are given names. This is so and so and so we did this. The name 'impossible' was given to us by the headmaster, and he just said 'You are the impossibles' (LFG).

The frequent references she makes to being given a name suggests that this learner is clearly aware of the discursive power of labelling and of the 'discursive practices which appear to describe subjects are not, in fact, simply descriptive. Rather they are productive' (Youdell, 2003:86 drawing on Butler,1993). This schoolgirl chooses to take up the identification as an 'impossible' as a form of resistance. While she iss obviously critical of the name she has been given, she performs the habitus. Butler argues that

> discursive performativity appears to produce that which it names, to enact its own referent, to name and to do, to name and to make [g]enerally speaking, a performative function to produce that which it declares (Butler, 1993:107).

The schoolgirl who takes on the role of *an impossible* is both produced and constrained by this performative, but so, too, does her subject position restrict the power the teachers have over her. Being *impossible* allows her to behave *impossibly* thus affording her certain power; as she says, *so what if I don't do it, it doesn't matter.* This incident illustrates that 'what is important then, is not so much what language means, but what language does, what it enables human beings to imagine and to do to themselves and to others' (Rose, 1989: xix). Constructing subject positions in educational institutions is a decidedly political act, and the productive power of such constructions to both include and exclude

needs to be acknowledged. So, too, do the larger discourses that frame these constructions need to be interrupted and reconstituted.

7.4.4 Public individualising

In addition to individual labelling by certain teachers, the learners placed in detention were named publicly during assembly, and lists of detention candidates for the week were placed on a public notice board. This enabled everyone in the school to read the lists if they so wished. While the reason given for the display of names was that learners needed to be informed of their detention, this appears unnecessary as they would already have signed a form acknowledging their detention. Some of the teachers believed that the practice of naming and shaming offenders was part of the punishment:

> Alison: We used to read out the DT pupils as part of the assembly and this year they changed it, they're doing it after the staff have left.
> Jacqui: Why are the names read out?
> Suzie: Just so they know. Or they'll just say they didn't't know or something.
> Jacqui: But don't they sign anything?
> Suzie: Yes, but still, you still have to, its part of the punishment.
> Jacqui: It's like a public humiliation, shame...
> Zander. It's not shame, sorry, it's not shame.
> Emily: I think it has a counter-effect though; it makes them into heroes.

The announcing of names for learners in detention clearly reveals the racial nature of the system and, as Alison argues, it had become very embarrassing:

> I was incredibly aware that they were reading black name after black name. Quite honestly, I'll be honest with you, I felt quite relieved when there was an odd white name. Something has distinctly focused this year on the fact that the DT list became extremely black, and we got more and more reaction to it (FG9).

Alison indicates that it had become obvious to her and the learners that the names of those placed in detention were becoming increasingly and

embarrassingly racially skewed as more and more black learners were being placed in detention. The regular absence of white learners' names was also obvious, so much so that when a white name was occasionally called, Alison felt relieved.

The *reaction* refers to a loud response during assembly from the 'floor' by other black learners when names of black learners were called. Learners would 'boo' and 'cheer' and the school management then decided to announce the names only after the staff had left. Alison wondered about the reasons for this change:

> Something that has changed over the past few weeks that Butch said, 'Check your name on the board to see if you're in Detention.' I don't know the reason why they stopped calling it out. I don't know if it was too problematic or if the list was too long or the reactions were too much. The staff had already left the hall (FG9).

It appears that the students' loud vocal response to the naming of the detainees was effective in halting the process. However, Alison feels that by announcing the names in assembly, management were 'forced' to witness the dissent and resistance from the other learners, and the discomfort of this would be effective in getting the system changed rather than simply removing it from public scrutiny, which enabled them to go 'underground'. The management probably hoped that if the detention lists were no longer read out in assembly, then the learners would have no reason to resist, and that the problem would therefore disappear.

Foucault (1977:173) argues that a 'machinery of control' can function like a 'microscope of conduct'. Learners, especially black and male learners in Model C Ordinary, appear to have their conduct minutely scrutinised and at the first sign of a transgression, they are regulated and disciplined. While it may be necessary to have systems of discipline in order to ensure that schools run effectively, these systems are seldom neutral and can often discriminate unjustly against certain groups of learners.

7.5 NORMALISING TECHNIQUES

In addition to the machinery of surveillance and the individual naming and shaming of offenders, normalisation plays a significant role in Model C Ordinary's detention system. It became very clear that the normalising discourse was overwhelmingly rooted in British colonialism and Christian National Education[19] (CNE). While it can be claimed that certain values such as being respectful and obeying the rules of the institution might be universal, the *manifestation* of these values into accepted norms is decidedly cultural and historical. May (1999:31) argues that we need to deconstruct the 'apparent neutrality of civilism that is supposedly [a] universal, neutral set of cultural values and practices that underpin the public sphere of the nation-state' . May explains further that while civic values are important, equally important is the need to acknowledge the historical and social situatedness of these values. Additionally, the

> normalisation and universalisation of the cultural knowledge of the majority ethnic group, and its juxtaposition with other (usually non-western) knowledges and practices should be critically interrogated (1999:32).

The notion of being respectful and civilised at Model C Ordinary became a pervasive and powerful judgement by which learners were made 'knowable, calculable and administrable (Rose, 1989:143) against a membership of a homogeneous social body (of teachers) which was racialised and classed. Those learners, who did not, could not, or chose not to conform, were punished and disciplined in some way or another. As Foucault (1977:178/9) notes:

> What is specific to the disciplinary penalty is non-observance, that which does not measure up to the rule, that departs from it. The whole indefinite domain of the non-conforming is punishable.

---

19 Christian National Education was a cornerstone of apartheid ideology. 3 It was highly problematic that I had become the spokesperson for the teachers who had become silenced when faced with the presence of three white males representing management.

In the rest of this chapter, the racialised and classed nature of the normalising discourse in Model C Ordinary will be discussed with regard to two issues: punctuality and 'civilised' behaviour.

7.6 LATECOMING

While a public school is obliged to admit learners who live within a certified area of the school, most ex-Model-C schools also admit learners who live far from their areas and need to be bussed into the area. The reasons for admitting learners from outside the residential zone is legislated to provide access to learners of all races and classes and to ensure that the schools maintain an acceptable level of representation of all races. Logistically, learners who live far from the school and whose parents do not have their own transport have to rely on public transport that is neither reliable nor particularly safe in South Africa. However, if a learner wants to attend the school, he or she has little choice.

At Model C Ordinary, there was an ongoing problem of 'latecoming'. Scores of learners each day were handed out detention slips because they entered the school a few minutes after the bell. While the management of the school admitted that public transport was unreliable and difficult, they believed that many learners *consciously chose* to be late. In addition, students' latecoming was often placed within a moralistic and judgmental discourse, as is seen in the following extracts from Butch's descriptions during the meeting with management:

> If you don't do a latecoming, some sort of follow up, numbers mushroom very quickly … You see *I don't know what the mind-set is there because I've not followed* up, I've asked the kids, I've had a number of meetings with them and it's mostly ones that come there from (……..) that are regularly late you know, so I've spoken to them and they are taking taxis, you see, and then I've also been in contact with the bus company. I've at last, I found the guy who organises us the bus. And I found out that they say they miss the bus. *But they've been lying to me, yes they miss the bus, the early bus and then they take the late bus*….I found with them as soon *as there's a little*

gap, the guys take it. The *fraud and the lying is* unbelievable. (Mtg1)

Learners who did not arrive at school on time were constructed as dishonest and deliberately disruptive, and frequent public statements were made (by staff at assemblies and in the passages) to positioned these learners as unwelcome at the school. Here are some examples:

- I heard at the beginning of the year that the children were told that if they couldn't make it to this school on time then they must go and find a school closer to where they could make it (FG7).
- That is the message sent to our learners. If you are late, go to a school closer to you. Go to that school and don't apply here (F G7).
- The aim of the school is to keep the school as white as possible and financially strong as possible and get the best people here as possible (FG 9).
- Because you can say what you like, they still want the old Model-c schools; the white bright child must be number one. That's what they want. If they want to look down at assembly, they want to see white as possible (FG 9).

Schooling is premised on the 'identification, production and recognition of an idealised subject' (Soudien,1998:8). At Model C Ordinary, the conflation of race, class, and intelligence could be seen clearly in the construction of a binary of the *right kind of learner and those the school would prefer not to have*. The 'right kind' was one who stayed close to the school and could afford to live in middleclass suburbs, pay school fees, was automatically intelligent, and was the *white bright child*. The 'wrong kind' came to school late, stayed far from the school, and was financially and academically weaker. This is similar to findings in Gillborn's (1990) study which reported that 'ideal clients' and 'appropriate pupil behaviour' were constructed within classed, gendered and raced frames.

While it is understandable that a school would like to boast about strong academic and sporting achievements, these comments deliberately excluded learners who lived far from the school, were not *white and therefore bright* (sic) and not financially strong. The overriding message was that learners who took

public transport to school were unwelcome at Model C Ordinary.

In addition, management, while indicating that they were *sympathetic* to the transport difficulties faced by out-of suburb learners, were in fact, doing *them* a favour by *educating them* and *preparing [them] for the real world*:

> Yeah. probably cause I don't mind to say that I'm really fortunate that I'm not a Xhosa-speaking person, not having a good school close to my home, and I understand that, uhm, but if you look at their own circumstances when they move on to the working environment, that's probably not going to change much and therefore what we have to educate towards and that you've got to be on time for your job or your school. What you are doing, I believe is unfortunately correct even though I do have sympathy for them in particular circumstances, so I think in terms of what we are doing, we have to keep it up (Mtg1).

In an attempt to make it easier for learners who lived far from the school to arrive on time, it was decided at our previous focus group that we would request that management consider starting the school slightly (between 5-15 minutes) later in order to accommodate out-of-suburb learners. This was met with resistance on the basis that it was unreasonable because of the weather and because so few people were affected by the incidents of latecoming.

- Because if I had any way, I would have the school to start early not late because South Africa's mad in summer time; we miss the best part of the day, which we lie in bed at 6 o'clock, it's beautiful outside at that time of the day, and if we are moving everything later and later (Mtg1).

- Well we're speaking for 15 people out of a 1 000 people. Are we going to move the best teaching time of the day into the hottest period of the day for a thousand people because of fifteen people (Mtg1)?

- Yes, but I mean, I'm saying, why change the whole time of school for 15 where 985 are not late, and they are making it on time and therefore we get the best benefit out of teaching when it's reasonably cool, and if we move everything on, we moving into agony period of the day so I don't know if that could do the right thing (Mtg1).

The number of learners coming late and being placed in detention far exceeded 15, but since I did not have specific statistics on hand to refer to, I decided not to address this obvious underestimation. Rather, I indicated that some schools had

done it in Natal, but then the discussion started to turn in a dangerous direction that of excluding those people who did not live in the suburb:

> Butch:I know it's controversial but if you just don't take people from an area so they won't be late…Ja, we have to, by law, by the government, by the Education Department, we've got to take those closest to us and we're not obliged to take people the outside area but we don't have to but we do if they have a sibling at the school and they come with strong recommendation or you know the other reason why we're accepted people outside the area.
> Jacqui: But if they've gone to the primary school next door, it will become very difficult for black children to go back to township schools if they had all their schooling...
> Butch:No. Well that's the major problem and that's probably why we've had so many people who can't get into another school, you know and then that's why at the beginning of the year we say…

This discussion continued for a while and soon it was obvious to me that the management of the school was not prepared to consider starting the school later. To clarify this, I asked:

> Jacqui: And now, so you wouldn't even consider changing the starting time? Is that for you totally unacceptable?
> Head: I'd love to try it for a while, but it would be a huge, but I honestly don't think it would solve the problems we have, I really don't think it will, it will just shoot the whole goal we are setting with the time.

The excessive use of modalities (*it would be, don't think*,) and hedging *(honestly, really, I'd love to try, but*) displayed the headmaster's discomfort with discussing this topic. He did not want to reject the idea outright but was clearly not prepared to seriously consider it.

The following day when I went to the school to observe Alison, the headmaster spoke to me in the staffroom and told me that he had not liked the way I had asked him to consider making a change. He informed me that research meant that I was to come into the school, write a report and give it to him and leave; it did not mean that I was to ask him to consider making a change. This comment again emphasised how uncomfortable I had made the management of the school. This had not been my intention, and my becoming the spokesperson for the participating teachers had compromised my position as participant observer.

I was positioned as an outsider who was making unreasonable requests. While I was distressed by being positioned as such by the headmaster, I gained some comfort from the reaction of the teachers in the following focus group, who indicated that they had felt silenced by the gaze of the management and had wished that they had been more able to present their case as their own and not as my personal quest.

The issue of re-examining detention was not mentioned any further, but I was thrilled when one of the teachers phoned me in January 2005 to inform me that a decision had been taken by the management to informally allow 5 minutes of lateness before a learner's name was recorded for latecoming (FN 18 January, 2005). I recognised that the decision had not been an easy one to make, and that having had some time and space to think about the idea probably assisted with the implementation of it, albeit it informally.

7.7 'UNCIVILISED' BEHAVIOUR

'Uncivilised behaviour', as indicated on the non-negotiable class rules document (Appendix J), was not tolerated at Model C Ordinary. 'Uncivilised' behaviour was embodied through the voice and movement of the learners that were perceived to be excessive and an indication of lack of control. Unlike the constrained, regulated 'docile body', the 'uncivilised body' showed intense emotion, spontaneously broke into dance and cheering, and spoke and laughed loudly. The notion of *uncivilised behaviour* was strongly racialised and at times gendered, with black girls named as the primary perpetrators.

> Alison: Yes, we have HUGE problems in assembly with the booing and cheering. Huge problems. We are permanently keeping the children in to come and re-do assembly because they *didn't behave*. It's a question of *reacting to things*.
> Jacqui: Do you think it is a cultural thing?
> Alison: It is. Whenever we have an act on stage and there's singing and dancing and this kind of thing; there is a… They stand up…there is the notion that the black children go ballistic, out of control and cheer and dance and "carry on" as it is called and the white children get irritated and annoyed and they feel it is unnecessary and we haven't got middle ground anymore.

> The only middle ground is with the staff. You will come back to the hall and they lose another break and they come back to the hall.
> Jacqui: The whole school? There must be resentment.
> Alison: There is resentment from the whites against the blacks having made them come back. Maybe it's the more junior grades as compared to the senior grades but actually it's right across the school. I think the grade 11 boys and the grade10 girls *as a rule are very strong in their reaction*. (AI1)

The notion of habitus (see 2.2.1) is useful in explaining the apparent differences in what was regarded as *civilised behaviour* in this school. Using Bourdieu's explanation that children are socialised to use and carry their bodies through their exposure to their families, communities and schools, which in South Africa have been geographically racialised and classed, then it is possible that racial, ethnic, class and gender differences in habitus exist**.** By implication then, different bodily practices will be valued differently. Such differences have been noted in various studies, including by Horvat and Antonio (1999) who found that African American girls were 'forced' to change their behaviours, dress and attitudes in order to fit into their school environment. Another study indicated that African-Caribbean boys in school were perceived to be anti-authority, based on their particular way of walking (Gillborn, 1990). Likewise Youdell (2003) reported that the discursive practices in relation to the posture and bodily practices of black males at her research site constructed them as anti-school. Both Youdell (2003) and Gillborn (1990) argue that, rather than intentional racism, such practices suggest institutional racism, and they stress the need to interrupt naturalised practices and discursive enactments of the society at large, in addition to recognising how individual teachers are implicated in reproducing ways of exclusion.

Understanding racism (and others forms of discrimination) as institutionalised rather than individualised enables us to see how communities and cultures come to value certain bodily practices over others, and how these ways of thinking get reproduced by those in power. An example of this can be illustrated by exploring the role of laughter in Model C Ordinary. Laughing and cheering when they found something amusing and entertaining was part of *'natural'* behaviour for some of the black girls who were interviewed. However, this belief

often led to them being given detention and accused of misbehaving. As one girl said:

> You laugh in class you misbehave. You talk maybe with someone close to you you misbehave. Things as little like that. Sometimes you take out your drink because you are thirsty and drink you misbehave, your name is written for just little things and those *things are part of being a human being*. It's like *telling us not to breathe*, don't do this, you simply cannot help laughing when there's a joke. (LFG)

It appears that laughing out aloud at something humorous was a normal feature of this girl's behaviour. Yet the institution reads her laughter as inappropriate and regards it as misbehaviour and therefore punishable. Using the notion of habitus, we can argue that laughing out aloud may be valued and acceptable in the habitus of the learner's community and family context, but not in the community of the middleclass teachers who possibly consider loud laughter to be crude and disrespectful. They might have learnt to value quiet smiles and hidden sniggers as a way of demonstrating appreciation of humour. Rather than understand that these differences result from communally influenced socialisation, the teachers/institution evaluates her behaviour through their culture-specific frames.

Many of the girls indicated that they were given detention for *simple* things. One of the more common reasons was laughing or not maintaining absolute silence:

- I think this system is ineffective because I was detained 24 times last year *but still I laugh* when I find *something amusing because you can laugh now* at what Ezekhaya just said and that would be detention for you. I would *also laugh* at what the teacher says and don't stop and that's another date in DT for me. When you get out of the classroom you already have three DT slips. It really doesn't help. (LFG)

- When you don't have a reason to keep quiet then you won't keep quiet and you cannot be given detention just because there must be absolute silence. To me *it's as if a white person doesn't understand a child. Uh, I don't know! They don't understand a black person that we cannot help ourselves but laugh*. The problem is, on the 24th I'll be in DT, I will go there because I laughed and [for] talking in class and for not doing homework sometimes. (LFG)

Not being understood, especially by white teachers, was often mentioned by the learners. One girl appealed to have someone talk to her and her friends in order to *understand her better and to help rather than punish* her: She was appealing for the valued habitus of the school to be made explicit so that it could be learnt, and also that the habitus valued by the learners could be understood and appreciated:

> I think we need someone who will like what we are doing right now, who will talk to us and try to understand why we are sent to detention. Someone who will give us advice on what we can do so that we can stop being late or stop laughing not someone who will just crush us (LFG).

Another learner made the observation that as a black learner she had a greater chance of being misunderstood by a white teacher than did a white learner. As she explained,

> Yes, it's my colour, my colour because I'm black makes me, a white person has an advantage because he is white, and the school teachers are also whites therefore that person's chances of going to detention are not the same as mine. Mine are very high, the white students can be silly in class, but some of the things will go unnoticed as if that was not so bad but if you do something it will turn to be something serious. (LFG)

While the learner essentialises race differences as the primary factor in determining his chance of being given detention, class, culture and gender are also playing a deciding role. The white teachers who decide what is regarded as civilised behaviour have multiple influencing factors which include, among others, class, race, culture, gender, age and religion. These teachers have been schooled mainly in white-only schools and universities, which were based on either British traditions or on Afrikaans Christian National Education. Such institutions would have reproduced the cultural capital and habitus valued by them. The older teachers currently in service probably have had little or no social contact with other class or race groups, and therefore, they have culturally specific understandings of what constitutes acceptable and unacceptable behaviour. However, they expect all learners to conform to their views of what is appropriate and desirable without considering that many learners would have been socialised to value different cultural and habitus norms. In addition, the cultural capital valued at the school is seldom, if ever, made explicit, making it

difficult for those learners who had not attended Model C primary schools to easily acquire it.

In essence, the meticulous discipline system at Model C Ordinary works to construct bodies that conform to white, middleclass views of what a good learner should be: docile, conforming, quiet, respectful, and obedient; these qualities of constraint and control would be reflected in the bodies of these learners. Any *carrying on* or *loud outbursts* would result in learners being 'compared, differentiated, hierarchized, homogenized and excluded' (Foucault, 1977:185). The exclusion was felt acutely by the black learners, as can be illustrated in the comments above. They are made to feel unwelcome and their culture and habitus judged and dismissed.

7.8 CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this chapter has presented the discipline system of Model C Ordinary and argued that the practices and effects of this system are emblematic of the larger problems facing the management of difference in this school. The disproportionate number of black male learners being placed in detention regularly reveals the racialised, classed and gendered response of management to those learners who do not conform to their construction of normality. Techniques of record-keeping, surveillance, individualising, differentiating and labelling all serve to construct a normalising subjectivity of the 'perfect learner'. Learners who fail to arrive at school on time and who laugh in class and who cheer and dance at assemblies are seen to be deviating from the norm, and are told, both explicitly and implicitly, that they do not belong at the school.

Four data analysis chapters have thus been presented. It is hoped that they have provided the reader with an understanding of the numerous practices and discourses at work in Model C Ordinary and of the various structures that

enabled and constrained critical reflection among the teachers. In addition it is hoped that it has been demonstrated that school is indeed a ‘contested terrain’ (Soudien, 2001:325) for young people (and teachers). In an attempt to deal with the complex nature of school in post-apartheid South Africa, Soudien (2001:325) argues that learners take up ‘submissive and combative’ subject positions. I argue that this can also be said of teachers in multicultural spaces who contest hegemonic discourses. They, too, operate in discursive spaces where ‘collusion, contestation, agreement and dissonance’ (ibid, 325) feature regularly. The following and final chapter draws conclusions from these four chapters as well as makes recommendations.

CHAPTER EIGHT

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter summarises the primary findings of this research and presents conclusions about the intervention constructed at Model C Ordinary. It also provides answers to the research question regarding what the effects on a post-apartheid high school are when a group of teachers are encouraged to reflect critically on issues relating to difference.

8.1 DIFFERENCE AT MODULE C ORDINARY

Model C Ordinary presents itself to the public as an inclusive institution which rejects any form of discrimination. The school has made considerable progress in accommodating students from diverse backgrounds and providing access to students from previously disadvantaged groups. The academic and sporting achievements of students of different race, class and gender bear testimony to this. There has also been a solid attempt to encourage teachers of different race groups to apply for positions at the school. However, despite these achievements, many of the everyday occurrences and naturalised practices in the school work to position students in racialised, classed and gendered ways. This does not mean to suggest that the teachers and management of the school are intentionally racist or sexist. On the contrary, most of the staff desire equality and justice for all their students. However, the deeply entrenched and institutionalised practices as well as the enduring discourses of apartheid continued to infiltrate meaning-making in this post-apartheid school.

Strongly racialised, gendered and cultural stereotypes appear to have become naturalised in the everyday talk of the staff. Racialised stereotypes position black students as disruptive, dishonest and ill-disciplined, and are primarily directed at the habitus and bodily practices of black students. Gender stereotypes position girls as academically and socially mature and boys as lazy

and attention-seeking. Cultural stereotypes perpetuate a notion of amaXhosa as *hooligans*. While stereotypes are for the most part directed at students, staff members are also subjected to gendered representations. Teachers involved in 'masculine' sports are privileged and afforded positions of power, whereas the more 'feminine' sports as well as the teachers who take these are relegated to the margins.

While there is resistance against essentialised positioning by both students and teachers, overt resistance is blocked by the management of the school. The convergence of historically determined hierarchical structures in the school and the dominance of white males in authoritative positions work against attempts to shift hegemonic practices. Shifts that do occur are either a result of individual teachers within the private space of their classrooms or groups of students within the relative anonymity of school assemblies.

The prevalence of various discourses in the school that worked to constitute Otherness is a concern. Students (and teachers) whose cultural capital does not reflect that of the dominant westernised understandings are devalued and marginalised. Attempts to make visible and disorder these discourses are viewed with fear and suspicion, and thwarted as they were deemed inappropriate to meet and attract the middleclass market. The dynamics of power, privilege, race and gender served to sustain and legitimate the silencing of teachers and restrict their opportunities to *go against the flow*. Few spaces exist in the school that allow for the emergence of alternative discourses. However, despite the lack of formal spaces, there is a significant sense of what Weis (in McLaren & Giarelli, 1995) refers to as 'the discursive underground' where teachers and students resist and challenge dominant practices.

8.2 TEACHERS AND REFLECTION

Institutionalised practices and discourses can become sedimented and taken for granted unless they are interrupted and unsettled. This is what critical reflection

sets out to do. Believing that 'changes do not occur though policy changes but through practising differently in the everyday, from moment to moment across school spaces' (Youdell, 2006:40), I set out to unsettle the prevailing discourses at Model C Ordinary.

The heavy administrative and teaching loads of the participating teachers meant that they seldom, if ever, took time out to reflect critically on their own and the institutionalised practices of their school. More importantly, the ethos of the school discourages critical reflection. The only institutionalised space created for discussion is the staff meeting, and while teachers are told that they are able to add items to the agenda, the gendered practices discourage them from doing so. Teachers wanting to contest dominant views or raise uncomfortable topics have to strategise by canvassing prior support or selecting a credible spokesperson perceived as being in favour with the management of the school. This person usually has acquired his or her status from engagement in masculine sports such as rugby and to a lesser extent, soccer. Female staff, unless they aggressively challenge naturalised practices, are seldom afforded the respect or status given to their male peers.

8.3 THE EFFECTS OF ENCOURAGING REFLECTION

8.3.1 Awareness

The intervention and creation of a space to examine the everyday practices of the school resulted in a heightened awareness of how seemingly mundane acts and talk are entangled in convoluted ways with tacit assumptions and beliefs that work to both include and exclude certain students. Research participants also became more critically aware of the constraining effects of the authoritative discourses that prevailed among the staff and of the ways in which these discourses implicate them in the reproduction of discriminatory practices. This awareness enabled the denaturalising of entrenched habits of talking and being. Without critical awareness, teachers and students tend to subscribe to the hegemonic view which constructs the institution as non-discriminatory, and

positions resisting members as unreasonable and disruptive.

8.3.2 Identity and representation

One of the more noticeable effects of the intervention was the recognition by the participants of the interconnectivity of representation, subjectivity and action. An example of this was Brolox's identification of the discursive power of the detention practices to constitute black students as the *baddies,* thus interpellating them into subject positions which result in their *disloyalty* to the school. Regular participation in the focus groups appears to facilitate more nuanced and fluid representations of their students by the teachers. They begin to contest the over-reliance and dominance of race and gender as single and/or binary determinants, and to understand the powerful role that class plays in the identities of many of their students. Teachers were also able to refelct on the high status given to certain sports and question the favouring of sports 'stars' who seem to be exempt from many of the rules that apply to the other students.

8.3.3 Material effects

While the intervention did not produce major changes in the school, certain significant shifts did occur. One was that the prefect system was re-examined and the cut-off time for latecomers to be punished was extended by five minutes. One of the teachers, because of a particular focus group discussion, met with the headmaster to discuss ways of ensuring that the movement of the students between classes was more streamlined, and that students were not to be allowed to disturb teachers while they were on break. There was also heightened awareness, especially among the management, that the detention system was discriminatory and ineffective in deterring unwanted behaviour. The resignation (see Afterword) of Butch created an opportunity for MM to manage a fairer system, and allowed for alternative methods to be demonstrated and for alternative discourses to be constructed.

8.4 WHAT FACILITATED CRITICAL REFLECTION

8.4.1 Construction of a space for reflection

Given the stressful nature of teaching, it is improbable that teachers will find the time or resolve to reflect critically on their assumptions and practices. Therefore a time and space needs to be constructed to enable this to happen. This research indicates that teachers not only enjoy the opportunity to reflect critically but that they desire such an opportunity. Allowing the teachers to attend the focus groups at their school and during school time contributed greatly to their enthusiastic participation and high attendance. This research illustrates that meaningful critical reflection is more likely to occur if participants are given an extensive period (between 6-12 months) in which to develop trust, and to have the confidence to address sensitive issues.

8.4.2 Group collaboration

This research reinforces the literature encouraging reflection to occur collaboratively. However, the composition of the group needs to reflect alternative perspectives and experiences. The differences amongst the participants in terms of age, background, gender, race and culture requires of them to confront the limitations of their assumptions and viewpoints and to share new insights. Having groups of similarly minded people and similar backgrounds might simply reinforce and cement existing perceptions.

8.4.3 Theories

Having access to theories on a variety of topics relating to difference was crucial to the successful reflection by the teachers. These theories included:

- school change (Fullan, 1999; Gillborn, 1995),
- multicultural approaches (summary from literature review),
- the role of humour (worksheet),
- gendered practices (Spender,1982),
- influence of class (diversity grid)

Theory allowed the teachers to 'name' their experiences (Brookfield, 1995:186) thereby creating a distance from an experience, which in turn facilitated a less individualised response. The theories of school change and multicultural practices located the issues under examination in socio-cultural contexts, and enabled the participants to reflect both on the micro and macro influences of their own practices. Engagement with literature on diversity and difference provided a theoretical lens for the teachers to reflect on the pervasive power of ideology, and to recognise how they, too, were implicated in reproducing such ideologies. The completion of the diversity grid required of the teachers to interrogate their own silences around class issues, while the Spender article in conjunction with the discussion of the observation of Alison's teaching practices advanced the understandings of deeply entrenched patterns of gender (and race) discrimination.

8.4.4 Role of students

The need to involve students as recommended by Gillborn (1995) has been illustrated by this research. The inclusion of the students in the interviews on detention provided the teachers and me with rich and poignant accounts of how the prevailing discourses and practices impacted directly on the identities and actions of the young people involved. Additionally, the two teachers, Alison and MM, who regularly engaged with their students and who provided opportunities for their students to discuss 'sensitive' topics in their class are most aware of student issues as well as more critical of institutionalised practices. If teachers and management do not listen to their students nor provide opportunities for them to voice their concerns and ideas, they are unlikely to transform hegemonic practices.

8.4.5 Outsider researcher

My presence as an outside researcher seemed to facilitate critical reflection. Firstly I was able to provide the teachers with readings and tasks. Secondly I provided structure to the focus groups and mediated discussions between the teachers. Thirdly, my presence and accessibility via the phone and email enabled the teachers to have a kind of sounding board on which they could formulate and try out ideas that they might have wanted to discuss later in the focus groups. This relationship has continued as two of the teachers have maintained contact, especially when contentious issues arise in their institution which they feel the need to share or discuss with someone who understands the context yet has a measure of distance. My position in the university legitimised the participation of the teachers in the project and afforded it the necessary status within the school. Finally, my presence constituted initial pressure on the school authorities to re-examine some of their practices. However my involvement in the project also resulted in the positioning of the critical input as being mine rather than that of the group. This is discussed as a design limitation below.

8.5 LIMITATIONS OF THE RESEARCH

8.5.1 Design of intervention

One of the major limitations in the design of my intervention was the lack of involvement of the headmaster. When I received initial support and permission to undertake the study, I had not understood fully the implications of imposing a critical research gaze on a school. It appeared that the headmaster of the school willingly and enthusiastically allowed me into his school with the unspoken understanding that I would laud and value the multicultural practices in his school. Instead, I encouraged the teachers to be critical, and we confronted him on the racialised and gendered practices of detention at his school. Feeling threatened and deceived, he rejected the report I wrote on the detention and asked me to discontinue the research. Fortunately all the fieldwork had been

completed. His reaction to the critical gaze is revealing of many things. Firstly, it reveals the shortcoming in my design. It was unrealistic to provide the teachers with the means and space to develop their critical abilities and yet not provide the headmaster and management with similar opportunities. Partaking in the focus groups over a period of 18 months had transformed many of the participants both epistemologically and ontologically and enabled them to revise and re-inscribe their subjectivities as agents of change. The headmaster was in a different space to these teachers. Another weakness of my design was my role as participant observer in the meeting between management and the group. Rather than retain my objective stance as the researcher, I became the spokesperson for the group. This undermined the agency of the participating teachers and positioned the work we had achieved over the period of 18 months as belonging to me. This in effect sabotaged the likelihood of the headmaster effecting change and gave him a reason not to engage with an outsider of the school.

The strong reaction from the headmaster reveals the immense power that this level of management possesses to block any changes. Unless there is substantial involvement from the management of the school, significant changes are unlikely to happen. Involvement does not only imply granting permission for research; it implies a deep and committed willingness on the part of management to engage with contentious areas, and preparedness to shift practices despite personal and social investments. It also requires school leaders to innovate ways of valuing and rewarding various forms of cultural capital.

8.5.2 Limitations of the case study

Broad generalisations cannot be made from a single case study. This research provides in-depth understandings of only one school in South Africa and does not in any way attempt to claim that findings from this school can be used to generalise conditions and practices in other schools in South Africa, including other ex-Model-c schools. It does, however, provide powerful examples of how seemingly mundane talk and everyday practices can exclude students and

reproduce gender, race and class discrimination in what can be seen as a typical ex Model-c school.

8.6 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RESEARCH

8.6.1 National Policies

The latest document, *Strategy for Racial Integration*, (2006) produced by the Department of Education identifies the urgent need to provide both support and pressure to educational institutions to assist them in transforming their practices. One aspect of their strategy is to 'promote diversity and anti-racism training through inset and preset programmes for educators, managers and district and provincial support staff' (2006:21). The methods employed by this research to encourage critical reflection may prove useful to the Department of Education in their quest to provide training for educators.

8.6.2 Summary of lessons learnt

This research suggests that critical reflection can play a significant role in promoting positive change for teachers. Given appropriate opportunities, teachers can become powerful change agents within their schools, but this requires the full commitment of those in management. This research has clearly illustrated the limitations of providing training only for the teachers, and recommends that parallel training be offered to management.

In saying this, further research is needed in order to consider the intricate ethical issues that surround research on school change. Such research needs to take into consideration the unequal power relations that exist in institutionalised spaces and the impact change has on those attempting to disrupt the status quo. More lessons can be learnt in researching schools that are working with multiculturalism in productive ways. There are indications that these practices are starting to emerge in some schools. This in itself is a positive sign.

AFTERWORD

Nowhere in this thesis have I described the final feedback session given to the whole school. Since I had promised the headmaster that we would do such a session, I discussed it with the teachers in the final focus group. Their strong reaction surprised me. They were very reluctant to share what they had learnt and particularly nervous to 'publicly' share the issues we had discussed over the previous 18 months. As a compromise, they were prepared to share their findings on gender discrimination with reference to the Spender reading and Alison's classroom observation.

I introduced the feedback to the whole staff by reminding them of my visit 18 months earlier and indicated that we wanted to share a particular finding with them, that of gendered practices. I then passed it on to the research participants who discussed generally what they had discovered during their reflection on this topic. The response to their input was very vocal and aggressive, particularly from the male teachers, who insisted that they were in no way to be incriminated for favouring boys or for spending more time and attention on the boys. They indicated that the gendered nature of the detention was simply because boys are more physical and more difficult. A loud and uncontrolled debate ensued for about ten minutes. I then called their attention to the fact that we were not accusing anyone, but rather sharing what we had learnt, in the hope that it might encourage all of them to become more aware of how our naturalised practices are not always as neutral as we think, and that by becoming more aware of this, we could improve our teaching. The workshop ended with some teachers remaining behind to discuss their own experiences of gender discrimination and that despite the loud outcry from many of the men, it remained a serious issue.

Since I have kept in contact with many of the teachers who participated in the research, I am able to provide the reader with some of the changes that occurred at Model C Ordinary after I left.

MM

In 2005 Butch resigned as teacher in charge of detention. This was announced at the annual *bosberaad*. Since there were no immediate volunteers, MM decided that it would be a good opportunity for him to see if he could bring about some changes in the system. He volunteered, and became responsible for detention the following year. The biggest change he was able to implement was to have regular meetings with the students and counsel them. In these private spaces he afforded the students an opportunity to discuss their reasons for deviating from the school rules, and to share their personal and academic goals. In this way he showed his concern and empathy, and developed good relationships with the students. Towards the middle of the year as he became more involved with soccer, he was unable to continue his high level of intervention. However it was commented at the end of the year that the detention lists had been drastically reduced. The following year he was asked to head up a grade which included a promotion and thus he was unable to continue being responsible for detention as well. It was then handed over to another white male teacher who has been noted for his ability to implement discipline with military zeal.

Emily

Emily left the Model C and took up a post at another Model C also teaching English. She is extremely happy there, especially because the headmaster has implemented many changes to that school in order to make it less assimilationist and more multicultural. Emily has indicated to me that the staff meetings are always very controversial because any staff member is allowed to question, challenge, and disagree with what is said.

When the headmaster of her school heard about this research from Emily, he contacted me and asked me to present an overview of it to the school. In addition he has organised for me to present workshops on 'dealing with difference' to the Teachers Union in various areas.

Brolox

Brolox still teaches at Model C but was passed over for a promotional post. He

feels that it was not in any way connected to his involvement in the research. Despite this setback, Brolox appears to have retained his passion and energy for teaching. He and MM continue to have a close friendship and to share critical discussions.

Alison

Alison still teaches at the university and has decided to continue studying. She has constructed a focus group at the university with a group of colleagues, including me, to reflect critically on our teaching practices. The group calls itself *Ambiguity,* fashioned after the desire to eschew any fixed and rigid understandings and embrace ‘radical openness'.

Suzie and Sally both still teach at Model C Ordinary.

REFERENCES

Adler, S. (1991).The Reflective Practitioner and the Curriculum of Teacher Education. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 17(2), pp.139-150.

Althusser, L. (1971). Ideology and ideological state apparatuses. In B. Brewster (Ed.). *Lenin and philosophy*. London: New Left Books, pp.127-186.

Bacchi, C. (1996). *The Politics of Incorporation. The Politics of Affirmative Action*. London: Sage.

Ball, S. (1987). *The micro-politics of the school: a theory of school organisation*. London: Methuen.

Ball, S. (Ed.). (1990). *Foucault and education: Disciplines and knowledge*. London & New York: Routledge.

Barthes, R. (1972). *Mythologies*. Translated: Annette Lavers. London: Jonathan Cape.

Bhabha, H. (1990). *Nation and Narration.* London: Routledge.

Bhabha, H. (1994). *The location of culture.* London & New York: Routledge.

Brookfield, S. D. (1995). *Becoming a critically reflective teacher*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brookfield, S.D. (2002). Using the lenses of critically reflective teaching in the community college classroom. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 2002(118), pp.31-38.

Bourdieu,P. (1990). *In Other Words*: *Essays towards a reflexive sociology*

Bourdieu, P. & Passeron, J. (1977). *Reproduction in education, society and culture.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction.* Trans. Richard Nice. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1990). *Language and symbolic power.* Great Britain: Polity Press.

Burbules, N. (1997). A grammar of difference: Some ways of rethinking difference and diversity as educational topics. *Australian Educational Researcher,* 24(1), pp.97-115.

Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of "sex"*. London: Routledge.

Calderhead, J. & Gates, P. (1993). *Conceptualizing reflection in teacher development.* London: Falmer Press.

Canagarajah, S. (2004). Subversive identities, pedagogical safe houses in Norton, B. & Toohey, K. (Eds.). *Critical Pedagogies and Language learning*. USA: Cambridge, pp.116-137.

Carr, W. & Kemmis, S. (1986). *Becoming critical: education, knowledge and action research.* London & Philadelphia: Falmer Press.

Carrim, N. (1998). Anti-racism and the 'New' South African educational order. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 28*, pp.301-320.

Carrim, N. & Soudien, C. (1999). Critical antiracism in South Africa. In S. May (Ed). *Critical multiculturalism: Rethinking multiculturalism and*

antiracist education. London: Falmer Press.

Chisholm, L. (Ed). (2004). *Changing class: education and social change in post-apartheid South Africa*. Cape Town: Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC) Press.

Connell, R.W. (2004). Working–class parents' views of secondary education. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 8(3), pp.227-239.

Connelly, M.,& Clandinin, J. (1988). *Teachers as curriculum planners: Narratives of experience*. New York: Teacher's College Press.

Comber, B. (1996).The discursive construction of literacy in a disadvantaged school. Unpublished PhD thesis, Townsville, James Cook University.

Comber, B. & Kamler, B. (2005). (Eds.).*Turn-around pedagogies: literacy interventions for at-risk students*.

Deakin University. (1998). *Research methodologies in education: Study guide.* Geelong, Australia: Deakin University Press.

Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York: New Press.

Department of Education (DoE). (2002). *Values in Education Programme of Action*.
Available from: www.department of education.org

Department of Education (DoE). (2006). *Strategy for Racial Integration*. Pretoria: Department of Education.

Department of Education (DoE). (2006). *Values and Human Rights in the Curriculum: A Guide.* Department of Education.

Devine-Eller, A. (2005). *Rethinking Bourdieu on race: A critical review of cultural capital and habitus in the sociology of education qualitative Literature*. Rutgers University.
Available from:
http://www.eden.rutgers.edu/~auderey/Rethinking%20Bourdieu,%20A%20Critical%20Review%20of%20Cultural%20Capital.pdf.
[Accessed on 19 June 2007]

Dewey. J. (1933). *How we think. A restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the educative process*. Boston: DC Heath.

Dixon, K. & Dornbrack, J. (2007). They said we were the impossibles: How discourses and regimes of disciplinary practice construct subjects in a desegregated South African school. Paper presented at the International conference on Student Discipline: National and International Perspectives, 2-4 April 2006. Potchefstroom University.

Donald, J. & Rattansi, A. (Eds.). (1992). *'Race', culture and difference.* London: Sage.

Ellsworth, E. (1989). Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review*, 59(3), pp. 297-324.

Epstein, D. (1993). *Changing classroom cultures: Anti-racism, politics and schools*. England: Trentham Books.

Evans, R. (1996). *The human side of school change*.
Available from: http://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&1r=school+change

[Accessed 12/20/2006]

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. UK: Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and Power.* (2nd Ed.). Essex: Pearson Education Limited.

Fanon, F. (1967). *Black skin white masks*. New York: Grove press.

Fish, D. & Twinn, S. (1997). *Quality Clinical Supervision in the Health care Professions: Principled Approaches to Practice*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Fiske, E. & Ladd, H. (2004). Balancing public and private resources for basic education: school fees in post apartheid South Africa. In L. Chisholm (Ed.). *Changing class: Education and social change in post-apartheid South Africa*. Cape Town: Human Sciences Research Council (HSBRC) Press, pp.57-88.

Foucault, M. (1972a). *The archaeology of knowledge & the discourse on language*. New York: Pantheon.

Foucault, M. (1972b). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings*. C. Gordon (Ed.). New York: Pantheon.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and Punish: The birth of the prison*. New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1986). Of Other Spaces. *Diacritics,* 16, pp.22-27.

Freedom Charter. (1955).
Available from: http://www.anc.org.za/ancdocs/history/charter.html
[Accessed 5 November 2004]

Fullan, M. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change.* London: Cassell Educational.

Fullan, M. (1999). *Change forces: The sequel.* London: Falmer Press.

Gadamer, H.G. (1976) *Truth and Method*.

Gee, J, P. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses* (2nd ed.). London: Falmer Press.

Gee, J. P. (1999). *An Introduction to discourse analysis: theory and method*. London: Routledge.

Gillborn, D. (1995). *Racism and antiracism in real schools.* Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Gillborn, D. & Ladson-Billings, G. (2004). (Eds.). *Multicultural Education*. London: Routledge Falmer.

Goffman, E. (1961). *Asylums: Essays on the social situation of mental patients and other inmates*. New York: Anchor.

Gore, J. & Zeichner, K. (1991). Action Research and Reflective Teaching in Pre-service Teacher Education: A Case Study from the United States. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 7(2),* pp.119-136.

Grant Lewis, S & Motala, S. (2004). Educational de/centralisation and the quest for equity, democracy and quality. In *Changing Class*. ChisholmL (Ed). Cape Town: HSRC Press.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks*.(Hoare, Q. & Smith, G.N. & Trans. E.). New York: International.

Greenbaum, T. (1998). *The handbook for focus group research* (2nd ed.). Delhi & London: Sage.

Green, J. & Mellow, N. (1998). *Integration where it counts: A study of racial integration in public and private school lunchrooms*. Presented at the American Political Science Association in Boston in September 1998.

Gunew, S. & Yeatman, A. (Ed.). (1993). *Feminism and the politics of difference.* Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Haldrup, M., Koefoed, L. & Simonsen. (2006). Practical Orientalism-Bodies, Everyday Life and the Construction of Otherness. *Swedish Society for Anthropology and Geography,* 88(2), pp.173-184.

Hall and Du Gay (1998). (Eds). *Questions of cultural identity*. London: Sage.

Harker, R. (1984). On Reproduction, Habitus and Education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 5(2).

Hatton, N. & Smith, D. (1994). *Reflection in Teacher Education*. Accessed from

Hemson, C. & Francis, D. (2007). Rainbow's end: Consciousness and enactment in social justice education. *Perspectives in Education*, 25(1) March 2007.

Heron, J. & Reason, P. (2006). The Practice of Co-operative Inquiry: Research 'with' rather than 'on' people. In Reason & Bradbury (2006). *The Handbook of Action Research*. London: Sage, pp.144-154.

hooks, b. (1990). *Yearning.* Boston: South End Press.

hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of*

freedom. London: Routledge.

Hooks,b. (1996). *Killing Rage*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.

Horvat & Antonio (1999). Hey those shoes are out of the school uniform: African American girls in an elite high school. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*.

Janesick, V. (2000). The choreography of qualitative research design. In Denzin, N. and Janks, H. (1993). *Closed meanings in open schools in Literacy for the new millennium*. Conference papers: Australian Reading Association, pp.85-93.

Janks, H. (1997). Critical discourse analysis as a research tool. *Discourse*, *18*(3), pp.329-342.

Janks, H. (2002). *Domination, access, diversity and design: A synthesis for critical literacy education*. South Africa: University of Witwatersrand.

Janks, H. (2005a). The interplay of grammar and meaning. Keynote paper presented at the ESL educators symposium *Exploring English Language Learning and Identity Symposium*. University of Adelaide, 2-3 October 2005.

Janks, H. (2005b). Language and the design of texts. *English teaching practice and critique* Vol 4 (3). Pp. 97-110

Jaworski, A. & Coupland, N. (Eds.). (1999). *The discourse reader.* London & New York: Routledge.

Jayanthi, M. & Nelson, J. (2002). *Savvy decision making: An administrator's guide to using focus groups in schools*. California: Corwin Press.

Kalantzis, M., Cope, B. & Slade, D. (1989). *Minority languages and dominant culture.* London & New York: Falmer Press.

Kalantzis,M.,Cope,B.,Noble,G.,& Poynting,S. (1990). *Cultures of schooling: Pedagogies for cultural difference and social access*. London, New York & Philadelphia: Falmer Press.

Kamler, B. (1997). Text as Body, Body as Text. *Discourse*, 18, pp.369-387. England: Carfax Publishers.

Kemmis, S. (1985). Action Research and the Politics of Reflection. In D. Boud,R.Kough & D. Walker (Eds.*). Reflection: Turning experience into learning*. London: Croom Helm, pp.139-164.

Kezar, A. & Eckel, P. (2007). Learning to ensure the success of students of colour. Change, July/August 2007, Heldrif Publications.
[Accessed on Ebsco Host, 7/12/2007]

Korthagen, F. & Vasalos, A. (2005). Levels in reflection: core reflection as a means to enhance professional growth. *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice*, 11(1), pp.47-71.

Kostogriz, A. (2002). *Rethinking ESL literacy education in multicultural conditions: The passage through cultural-historical psychology*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of New England, Australia.

Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Lakoff and Johnson. (1980). *Metaphors we live by.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lamont, M. & Lareau, A. (1988). Cultural Capital: Allusions, gaps & Glissandos in recent theoretical developments. *Sociological Theory*, 6(2),

pp.153-168.

Lareau, A. & Horvat, E. (1999). Moments of social inclusion and exclusion race, class & cultural capital in family-school. *Sociology of Education*. 72(1), pp. 37-53.

Lareau, A. (2003). *Unequal childhoods: class, race and family life*. California: University of California Press.

Lareau, A. & Weininger, E. (2003). Cultural capital in educational research: a critical assessment. *Theory and Society,* 32, pp.567-606.

Lincoln, Y. & Guba, G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry.* Beverley Hills: Sage.

Madriz, E. (2000). Focus groups in feminist research. In Denzin,N and Lincoln, Y. (Eds.). *Handbook of qualitative research (2nd ed.).* London: Sage.

May, S. (Ed). (1999). *Critical multiculturalism: Rethinking multicultural and antiracist education*. London: Falmer Press.

Maykut, P. & Morehouse, R. (1994). *Beginning Qualitative Research: a Philosophic and practical guide*.

Manjoo, S. (2004). A review of national strategies and forums engaging with racism and human rights in education. In *Reflections on School Integration*. Colloquium Proceedings. Nkomo, McKinney & Chisholm (Eds.). European Union, HSRC & Charles Stewart Mott foundation.

McDiarmid, G.W. (1993). Changes in beliefs about learners. In Gates, P. & Calderhead, J. *Conceptualizing reflection in teacher development* .London*:* Falmer Press.

McKinney, C. & Van Pletzen, E. (2004). This apartheid story…we've finished with it: Student responses to the apartheid past in a SA English studies course. *Teaching in Higher Education, 9*(2), pp.159-170.

McLaren, P. & Giarelli, J. (1995). *Critical Theory and Educational Research.* State University of New York Press.

McNiff,J. (1988). *Action Research: Principles and Practice*. New York: Routledge.

Misson, R. (1997). *Only joking: being critical and keeping a sense of humour*. Faculty of Education. Australia: University of Melbourne.

Moletsane, R. (2002). Swimming against the tide: External intervention in a 'non-resilient' school? *Journal of Education,* 22, pp.117-136. School of Education, Training and Development. Pietermariztburg: University of Natal.

Moletsane, R., Hemson, C. & Muthukrishna, A. (2004). Educating South African teachers for the challenge of school integration: towards a teaching and research agenda. In *Reflections on School Integration. Colloquium Proceedings*. Nkomo, McKinney & Chisholm, (Eds.). European Union, HSRC & Charles Stewart Mott foundation.
Available from: www.hsrcpublishers.ac.za.
[Accessed on 17 /12/2006]

Mottee, S. (2005). South Africa Teacher Training Survey. Available from: http://www.hrusa.org?workshops/HREWorkshops/USA
[Accessed on 1/1/2007]

Mouton, J. (1996). *Understanding Social Research.* Pretoria: Van Schaiks.

Naidoo, J. (1996a). *Racial integration of public schools in South Africa. A study of practices, attitudes and trends*. Education Policy Unit, Durban:

University of Natal.

Naidoo, J. (1996b). *The racial integration of schools. A review of the literature on the experience in South Africa*. Education Policy Unit. Durban: University of Natal.

National Department of Education. (2002). *Values in education: Programme of action*.
Available from:
http://www.education.gov.za/dynamic/dynamic.aspx?pageID=329

Ndimande, B. (2007). It Is a catch 22 situation: The challenge of race in post-apartheid South African desegregated schools*. International Journal of Educational Policy, Research and Practice,* 8(1).

Nesbit, T. (2006). What's the matter with social class? *Adult Education Quarterly*. American Association for Adult and Continuing Education, 56(3), pp.171-187

Nkomo, M., Chisholm, L. & McKinney, C. (2004). Through the eye of the school - in pursuit of social integration in Reflections on School Integration . Colloquium Proceedings, (eds) Nkomo, McKinney & Chisholm. European Union, HSRC & Charles Stewart Mott Foundation.
Available from: www. hsrcpublishers.ac.za
[Accessed on 17 /12/2006]

Nieto, S. (1995) From Brown heroes and holidays to assimilationist agendas. In Sleeter, C. & McClaren, P. (Eds.) *Multicultural Education, Critical Pedagogy, and the Politics of Difference*. Suny series.

Nieteo, S. (2004). *Affirming diversity: A sociopolitical context of multicultural education*. (4th Ed.). USA: Pearson Education.

Obear, K. (2000). *Exploring the phenomenon of triggering events fro social*

justice educators. Unpublished DEd Thesis. University of Massachusetts.

OpenAfrica.com SEK Mqhayi Monument (Praise singer).
Accessed from:
www.africandream.org/participant/31293?popup_win=SEK+Mqhayi+Monument - 7k on 8/12/07.

Osterman, K. & Kottkamp, R. (1993). *Reflective Practice for Educators.* Newbury: Corwin Press.

Posel, D. (2001). What's in a name? Racial Classification in Apartheid South Africa and beyond. *Transformation,* 47, pp.50-74.

Potter, J. (1996). An Analysis of Thinking and Research about Qualitative Methods. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Pratt, M. (1991). Arts of the contact zone. *Profession*, 91, pp.33-40.

Pressley,M., Graham,S. &Harris,K. (2006). The state of educational intervention research as viewed through the lens of literacy intervention*. British Journal of Educational Psychology* (2006). The British Psychological Society,76, pp.1-19.

Reason, P. & Bradbury, H. (2006). *Handbook of Action Research.* London: Sage.

Reed, Y and Adler, J. (2002). *Challenges of teacher development*. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.

Republic of South Africa (RSA). (1996). *Constitution of the Republic of South Africa*. Pretoria: Government Printer.

Ritchie, J & Lewis, J. (2003). *Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers*. London: Sage.

Rizvi, F & Lingard, B. (2006). Edward Said and the cultural politics of education. *Discourse. Studies in the cultural politics of education*, 27(3), pp.293-308.

Rose, N. (1989). *Governing the soul: The shaping of the private self*. New York & London: Routledge.

Said, E. W. (2003). *Orientalism*. London: Penguin. (Original work 1978).

Sayed, Y. (2002). *Education exclusion and inclusion in the South: A review of the literature. Exclusion and inclusion research project*. *Discussion paper 1* Brighton: CIE, University of Sussex.

Sayed, Y. & Soudien, C. (2003). (Re) *Framing education exclusion and inclusion discourses: Limits and possibilities*. IDS Bulletin, 34(1), pp.9-19.

Schon, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner.* New York: Basic Books.

Schon, D. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. Presentation to AERA (American Educational Research Association). Washington DC.

Sekete, P., Shilubane, M. & Moila, B. (2001). *Deracialisation and migration of learners in South African Schools*. Pretoria: HSRC .

Silverman, D. (1997*). Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice.* London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: Sage.

Silverman,D. (2000). *Doing qualitative research: a practical handbook*. London: Sage.

Sleeter, C. (1992). Resisting racial awareness: how teachers understand the social order from their own racial, gender and social class locations. *Educational Foundations,* (6), pp.7-32.

Sleeter,C. (1993). How white teachers construct race. in Mc Carthy, C. & Crichlow, W. (Eds) *Race and Representation in Education* New York: Routledge.

Sleeter, C. & McLaren, P. (1995). *Multicultural education, critical pedagogy and the politics of difference*. New York: University of New York Press.

Soja, E. (1996). *Thirdspace.* USA & UK: Blackwell.

Soudein, C. (1998). We know why we're here: the experience of African children in a 'coloured' school in Cape Town. In *Race, Ethnicity and Education*. 1(1) 1998. Carfax Publishing Ltd.

Soudien, C. (2004). Constituting the class: An analysis of the process of 'integration' in South African schools. In L. Chisholm (Ed.). *Changing class: Education and social change in post-apartheid South Africa*. Cape Town: Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC) Press, pp. 89-114.

Soudien, C. (2007a). Caste, Class and Race: Continuities and Discontinuities across Indian and South African Schools. *South African Historical Journal*, 57, pp.113-133.

Soudien, C. (2007b). Making our own modernity: Standards, values and benchmarks in the African school in the age of globalization. *Southern African Review of Education: Assessment and Educational Standards: Special Issue*, Vol 13 Issue 1, Jun 2007

Soudien, C. & Sayed, Y. (2004). A new racial state? Exclusion and inclusion in education policy and practice in South Africa. *Perspectives in Education*, 22(4) , pp.101-115.

South African Human Rights Commission (Valley & Dalamba). (1999). *Racism, 'racial integration' and desegregation in South African public*

secondary schools.
Available from: http://www.sahrc.org.za
[Accessed on 20 July 2002]

Spender, D. (1982). The invisible women. *The Womens Press*. London.

Stake, R. (2000). Case Studies. Denzin, N and Lincoln,Y (Eds). *Handbook of qualitative research (2nd Ed.).*London: Sage.

The Freedom Charter. (1955).
Available from: www.anc.org.za/ancdocs/history/charter.html

Thompson, J. (1990). *Studies in the Theory of Ideology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Troyna, B. (1984). Multicultural Education: emancipation or containment" in L. Barton & S. Walker (Eds) *Social Crisis and Educational Research.* Beckenham:Croon Helm, pp.75-92.

Troyna, B. & Carrington, B. (1990). *Education, racism and reform.* London: Routledge.

Vacarr, B. (2001). Moving beyond polite correctness: Practising mindfulness in the diverse classroom. *Harvard Educational Review,* 71(2), pp.285-295.

Vally, S. & Dalamba,Y. (1999). Racism, 'racial integration' and desegregation in South African Public Secondary Schools. *A report on a study by the South African Human Rights Commission (SAHRC*). Pretoria.

Values and human rights in education project.
Available from: sdc.org.za/index.php?navID=21653&langID=1.
[Accessed 1/1/07]

Vandeyar, S. (2003). The jagged paths to multicultural education: international experiences and South Africa's response in the new dispensation. *South African Journal of Education*, 23(3), pp.193-198.

Van Heerden, M. (2000). Being together: interaction and separation among learners in desegregated schools in South Africa. *South African Journal of Education,* 20 (4).

Van Veen, K., Sleegers, P. & van de Ven, P-H. (2005). One teachers' identity, emotions, and commitment to change: a case study into the cognitive-affective processes of a secondary school teacher in the context of reforms. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21 (2005), pp.917-934.

Weber, M. (1968). *Economy and Society: An outline of interpretive sociology*. New York: Bedminster Press.

Weedon, C (1997) *Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory.* (2nd Ed.). Oxford: Blackwells.

Weiner, B. (1992). *Human Motivation: metaphors, theories and research*. London: Sage Publications.

Weis, L. (1995). Constructing the "other'': Discursive renditions of white working-class males in high school. In *Critical Theory and Educational Research*. Mc Laren & Giarelli (Eds.). State University of New York. pp.203-222.

Youdell, D. (2003). Identity Traps or how black students fail: the interactions between biographical, sub-cultural and learner identities in Gillborn,D & Ladson-Billings,G. (2004) (Eds.) *Multicultural Education.* London: RoutldgeFalmer, pp.84-102.

Youdell, D. (2006). Diversity, inequality and a post-structural politics for education. Discourse: *Studies in the cultural politics of education,* 27 (1),

pp.33-42.

Zeicher, K. & Liston, D. (1996). *Reflective teaching: An introduction*. Mahwah NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Information Letter
Appendix B: Teacher written consent form
Appendix C1: Semi-structured in-depth interview
Appendix C2: Semi-structured in-depth interview 2
Appendix D1: Learner consent form (English)
Appendix D2: Learner consent form (English)
Appendix E: Sample questions for group interview of pupils who frequently attend detention
Appendix F: Diversity grid
Appendix G: Humour task
Appendix H: Gender reading
Appendix I: Pupil detention system copy
Appendix J: Non-negotiable classroom rules
Appendix K: Teachers' copy of detention system
Appendix L: Copy of records of DT learners
Appendix M: Observation schedule

APPENDIX A: INFORMATION LETTER

Information sheet: Teachers/Principal

Dear Teacher

My name is Jacquelin Dornbrack and I am currently registered for my Doctorate in Applied Language Studies at the University of the Witwatersrand. I am being supervised by Professor Hilary Janks and my research is approved by an Ethics committee.

My main research question is, how various teachers manage difference in the school. Difference refers to pupils in terms of gender, race, ethnicity, ability, class and others. I am interested in better understanding the challenges that face teachers in a post-apartheid, "model C" classroom and in collaborating closely with 6 volunteer teachers from your school. I would like to work with a range of teachers mainly those who teach in grades 8 and 9. The project is totally voluntary and the teachers are under no obligation to partake and may withdraw their consent at any time during the project.

Participating teachers will be interviewed and a few of their classes will be observed and video-taped by me. They will also be asked to attend two or three afternoon workshops where I will discuss relevant literature as well as share with them findings, based on my observations, relating to their management of difference in their classrooms. They will also be asked to keep regular journals documenting their participation in this project. Subsequent to the workshops, the teachers will again be interviewed and their classes once again observed and video-taped.

I believe that the participating teachers will benefit immensely from their participation in this project as I am hoping to share current theories in critical multiculturalism, notions of thirdspace which allow for new ways of thinking about difference, and also to affirm and critically analyse teachers' current practices. I foresee no danger to any of the participants.

All the raw data (the videos, interview transcripts and journals) will be kept securely in my office and will only be shown at academic conferences outside the Eastern Cape, with the express permission from the relevant teachers. My thesis and any articles resulting from this research will be made available to the school and to the teachers involved.

Pseudonyms will be used for the school, the area and the teachers to ensure anonymity.

I am happy to make myself available to answer any questions you might have.

Thank you for your interest in this project.

Yours faithfully

Jacqui Dornbrack

041-5043767

Consent form: Principal of the High School

I,.....Principal of
.....High School

give my consent to this research project being conducted in my school during 2003 and 2004.

I have read the information sheet and the letter to the teachers and parents and understand that the main aim of this research is to understand how some teachers in my school are managing difference.

I acknowledge that:

* The aims and methods and anticipated benefits and possible hazards have been explained to me.
* The teachers are free to choose not to participate and that no pressure will be placed on any teachers to take part in the research
* The teachers and myself are free to withdraw our consent at any time during the study, in which event our participation in the research project will immediately cease and any information from us will not be used.

Signature.....

Date.....

APPENDIX B: TEACHER WRITTEN CONSENT FORM

University of the Witwatersrand
Consent Form: Teachers

I, ...of .....

consent to participate in the research to be undertaken

by Jacquelin Dornbrack at my school during 2003 and 2004

I have read the letter to teachers and I understand that the purpose of the research is for the researcher to gain an understanding of the impact on teachers and their practices when they reflect critically on some issue relating to diversity.
I acknowledge that:

- The aims, methods and anticipated benefits and possible hazards have been explained to me.
- I voluntarily and freely give my consent to my participation in such a research study.
- I understand that findings will be used for research purposes and may be reported in journals.
- The school and the teachers anonymity will be protected
- I am free to withdraw my consent at any time during the study, in which event my participation in the research study will immediately cease and any information from me will not be used.

Signature:----------

Date:----------

APPENDIX C1: SEMI-STRUCTURED IN-DEPTH INTERVIEW

Teacher interview questions

1. *How long have you been teaching and what are your specific subjects?*

1. *Tell me why you volunteered to participate in this project.*

1. *What's changed in your classroom since schools have been desegregated?*

1. *In what way has the work you do as a teacher changed since desegregation?*

1. *What aspects of your teaching have not changed and why?*

1. *In what ways do you see children as being different from one another in your classroom?*

1. *Did these differences exist before desegregation?*

1. *How do you handle these changes?*

1. *What positive changes have you seen in your classes since they have become more diverse?*

1. *What aspects of difference seem to take up most of your time?*

1. *Are there any aspects related to difference that seem to extend beyond the classroom?*

1. *Is there anything in your classroom that you would like to change?*

1. *Could you describe an incident / lesson / achievement in relation to difference that you have experienced.*

1. *What kind of support (training, organisational, infra-structure) have you received that has contributed to your management of difference in the classroom?*

APPENDIX C2: SEMI-STRUCTURED IN-DEPTH INTERVIEW

Post - Intervention Interview Questions

- Reflection –what particularly encouraged reflection:
  - Readings- Fullan text, Gillborn case studies, Report form SAHRC
  - Input from me-eg. multicultural models
  - Activities/ tasks-diversity rubric, detention records,
  - Observation
  - Focus group discussions (eg detention, dealing with conflict, Cultural evening)
  - Meeting with management

- What, if anything, has changed in your
  - Attitude towards difference
  - Classroom practices
  - Institutional practices
  - Colleagues in group
  - Colleagues in general

- Were there any benefits from participating in this research. What would you say were the main benefits?

- Were there any disadvantages/ negative features from participating?

- Can you remember any particular highlights or discussions that stood out for you. What were they and why were they significant?

- Clara (only). You left the school. Have you taken anything with you from participation in this research, with you to your new context?

- Any comments that you would like to make in general regarding any aspect of the whole research?

APPENDIX D1: LEARNER CONSENT FORM (ENGLISH)

Information sheet for pupils and parents

Dear Pupils and Parents

My name is Jacquelin Dornbrack and I will be doing some research at your school which will be supervised by Professor Hilary Janks from the University of the Witwatersrand. I lecture at the Port Elizabeth Technikon in the Language Department.

As you know, classrooms have changed a lot since schools have been desegregated and teachers want to make sure that different students are all treated fairly. They have invited me to help them to think about their teaching in light of these changes.

My research will focus on how six volunteer teachers work with students. The teachers will work together to reflect on their teaching. To enable them to do this, my research assistant or I will:

1. Observe their classes and the way they interact with students and how students interact with each other. We will take notes while observing.
2. Video some of their lessons
3. Possibly interview some pupils to find out their understandings of the changes in the school. These interviews will be tape recorded.

The notes from my observations and interviews with pupils as well as and some of the videos, will be used during my group meetings with the teachers. The videos will not be used outside of the school and students will not be referred to by name in my work. The names of the pupils being interviewed will not be told to the teachers.

,
In order to conduct my observations, interviews and videos, I need permission from pupils and their parents. You are able to withdraw your permission at any time during the research.

If you have any questions, I am happy to come to your school to answer them

I would appreciate it if you would complete the forms below and give them back to your teacher as soon as possible.

Regards

Jacqui Dornbrack (041-5043767)

University of the Witwatersrand

Consent Form: Observation of Pupils and Parents

I, parent of.....(pupil's name) of

.....(school)

give permission for my son / daughter to be **observed in class** by Jacquelin Dornbrack at school during 2003 and 2004

I have read the letter to the pupils/parents and understand that the researcher wants to see what happens in certain teachers' classrooms in relation to difference.

I agree that:

- I understand the aims of this research and that there will be no danger involved.
- **As a pupil,** I freely allow myself to be observed by Jacquelin.
- **As a parent**, I allow my child/children to participate in this research.
- I understand the findings will be used for research purposes and may be reported in journals but no actual names of the school, teachers or pupils will be used.
- I am free to withdraw my consent any time.

Signature Parent:.....

Signature Pupil.....

Date:.....

Jacqui Dornbrack (Tel: 041- 5043767)

APPENIDIX D2: LEARNER CONSENT FORM (ISIXHOSA)

Iphepha lolwazi kubantwana nabazali

Bafundi ababekekileyo

NdinguJacquelin Dornbrack igama lam. Ndiza kube ndisenza uphando kwisikolo senu, olu phando longanyelwe nguProfessor Hilary Janks weUniversity yase Witwatersand. Ndifundisa kwi Technikon yase Port Elizabeth kwicandelo lezeelwimi, ndikwafundela ezobugqira kwiApplied Language Studies.

Ndifuna ukufumanisa ukuba ootitshala benza kanjani na kwiklasi apho kukho iinkcubeko ezahlukeneyo ngokohlanga, ulwimi, iinkonzo kunye nobuchule. Ndinomdla wokwazi ukuba utitshala uzenza kanjani na ezi zinto kunye nani; nithetha kanjani, niphathana kanjani, kwaye nisebenzisana kanjani na kumagumbi okufundela. Ukuze ndikwazi ukukuqonda kakuhle oku, kufuneka ndithathe nemifanekiso yevidiyo ngexesha lezinye izifundo zenu.

Ukukhusela amalungelo enu nokufumana imvume kwikomiti ye University Ethics, kufuneka ndifumane imvume yokuthatha ividiyo ukuze ndivumeleke ukuba ndiyibonise kwabanye abaphandi nootitshala abanomdla wokufunda ngeyantlukwano kumagumbi okufundela.

Andisayi kulisebenzisa igama lesikolo , okanye amagama anokubonisa ukuba olu lwazi ndilufumene kwesiphi na isikolo. Andisayi kuyibonisa ividiyo eMpuma koloni.
Oku kwenzelwa ukuqinisekisa imfihlakalo nokungaziwa.

Ukuze ndithathe imifanekiso yevidiyo yenu kufuneka ukuba ndifumane imvume ebhaliweyo evela kuni nakubazali benu. Ndifake nefomu yemvume ekufuneka isayinwe ngumfundi kwakunye nomzali xa ndivumeleka ukuthatha imifanekiso yenu ngexesha lezinye zezifundo zenu. Akunyanzelekanga ukuba nivume xa ningathandi ukuba imifanekiso yenu ithathwe. Ndicela nikubonise oku kwifomu, mna andisayi kuyithatha imifanekiso.

Kwamkelekile ukuyeka ukuthatha inxaxheba nanini na ngexesha lophando. Xa ninemibuzo ndizimisele ukuza kuni ndize kuyiphendula.

Ndingavuya kakhulu xa ninokuzigcwalisa ezi fomu nize nizibuyisele kutitshala wenu ngokukhawuleza.

Enkosi ngokukufunda oku.

Ndiyabulela kakhulu
Jacqui Dornbrack
Tel: 041 – 5043767

Bazali abathandekayo

Nanjengoko bendichazile kwileta yomntwana wenu ndinethemba lokuba ndiza kukuqonda kakuhle okuqhubekayo kwiklasi zabafundi apho kukho indibaniselwano zeelwimi, iinkonzo, iintlanga, isini kwakunye nobuchule. Kwakhona ndinethenba lokuba ndizakwazi ngaphezulu

ukuba ootitshala benza kanjani na ukusebenza nala maqela ohlukeneyo sele ndiwachazile, kwaye benza zinto zini na ukukhuthaza bonke abafundi ukuba bathathe inxaxheba ukuze kubekho impumelelo kwizifundo zabo.

Ootitshala abathatha inxaxheba kolu phando bavumile ukukwenza oku. Okwangoku andikwazi ukunika abazali iinkcukacha zolu phando kuba iseyimfihlelo ndiya kunikezela ngengxelo esikolweni xa sele ndilugqibile olu phando, ingxelo leyo iya kufumaneka kwinqununu yesikolo.

Ndiceba ukuba kho kumagumbi okufundela ndize ndijonge okuqhubekayo kwaye ndithathe nevidiyo. Ndicela imvume ebhaliweyo yokwenza oku. Ukuba kuyamkeleka ukuba ndithathe imifanekiso yevidiyo yomntwana wakho ngexesha lezifundo kwaye ndivunyelwe ukuyibonisa ividiyo leyo kwabanye ootitshala nakootitshala abenza uphando abangengobalapha eMpuma koloni, ndicela nizalise le fomu yemvume ndiyifakileyo nize niyithumele kum ngokukhawuleza. Kwamkelekile ukuyiyeka imvume nanini na. Xa unemibuzo wamkelekile ukundifowunela kule nombolo ndiyibhalileyo. Ndiya kukuvuyela ukuphendula imibuzo eninayo.

Enkosi

Ndiyabulela kakhulu
Jacqui Dornbrack
Tel. 5043767

University of the Witwatersrand
Ifomu yemvume: Abafundi nabazali

Mna, mzali ka……..(igama lomfundi)
wase……
imvume yokuthatha inxaxheba kuphando oluzakwenziwa
nguJacquelin Dornbrack esikolweni ngo 2003 n0 2004

Ndiyifundile ileta eya kubafundi / bazali kwaye ndiyayiqonda ukuba injongo yolu phando kukuba umphandi afumane ulwazi lokuba ootitshala abakwizikolo zeModel C bazi ntoni ngeyantlukwano (phakathi kubafundi) kwaye kwenzeka ntoni ngezinto abazithethayo nabazenzayo kumagumbi okufundela.

Ndiyakuqonda ukuba izifundo ziza kuba phantsi koqwalaselo lomphandi kwaye kuza kuthathwa imifanekiso yevidiyo. Ndiyaqonda kwakhona ukuba umphandi akasayi kuyibonisa ividiyo eMpuma koloni ngenjongo yezemfundo, kwaye ividiyo iyakugcinwa endaweni ekhuselekileyo.

Ndiyavuma ukuba:

Ndiyaziqonda iinjongo zolu phando, kwaye akusayi kubakho bungozi.
Njengomfundi, ndiyavuma ukuthatha inxaxheba kolu phando
Njengomzali, ndiyavuma umntwana / abantwana bam bathathe inxaxheba kolu phando.
Ndiyaqonda ukuba okufumanekileyo kuya kusetyenziselwa injongo zophando kwaye kusenokwenziwa ingxelo ngako kwijenali, kodwa lingaxelwa igama lesikolo, iititshala nabafundi abasetyenzisiweyo / ekufumaneke kubo ulwazi.
Ndivumelekile ukurhoxa kwimvume endiyenzileyo nanini na.

Isignitsha yomzali…….
Isignitsha yomfundi……
Umhla…….

APPENDIX E: SAMPLE QUESTIONS FOR GROUP INTERVIEW OF PUPILS WHO FREQUENTLY ATTEND DETENTION

Sample questions for group interview of pupils who frequently attend Detention

1. You were in detention quite often last year. Do you always know why you were sent to detention?
2. Do you think the detention system is fair? If not, why?
3. Which kinds of pupils get sent to DT?
4. Does having to go to detention deter you from committing the same offence?
5. Can you suggest any system of discipline that might work better than detention?
6. What would motivate you to be sent to detention less next year?
7. Would there be any reason for you wanting to be in detention?
8. Is there anything about you or your background that you think disadvantages you more than your peers in getting DT?
9. Do you always get your parents to sign your DT slip? If not, why?
10. What do your parents/ guardians say about you getting DT often?
11. Are there any comments you would like to make about DT?

APPENDIX F: DIVERSITY GRID

DIVERSITY GRID

Level in class	Name	Race	Gender	Socio-economic class
top achiever 1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
Bottom achiever 1				
2				
3				
4				
5				

APPENDIX G: HUMOUR TASK

HUMOUR TASK

In order to understand the complexity of humour and its potential for building bridges, please do the following over the next two weeks:

- write down any jokes, teasing, humorous incidents that occur in your classroom, staffroom or within the school.
- indicate who said what and what the local context was
- what was the joke doing? (with reference to previous workshop)
- write down anything insights you might have gained from this task.
- bring this to the next group meeting for discussion

Work that jokes do:

But according to Thompson, "jokes ...are continuously engaged in recounting the way that the world appears and in reinforcing through laughter which profits at another's expense, the apparent order of things" (1990:62)

In this way we are drawn into a process which may sustain relations of domination and use humour to legitimate them.
Asks the question, How can we keep the space for powerful, critical, satisfying and socially responsible literate practices and at the same time have some fun?

"Only Joking": Being critical and keeping a sense of humour by Ray Misson

Douglas (1975) suggests that jokes take a dominant ordering of experience (an accepted pattern" and challenge it by "another hidden in the first". Eg a pattern of patriarchal dominance with the woman's viewpoint hidden in this dominance and jokes then allow it expression. In a joke, the result of disordering the natural pattern may be frivolous but it may also allow teaching to happen.

Douglas (1975:98) claims that "jokes are expressive of the social situations in which they occur" and that it is a necessary condition for the joke to be funny, is that a" dominant pattern of relations is challenged by another".
"In other words, jokes occur because there are contradictions and incoherencies in a social structure. The social structure leads us to see things one way, but also permits us to frame it differently, in a contradictory way. A joke is thus a triumph of relativisation" Misson. Eg 'anti-male jokes-express the tension between male-centred and female-centred perception of things. What is necessary for the joke to work is a "power differential between men and women which the joke undercuts" Jokes become nasty when they express the dominant view.

But, Jokes can also come from the dominant group to assert in an extreme way the supposed inferiority/ ..... of a marginal group. Misson. Plays with the idea that there are "normal' attitudes and ways of behaving and an illustration of how a minority group fails to display these "norms" is what makes the joke. "Because

they are so implicated in the social structure and with relativising particular ways of seeing things, they inevitably position both the speaker and the listener within an ideology" Misson.

In the classroom jokes can be used in the following 2 ways:
1. subvert certainties by subjecting them to satire
2. use jokes an the basis for analysis to show "faultlines in the social structure: the points at which there are contradictions or there is incoherence" Misson:11) can look at different ways of seeing or of valuing on which the joke is predicated and so expose the way power relations are naturalised in the social structure.

NB to acknowledge how meaning is determined not just by the broad social context but also by the local context of the immediate situation and the particular purposes of the individual within that situation.

Major tools of jokes are the following:
1. Solidarity – to laugh together is to assert certain values – feel part of community
2. Assert group identity-can use it to affirm that we are particular kinds of people.
3. Deny group identity – to distance ourselves and position ourselves with the dominant group.
4. Challenge – to use a joke to offend or show protest
5. Teasing – variation on joke as a challenge –"playful offence" teasing is offensive power play.
6. Protection – humour can be used as a protective device to defuse situations or as a neat sidestep.

From this we can see that jokes serve an important social function, summarised as follows:
1. Jokes work to set up opposition or solidarity and because of their structure, they tend to produce polarisation – the teller and listener as unified or set up against one another. Effect can therefore be subversive, undercut values or incorporate people into a particular value system.
2. Social meaning of joke is determined by the particular situation.
3. To analyse a joke, one must look at what it is doing, not just at what it is saying.
4. One must take seriously the notion of intent
5. need to pay attention to positioning because the meaning of jokes depends on one's own social positioning.

Use of Stereotypes

What jokes do in social situations is often bound up with stereotypes. Need to address the assumption that having identified something as a stereotypes means that nothing else needs to be done.
Stereotypes have a structuring, ordering function –allow us to place scraps of info of a person into a framework that gives us a working hypothesis on how we

should address them or on what they are like.. “They allow us to extrapolate with some likelihood of being right, from certain features to a conception of the whole person. In other words, a stereotype is a compression of a lot of social information about likely combinations of features” (Misson). We also create ourselves as stereotypes: we use them to define ourselves and assert ourselves to the world. We often dress and behave in certain ways to show our group allegiance or to announce that we are a particular type of person.

Stereotypes may be simplifications but they are not necessarily false. Stereotypes are seen from the outside. A stereotype is never neutral but comes with implicit evaluations. In some ways, the whole point of a stereotypes is not that it summarises what a particular group is, but that it summarises how a particular group is seen by another usually more dominant group. Therefore one is always positioned or positions oneself in relation to a stereotype. Through being addressed as a stereotype, people begin to live it out, to identify with it, to embody it – not because they want to , but because their subjectivity is being created by the way they are being addressed. In a real sense, one cant get outside a stereotype because of its social categorisation and one responds from within, or at least in relation to, the category in terms in which one is being addressed. This kind of naturalisation is one of the most powerful ways in which ideology works. The process of naturalisation of the stereotypes is doing powerful ideological work. Often ideology is set up in binaries which map out ways of being. When we think of generalities we reach for stereotypes and if we try to realise the complexity of an identity, we usually end up piling on contradictory stereotypes.

“Therefore stereotypes, like the jokes they often underlie, are frequently more important for what they are doing than for their content, for how they are positioning us and the people whom we are addressing in the terms they dictate and for the way in which they are providing us with ideological valuations.” Misson.

It is a balancing act not to deny positive pleasure on the one hand, but not to hurt people on the other. Jokes can be dangerous things because they are so seductive, but we certainly would lead an impoverished life without them. They are also an excellent resource to position students to see alternative points of view and to see those contradictions, multiplicities, faultlines in the society on which jokes are so often based.

Questions for Pam

I’m going to be asking you about anti-Semitic jokes. Can you remember any jokes that particular offended you.

1. Who told the joke?
2. What was the context?
3. Why was it so offensive?
4. Do you ever tell anti-Semitic jokes to your Jewish friends?
5. Does it matter who tells the joke?
6. Are anti-Semitic jokes always offensive

7. What stereotypes do anti-Semitic jokes draw on?
8. Do you think there is a place for jokes in a school?

Bhabha:
(1994) The Location of Culture. London + NY. Routledge
Stereotype, discrimination and the discourse of colonialism (66-84).

"An important feature of colonial discourse is its dependence on the concept of 'fixity' in the ideological construction of otherness " (66)

Paradoxical representation of Fixity connotes rigidity and an unchanging order as well as disorder
Likewise the stereotype, which is its major discursive strategy, is a form of knowledge and identification that vacillates between what is always 'in place', already known, and something that must be anxiously repeated. It is this process of ambivalence, central to the stereotype that constructs a theory of colonial discourse. It is the ambivalence that gives the colonial stereotype its currency, ensures its repeatability in changing historical and discursive conjunctures, informs its strategies of individuation and marginalization, produces that effect of probabilistic truth and predictability which for the stereotype must always be in excess of what can be empirically proven or logically construed. (66)

Need to shift from a ready recognition of images as positive or negative, to an understanding of the process of subjectification made possible (and plausible) through stereotypical discourse. Need to examine the repertoire of positions of power and resistance, domination and dependence that constructs the colonial subject (coloniser and colonised). (67)

Need to examine the "mode of representation of otherness"(68)
Traditional reliance on the stereotype as offering, *at any one time,* a *secure* point of identification which is not compensated for *at other times and places* the stereotype can be read in a contradictory way or be misread. There is a simplification in the process of stereotypical represnetation which hsa a knock-on effect on their central point about the politics of point-of-view. They operate a passive and unitary notion of suture which simplifies the politics and the 'aesthetics' of spectator-positioning by ignoring the ambivalent, contradictory mode of representation and demands that we extend our critical and political objectives and change the object of analysis itself. (69-70)

Therefore, despite the 'play' in the colonial system which is crucial to its exercise of power, colonial discourse produces the colonised as a social reality which is at once an 'other' and yet entirely knowable and visible' (70-71). It employs a" system of representation, a regime of truth".(70)

Edward Said-speaking of Orientalism, discusses the habit of dealing with 'questions, objects, qualities and regions deemed Oriental, will designate, name, point o, fix, what he is talking or thinking about with a word or phrase, which is

then considered either to have acquired, or more simply to be, reality...the tense they employ is the timeless eternal; they convey an impression of repetition and strength..' (Said:7) (71 in Bhabha)

Said points out the polarites and binaries at the centre of Orientalism-it is on the one hand a subject for learning, and also a site for dreams, fantasies and myths.

Stereotypes become lenses through which the Other is experienced.

"The stereotype is not a simplification because it is a false representation of a given reality. It is a simplification because it is an arrested, fixated form of representation that, in denying the play of difference (which the negation through the Other permits) constitutes a problem for the *representation* of the subject in significations of psychic and social relations." (75)

"Wherever he goes, the Negro remains a Negro –his race becomes the ineradicable sign of *negative difference* in colonial discourse" (Fanon). For the stereotype impedes the circulation and articulation of the signifier of 'race' as anything other than its fixity as racism." (Bhabha.75).

a stereotype is "a limited form of otherness" Bhabha

GROU MEETING: 16 OCTOBER 2006

In order to understand the complexity of humour and its potential for building bridges, please do the following over the next two weeks:

- write down any jokes, teasing, humorous incidents that occur in your classroom, staffroom or within the school.
- indicate who said what and what the local context was
- what was the joke doing? (with reference to previous workshop)
- write down anything insights you might have gained from this task.
- bring this to the next group meeting for discussion

Work that jokes do:

According to Thompson, "jokes ...are continuously engaged in recounting the way that the world appears and in reinforcing through laughter which profits at another's expense, the apparent order of things" (1990:62). In this way we are drawn into a process which may sustain relations of domination and use humour to legitimate them.

Asks the question, How can we keep the space for powerful, critical, satisfying

and socially responsible literate practices and at the same time have some fun?

Major tools of jokes are the following:

1. Solidarity – to laugh together is to assert certain values – feel part of community
2. Assert group identity-can use it to affirm that we are particular kinds of people.
3. Deny group identity – to distance ourselves and position ourselves with the dominant group.
4. Challenge – to use a joke to offend or show protest
5. Teasing – variation on joke as a challenge –"playful offence" teasing is offensive power play.

6. Protection – humour can be used as a protective device to defuse situations or as a neat sidestep.

From this we can see that jokes serve an important social function, summarised as follows:

1. Jokes work to set up opposition or solidarity and because of their structure, they tend to produce polarisation – the teller and listener as unified or set up against one another. Effect can therefore be subversive, undercut values or incorporate people into a particular value system.
2. Social meaning of joke is determined by the particular situation.
3. To analyse a joke, one must look at what it is doing, not just at what it is saying.
4. One must take seriously the notion of intent
5. need to pay attention to positioning because the meaning of jokes depends on one's own social positioning.

What jokes do in social situations is often bound up with stereotypes. Need to address the assumption that having identified something as a stereotypes means that nothing else needs to be done.

"Therefore stereotypes, like the jokes they often underlie, are frequently more important for what they are doing than for their content, for how they are positioning us and the people whom we are addressing in the terms they dictate and for the way in which they are providing us with ideological valuations." Misson.

It is a balancing act not to deny positive pleasure on the one hand, but not to hurt people on the other. Jokes can be dangerous things because they are so seductive, but we certainly would lead an impoverished life without them. They are also an excellent resource to position students to see alternative points of view and to see those contradictions, multiplicities, faultlines in the society on which jokes are so often based.

Language in the Classroom

In the following extract from *Invisible Women:* Dale Spender reminds us of the need to be aware of the kind of language we use in our classrooms and the space made available for our pupils' talk.

Teachers themselves are very often unaware of the way they allocate their time and it is not uncommon to ask teachers whether they give more attention to one sex than the other, and to have them vehemently protest that they do *not* and that they treat both sexes equally. But when their next lesson is taped it is often found that over two thirds of their time was spent with the boys who comprised less than half of the class. Most teachers do not consciously want to discriminate against girls, they say they do want to treat the sexes fairly, but our society and education is so structured that 'equality' and 'fairness' mean that males get more attention (see Spender, 1981, a).

If the teachers do not know that they give more attention to boys, and more *positive* attention that enhances the image of boys, the students *do* know. In her recent study in Cambridge, Michelle Stanworth (1981) asked the students who it was who received the attention in class and what sort of attention they received and the students indicated that it was overwhelmingly boys who received the attention and who were given the knowledge that they were important and liked.

In classroom discussion, said the students, boys predominated: for every four boys who participated, there was only one girl. When teachers asked questions they asked two boys to every one girl, and when teachers provided praise and encouragement three boys received it to every one girl. And in these classes there were more girls than boys.

The students themselves provided the data that the boys asked twice as many questions as the girls and made twice as many demands of the teachers' time. And both the boys and the girls stated that teachers are more concerned about boys, they consider boys more conscientious and capable, they get on better with the boys, they enjoy teaching the boys more and are twice as likely to consider boys the model pupils (Stanworth, 1981).

Despite what teachers may think or say they are doing, from the perspective of female and male students there is consensus that boys are considered more important, more authoritative, more deserving and worthy of attention, and this knowledge possessed by the students adds to the confidence of the boys (who go on to say more and demand more attention) and undermines the confidence of the girls (who react by saying less and by attracting less attention). These are the lessons learnt in the classroom from kindergarten to college.

Teachers who teach the lesson that boys are more important than girls are not debased and cruel individuals who are deliberately trying to create or reproduce a sexist society: on the contrary many can be consciously trying to combat sexism. When I and many others have actively tried to change our patterns of behaviour in the classroom, when we have tried to change the proportion of time spent with the girls, the curriculum materials we use, the topics we set for discussion, we have often been spectacularly unsuccessful and for numerous reasons (see also Elizabeth Sarah, *Interaction in the Classroom*).

One reason is that sexism is so pervasive and embedded in our ways of looking at the world that we are sometimes unaware of the extent to which it controls our actions so that even when we feel that we are being just and fair, or even showing 'favouritism' to the girls, empirical evidence can indicate otherwise. Because we take it so much for granted that boys are more important and deserve more of our time and attention, giving the girls 35% of our time can feel as if we are being unfair to the boys.

While it is 'normal' to devote most of our efforts to boys, then even giving slightly more than one third of our attention to the girls seems to be a significant intervention and feels like making an effort to achieve equality.

I have taped many lessons that I and other teachers of mixed-sex classes have taught and there have been numerous occasions when the explicit aim has been to spend an equal amount of time with both sexes. At the end of the lesson I have felt that I managed to achieve that goal — sometimes I have even thought I have gone too far and have spent *more* time with the girls than the boys. But the tapes have proved otherwise. Out of ten taped lessons (in secondary school and college) the maximum time I spent interacting with girls was 42% and on average 38%, and the minimum time with boys 58%. It is nothing short of a substantial shock to appreciate the discrepancy between what I *thought* I was doing and what I actually *was* doing.

Other teachers have also been reasonably confident that they have achieved their aim of allocating their time equally between the sexes only to find when the tapes have been analysed, that spending approximately 38% of their time with girls feels like *compensating* the girls, feels like artificially constructed equality.

'I was so conscious of trying to spend more time with the girls that I really thought I had overdone it' one teacher said in amazement when she listened to the evidence of the tape and worked out that in her interaction with the students only 36% of her time had been spent with girls. 'But I thought I spent more time with the girls' said another who found that she had given them 34% of her attention, 'and', she added 'the boys thought so too. They were complaining about me talking to the girls all the time.'

It should not be surprising that the students should share a similar notion of fairness with their teachers, for we are all members of the same society which accords more significance to males. In the classrooms where teachers were trying to allocate their time equally, their efforts did not go unnoticed by the students, and despite the fact that the teachers were unsuccessful, and were able to spend only slightly more than one third of their time with the girls, many of the boys protested that slightly more than one third was unfair, and that they were missing out on their *rightful* share of teacher attention.

'She always asks the girls all the questions' said one boy in a classroom where 34% of the teacher's time had been allocated to girls. 'She doesn't like boys and just listens to the girls' said another boy where boys had interacted with the teacher for 63% of the time; and these are among some of the more 'polite' protests. From this it would seem that in a sexist society boys assume that two thirds of the teacher's attention constitutes a fair deal and if this ratio is altered so that they receive less than two thirds of the teachers' attention they feel they are being discriminated against.

Many exercised pressure on their teachers in the classroom but some even went further and either complained, or threatened to complain, to those in authority, about the preferential treatment girls were receiving when allocated more than one third of the teachers' time. And this is another reason that teachers are unable to give an equal allocation of time to the sexes — many of the boys are against it, they make trouble and they get results.

APPENDIX I: PUPIL DETENTION SYSTEM COPY

DETENTION SYSTEM (PUPIL COPY)

DATES

Teachers keep a file on hand in which dates of offences are noted. Two different sets of record are kept. One set keeps record **of academic** misdemeanours in subject classes, the other set is used to track more **general** misbehaviour. Offences that qualify for **DATES** are:

> Homework not done or incomplete.
> Quality of work (untidy, incomplete, poor attempt, incorrect)
> Books not at school or in class
> Punctuality
> Minor disruption
> Appearance / dress
> Reply slips not signed or returned.
> Absentee notes not returned on first day back at school.

As **a first level intervention,** teachers are expected to follow-up on above misdemeanours by giving a date and taking disciplinary/corrective measures such as:

Giving writing-out
Giving break DT
" Contacting parents
Letting pupils do community service

DETENTION

Detention is a **second level intervention.**

The **Reasons** for giving a DT is as follows:

3 X dates for a particular offence (provided the teacher has already taken action)
6 X dates for a variety of offences (provided the teacher has already taken action)
Bunking (MOSA, class, school, and sports practice) Bunking is seen as absence, from where
the pupil should be, without leave.
Disrespect / attitude (e.g. Back-chatting, swearing).
Disobedience
Major disruption (pupil had to be sent out of class; must be sent to the grade head)
Missing a match / practice
Copying (homework or test)
not doing punishment set by a teacher

SATURDAY DETENTION

Saturday detention is the **third level of intervention.** Saturday DT is given for the following

reasons:

- 3 X DT sessions
- Missing DT without excuse.
- Serious misconduct (this will normally be accompanied by a disciplinary hearing)

- **DISCIPLINARY HEARING**

A disciplinary hearing will be convened for the following reasons:
3 X Saturday DT sessions completed
Serious misconduct (at the discretion of the headmaster / governing body)

A disciplinary hearing can lead to suspension, suspension with a view to expulsion, expulsion or any other measures that the disciplinary committee may decide upon.

SERIOUS MISCONDUCT

(From Provincial gazette 25 June 1999) Conviction by a court of a criminal offence
Used or had in his / her possession intoxicating liquor or drugs during a school activity.
Is guilty of assault, theft, gross insubordination or immoral conduct.
Has been repeatedly absent without leave from school or classes.

Intentionally and without just excuse-

- Seriously threatens, disrupts or frustrates teaching or learning in a class
- Engages in a conspiracy to disrupt the proper functioning of the school
- Insults the dignity of a staff member
- Cheats in a test or exam
- Distributes any test or exam material that may enable another person or himself/herself to gain an unfair advantage.
- Sexually harasses another person
- Is found in possession of or distributes pornographic material
- Supplies false information or falsifies documentation to gain an unfair advantage at school
- Is in possession of a dangerous weapon or uses it to threaten any person.
- Engages in any act of public indecency
- Endangers the safety and violates the rights of others.
- Fights, swears or falsely identifies himself/herself
- Threatens fellow learners or educators
- Uses hate speech, makes himself/herself guilty of racism or applies harmful graffiti
- Vandalises, destroys or defaces school property
- Repeatedly violates school rules or the code of conduct
- Conducts himself/herself, in the opinion of the governing body, in a disgraceful, improper or unbecoming manner
- Is guilty of offensive or oppressive behaviour

APPENDIX J: NON-NEGOTIABLE CLASSROOM RULES

Non-Negotiable Classroom Rules

*** One Person Speaking at a Time ***

*** When teacher talks - silence in class ***

*** No backchatting ***

*** Everyone in class by second bell *** No walking around ***

*** No littering ***

*** Homework must be done ***

*** English must be spoken in class - unless permission granted ***

*** Seated & attentive for intercom announcements ***

*** There should be mutual respect ***

*** No uncivilized behaviour

No talking out of turn

*** No littering

*** Cellphones to be switched off

*** No swearing

*** Formal greeting at beginning of period ***

Must have own equipment at school - no borrowing

*** No graffiti / vandalism ***

Everyone to address each other respectfully/courteously

*** Everyone to be treated equally/fairly ***

Everyone must stick to these rules

No copying of homework / cribbing

APPENDIX K: TEACHERS' COPY OF DETENTION SYSTEM

DETENTION SYSTEM (TEACHER COPY)

DATES

Teachers keep a file on hand in which dates of offences are noted. Two different sets of record are kept. One set keeps record of **academic** misdemeanours in subject classes, the other set is used to track more **general** misbehaviour. Offences that qualify for **DATES** are:

> Homework not done or incomplete.
> Quality of work (untidy, incomplete, poor attempt, incorrect)
> Books not at school or in class.
> Punctuality
> Minor disruption
> Appearance / dress
> Reply slips not signed or returned.
> Absentee notes not returned on first day back at school.

As **a first level intervention,** teachers are expected to follow-up on above misdemeanours by giving a date and taking disciplinary/corrective measures such as:

Giving writing-out
Giving break DT
Contacting parents
Letting pupils do community service

DETENTION

Detention is a **second level intervention.** The **procedure** for giving detention is as follows:

> The teacher must complete the DT form, leaving out the DT date only. The DT form must under no circumstances be given to the pupil. > The pupil must sign the form. This is an admission of guilt and acknowledgement that he / she will complete a DT during the next DT session.
>> The completed, signed form is posted in the appropriate box in the telephone room cupboard. > The relevant class teacher will distribute the parent notification portion of the DT form to DT candidates.

The **Reasons** for giving a DT is as follows:

3 X dates for a particular offence (provided the teacher has already taken action)
6 X dates for a variety of offences (provided the teacher has already taken action)
Bunking (MOSA, class, school, sports practice) Bunking is seen as absence, from where the pupil should be, without leave.
Disrespect / attitude (e.g. Back-chatting, swearing).
Disobedience
Major disruption (pupil had to be sent out of class; must be sent to the grade head)

Missing a match / practice
Copying (homework or test
not doing punishment set by a teacher

NB THE GRADE HEAD MUST BE NOTIFIED, IN WRITING, OF ANY OF THE ABOVE OFFENCES, EXCEPT THE FIRST TWO. A DT SLIP SUBMITTED VIA A GRADE HEAD IS
CONSIDERED SUCH A NOTIFICATION.

SATURDAY DETENTION

Saturday detention is the **third level of intervention.** Saturday DT is given for the following
reasons:
3 X DT sessions
Missing DT without excuse.
Serious misconduct (this will normally be accompanied by a disciplinary hearing)

DISCIPLINARY HEARING

A disciplinary hearing will be convened for the following reasons:
3 X Saturday DT sessions completed
Serious misconduct (at the discretion of the headmaster / governing body)

A disciplinary hearing can lead to suspension, suspension with a view to expulsion, expulsion or any other measures that the disciplinary committee may decide upon.

SERIOUS MISCONDUCT

(From Provincial gazette 25 June 1999) Conviction by a court of a criminal offence
Used or had in his / her possession intoxicating liquor or drugs during a school activity.
Is guilty of assault, theft, gross insubordination or immoral conduct.
Has been repeatedly absent without leave from school or classes.

Intentionally and without just excuse-

- Seriously threatens, disrupts or frustrates teaching or learning in a class
- Engages in a conspiracy to disrupt the proper functioning of the school
- Insults the dignity of a staff member
- Cheats in a test or exam
- Distributes any test or exam material that may enable another person or himself/herself to gain an unfair advantage.
- Sexually harasses another person
- Is found in possession of or distributes pornographic material
- Supplies false information or falsifies documentation to gain an unfair advantage at school
- Is in possession of a dangerous weapon or uses it to threaten

any person.

- Engages in any act of public indecency
- Endangers the safety and violates the rights of others.
- Fights, swears or falsely identifies himself/herself
- Threatens fellow learners or educators
- Uses hate speech, makes himself/herself guilty of racism or applies harmful graffiti
- Vandalises, destroys or defaces school property
- Repeatedly violates school rules or the code of conduct
- Conducts himself/herself, in the opinion of the governing body, in a disgraceful, improper or unbecoming manner
- Is guilty of offensive or oppressive behaviour

APPENDIX L: COPY OF RECORDS OF DT LEARNERS

APPENDIX M: CLASSROOM OBSERVATION SCHEDULE

OBSERVATION OF ALISON'S CLASSES 12 MARCH2004

Lesson one: Grade 11: X and Y axes and parabolas

14 Boys
9 Girls

Whole class instruction	Question or interaction	Function of interaction	Individual response/ interaction	General comment
X	Take out books. Explained while drawing Where is the f (x)> G (x)… What starts happening when I …. Draw the parabola	Instruction Explanation Instruction		WBs-at back commenting on class being like the North Pole. One BB drew on book shelf and WB behind commented on it.
X	Who has finished?	Indication of need to hurry up		Projector not working properly
	Please go and call Mrs……		WB	He jumped up and went out the door
	Name- you're not paying attention	Call to attention	BG 'I am mam'	Walked down middle of classroom

X **X**	**Who hasn't got that?** **What is happening here?**		**WB put up hand**	**Alison explains to him.**
X	**Why did I not mention…. (repeated)** **Repeats Where are they equal to one another?**	**Call to indicate understanding**	**WB Where they touch**	**No attempts at an answer** **Alison responds, that's it.**
	Call name	**Call to attention**	**WB**	
	Call name	**Call to attention**	**WB**	
	Call name- you're not looking **Call name , Can you say it for me**	**Call to show understanding**	**BG** **BG-did not respond. Alison read out**	**WBs at back chatting throughout**
X	**Is this the correct notation?** **What do I need to write?**	**Rhetorical call for indication of understanding**		**WBs at back chatting throughout**
	Called name. **What happens after this point here, where x=**	**Call to attention or Real request to show understanding?**	**WB**	**Did not verbalise**

X	**Where is the g of X function bigger than…**			**projection is bad. Comments from WBs at back yes mam it's hurting our eyes. General chit-chat about poor projection from WBs. Most of the class start working in books**
X	**Right now did you manage that part on your own?**	**Rhetorical Q-call for pupils to indicate if there are problems?**		**Alison walks back to front.**

X	Who's going to come and write it? No not…. He's always picked on. What about this lady BG Calls on BB	Encouragement	WB indicates he will. No, no Indicates that he doesn't want to	Alison walks to back of class
X	Ja, ja you are going to do it. Repeats question, Where am I going to….	More scaffolding of content		
X	Come on it's not so scary. Call on BG Come on I'm sure you can manage.	Encouraging Instruction		
X	Come on I'm waiting. Repeats, where is the red line… Won't you just write that question for your selves, where is the red…… Come on, give it a go and if you get stuck we will help you.	Encouragement	BB goes up and starts to write on the overhead	

	You know everywhere I walk I see blanks, everyone is finding this so scary that no one is writing, so what he is doing up there must be incredibly scary, hey.			

		.	**Look …WB has written something.** **BG Let me see what you've written-she replies, it's wrong. Alison It's wrong. Let me see**	**Looks at WBs at back's books.** **WB repeats 'let me see the wrong'** **General chit chat about the work.**
X	**Okay,**			**WBs at back bantering about scarey cat, scarey cat**
	Okay, …BB has said that he thinks that where x is……..			**Alison is now referring to what the BB has written on the projector**
	Do you read his language like this? He is talking about it everywhere … Does it ever stop happening ? Answers NO. So this is a true statement ….			**WBs at back saying YES**
			Call on WB to answer. He does correctly	

	Do you think it ever changes? No it doesn't			**BB goes back to seat and WBs clap for him**
	Now what worries me are the folks who can't write anything. If you can't write anything, you're very unsure of yourselves. Some people are writing y values …..Now everybody take out the blue book and for homework you are going to do number 1. Reads out question… I think you can answer this question….They use words like domain and range. Who can remember , yesWB		**WB yes, isn't it something like x and y.**	**General chit-chat about what is what..**

			Call on BG what is it now? She answer she is explaining to her friend. She doesn't understand this story here. Ok, can we just move on now… **Shoo this lady is taking a long time to get it right. But you're not helping me cos you always sit together**	**Alison walks does middle stops at 2 BG.** **WBs yes they are always sitting together**
X	**Now let's move on. Domain is always x value and Range is always Y value. Now which one is going to be boring in terms of parabolas?**			**Class repeats with her** **Somebody calls out the Y. Alison ignores this and when she hears the X, she repeats, the X value.**

X	**Y values tend to have a turning point, don't they, when they don't get used. So what are we going to do? ……. So do you understand that?** **Gives homework** **I've ordered some rain for Saturday and Sunday** **No some of it has to happen on your own. When we do it in class you have all reasons why you must talk to your neighbour**			**Poor attempt from one pupil** **No response** **WB ag mam, it's such a nice day outside, how can you give us homework** **WB makes some comment I can't hear. Ag mam can't we have a relaxing day , its Friday. Some WG answers, don't be rude**

X	**I'm now going to do question two and question five. Now lets go to number 2…….If I ask you…….. ……If I ask you what is special about the point P and the pointQ. Rhetorical question, don't answer. If I ask you what is special about point P and point Q. And then point R, what do you think will be the question relating to point R……. Look at the language of the question. (repeats this)..The function in x is such that….. Yes, that's why I'm giving it to you…So it connects…**		**.**	**WB Mam, the language is hard mam WB yes,,**

	….. **Will R have a number**			

X **Many react yes, yes**	**Have you noticed in the test yesterday, all the hard work that you did, Mrs Klitsie didn't even look at…. I'm worried about whether you can…..**			
X	**Next question, determine the length……**		**WG answers- gets ignored** **WB answers gets ignored**	
	Now try it yourselves. I'm going to come and look now		**Stops at WG, comments on her work.** **WB ..too many**	
X	**Shall we ask her how she feels**		**BBs comment on two meanings of the girl's name**	**Suddenly there is a big noise in the front of the class with 3 BGs about one of their names** **General noise**

			BG explains, the reason why they named me that, something happened to my mother while she was pregnant and so that's why they gave me that name, "what should we do?"	**General noise Lasts about 1 min)**
X	**We're talking about the meaning of our names**			**General noise** **WBs commenting on her name and repeating it-stressing certain syllables**
			WB my name in Xhosa means cut polony	**General laughter** **Mam, mam, what does your name mean?**