

https://dspace.org/

Subjectivity and pedagogy in a context of social change.

Ferreira, Ana Cristina

2014-01-16
http://hdl.handle.net10539/13489

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

Copyright Notice

The copyright of this thesis vests in the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa, in accordance with the University's Intellectual Property Policy.

No portion of the text may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, of transmitted in any form or by any means, including analogue and digital media, without prior written permission from the University. Extracts of or quotations from this thesis may, however, be made in terms of Sections 12 and 13 of the South African Copyright Act No. 98 of 1978 (as amended), for non-commercial or educational purposes. Full acknowledgement must be made to the author and the University.

An electronic version of this thesis is available on the Library webpage (www.wits.ac.za/library) under 'Research Resources'.

For permission requests, please contact the University Legal Officer or the University Research Office (www.wits.ac.za).

Subjectivity and Pedagogy in a Context of Social Change

ANA CRISTINA FERREIRA

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Humanities, University of the Witwatersrand, in fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Johannesburg, 2013

Abstract

This study is an exploration of the relationship between subjectivity and pedagogy in the secondary school English classroom in South Africa during a time that can be characterised as one of considerable social change. It examines the subject positions students take up in relation to a teaching intervention that invites them to historicise their identities. In so doing, it seeks to contribute to the growing body of education research on how to meaningfully engage young people in post-conflict societies with their recent past and their shifting present, with the primary aim being to understand how these students are positioning themselves in relation to the changing sociopolitical context. The research was conducted in two Grade 11 English classrooms, one a de(re)segregated former Model C school and the other an elite private school. The research design is a two-case case study, employing ethnographic tools to generate a multi-layered and multifaceted understanding of the students' engagement in all its forms.

Poststructuralist theories on discourse and subjectivity form the theoretical framework for this study, informing both the methodology and the data analysis. At the heart of this lies Foucault's notion of the discursively constructed subject, extended through the work of Stuart Hall, Chris Weedon, Bronwyn Davies and others in ways that facilitate their application to individual subjectivity, particularly in relation to the classroom as a pedagogically structured discursive space. The data is subjected to poststructuralist discourse analysis, adjusted to suit the mode and type of data which includes, *inter alia*, the analysis of a multimodal artefact, analysis of performative classroom talk and moment-by-moment analysis of classroom interaction.

The analysis shows that students' subjectivities are not fixed but shift in ways that are contingent on the pedagogic context. Such shifts are particularly noticeable when there is a shift in the interactional situation; when students move between different semiotic modes; or when they are provided with the opportunity for extended conversational interaction around an issue. In addition, students' participation in the section of work on South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) shows that engaging with the past in post-apartheid South African classrooms can have unpredictable results. Students' resistance to engaging with recent history seems to be related to discomfort with the ways in which the grand narrative of the past works to position them in racialised ways. While there is evidence of students seeking to 'unfix' racialised subject positions, it is also clear that past discourses linger. Despite their desire to be rid of the past, students' subject positions are frequently tied to their historically constructed locations in the sociopolitical and economic landscape of South Africa. These ambiguities and contradictions are viewed in part as a function of the complexity of the relationship between subjectivity and pedagogy, where what students are able to say and who they are able to be is shaped by the discursive structure of the classroom space. Ultimately it would seem that more serious consideration needs to be given to ways of developing a pedagogy that is able to tolerate contingency and heterogeneity and that would have relevance not only in post-conflict contexts but also beyond.

Keywords: subjectivity, pedagogy, poststructuralist discourse analysis, positioning, identity, English classroom, TRC, multimodal artefact, classroom talk, South Africa

Declaration

I declare that this thesis is my own unaided work. It is being submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before for any degree or examination at any other university.

_____

ANA CRISTINA FERREIRA

_____ day of _____ in the year _____.

Acknowledgements

To Hilary Janks and Carolyn McKinney, my supervisors,
I am grateful for your guidance, your insights and your encouragement over these long five years.

To the teachers who participated in this study,
thank you for your interest in this research, for giving of your time and teaching expertise and for being willing to open up your classroom practices to scrutiny.

To the students in the two classrooms,
thank you for your participation, for so readily grappling with issues, sharing ideas and speaking your mind.

To colleagues, friends and family
who were subjected to random discussions on Foucault, the TRC, 'the youth today', and read rambling drafts of various chapters,
your input and encouragement kept me going.

*

I am also grateful for the institutional support I received in the form of a Faculty of Humanities Ad Hoc Grant which I used to fund my fieldwork, and a Carnegie Time Off Grant that provided me with valuable time for writing.

Table of Contents

List of Figures vii
List of Tables viii
Abbreviations and Transcript Notation ix

1. Introduction 1

1.1 Rationale for this study 1
1.1.1 South Africa as a post-conflict society 1
1.1.2 Contemporary South Africa as 'ontological hotspot' 3
1.1.3 Schooling and identity in post-apartheid South Africa 6
1.1.4 Pedagogically speaking 12
1.1.5 The history of the teaching intervention 15
1.2 The research questions 16
1.3 Aims and value of the study 16
1.4 Outline of chapters 19

2. Theory 20

2.1 Poststructuralist theories on discourse and subjectivity 21
2.1.1 The Foucauldian framework: processes of subjectification 22
2.1.2 Moving beyond Foucault 26
Discursively constructed agency 30
Positioning and positioning theory 31
Problems with identity 34
2.2 Pedagogy, subjectivity and classroom discourse 35
2.2.1 Conceptualising the classroom space 35
2.2.2 Classroom research on discourse and/or subjectivity 38
2.3 Identity in the South African context 43
2.3.1 Race, culture and ethnicity 44
2.3.2 Class, race and place 49
2.3.3 Nation, history and reconciliation 52
2.3.4 Globalisation, youth and popular culture 55

3. Methods 60

3.1 Research design 60
3.2 Research site and participants 62
3.2.1 Locating the research sites 62
3.2.2 Site 1 63
3.2.3 Site 2 65
3.3 The teaching intervention 67
3.3.1 The outline of the lessons 67
3.3.2 Why the English classrooom? 68
3.4 Data collection techniques and instruments 70

3.4.1 Classroom observation 70
3.4.2 Artefact collection 71
3.4.3 Interviews 71
3.5 Data analysis methods 72
3.5.1 The poststructuralist orientation to analysing the data 73
3.5.2 Analysing a multimodal artefact 74
3.5.3 Analysing oral presentations of the multimodal artefact 75
3.5.4 Analysing moment-by-moment classroom talk 76
3.6 Ethical considerations 77

4. Positionings on the Past 78

4.1 Introduction 78
4.2 Discourses mobilised by the TRC interviews 80
4.2.1 First layer of analysis: Students reporting on their interviews 80
4.2.2 Second layer of analysis: A comparative discussion 85
4.2.3 Third layer of analysis: The spill-over discussion 88
4.3 Students'Positions on the relevance of the TRC to their generation 90
4.3.1 First layer of analysis 91
Category 1: I am not affected 93
Category 2: History is important 95
Category 3: Split between country and self 97
Category 4: Explains how we got here 98
Category 5: Perceptions of social change (or lack thereof) 100
4.3.2 Second layer of analysis: Working across the categories 102
Sutured into history? 103
Striving for 'unfixed' identities 107
4.4 Concluding thoughts 112

5. Placing the youth posters 114

5.1 Introduction 114
5.2 Pedagogic framing of the poster task 116
5.3 TAKE 1: Identities on display 117
5.3.1 Introducing the posters: The 'look' and the 'feel' 117
5.3.2 Coding collages 118
5.3.3 Presentation of data 120
Age, place and time: The dominant trends 122
Emerging differences 125
5.3.4 Discussion of data 126
5.4 TAKE 2: (Un)placed identities 127
5.4.1 Representations of place in Site 1 129
The teen code 130
The elusive self 138
Placing the youth 140
5.4.2 Performing subjectivity in the pedagogic space (Site 1) 145
5.4.3 Representations of place in Site 2 149
Placelessness 151
Peripherally placed 152
Negotiating place 154
Place dominating 160
5.4.4 Manoeuvring in the pedagogic space (Site 2) 164
5.5 Concluding thoughts 165

6. Classroom Talk 168

6.1 Introduction 168
6.2 Classroom talk in Site 1: Place, race, transformation and agency 170
6.2.1 General norms of classroom discourse 170
6.2.2 Rationale for selection of extracts 171
6.2.3 Extract 1 171
6.2.4 Extract 2 180
6.2.5 Discussion 191
6.3 Classroom talk in Site 2: Crime, place and privilege 192
6.3.1 General norms of classroom discourse 192
6.3.2 Rationale for selection of extracts 193
6.3.3 Extract 1 194
6.3.4 Extract 2 200
6.3.5 Extract 3 211
6.3.6 Discussion 215
6.4 Concluding thoughts 216

7. Conclusions 218

7.1 On the research design 218
7.2 On emerging findings 220
7.3 On the limitations of this study 224
7.4 On implications for post-confliect pedagogy 225
7.5 On young people's shifting identities in contemporary South Africa 227
7.6 On future directions 228

References 229

Appendices i-xliii

List of Figures

5.1 The structure of the continuum on place
5.2 The continuum on place for Site 1
5.3 The continuum on place for Site 2
6.1 The seating plan for Site 1
6.2 The seating plan for Site 2
7.1 The multilayered and multifaceted research design

List of Tables

3.1 Davies's framework for poststructuralist analysis of classroom practice

4.1 Distribution of answers on TRC relevance

4.2 The 'moving on' discourse across the categories

5.1 Ranked totals of poster categories across the full set of data

5.2 The 'cool' / 'uncool' binary

5.3 Discourses of teen vice

5.4 The verbal images in Poster 8

Abbreviations & Transcript Notation

Abbreviations

ANC	African National Congress
BEE or BBBEE	Black Economic Empowerment or Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment
FG1, FG2, etc.	Focus Group 1, Focus Group 2, etc.
L1, L2, etc.	Lesson 1, Lesson 2, etc.
P1, P2, etc.	Poster 1, Poster 2, etc.
PDA	Poststructuralist Discourse Analysis
S1, S2	Site 1, Site 2
TRC	Truth and Reconciliation Commission

Transcription Notation

[ ]	researcher's comment or observation
/	interruption
–	self-interruption or break in flow of sentence
/…/	overlapping speech
1, 2, 3, etc.	speaking turns (not line numbers)
(T1, T2, T3, etc.	used in discussion of extract to refer to speaking turns)
T	teacher
S(S)	unidentified student(s)
…?...	inaudible section of talk

1

INTRODUCTION

At the centre of this doctoral study is the relationship between subjectivity and pedagogy in a context of social change. This is classroom-based research which makes use of a teaching intervention to investigate the possibilities for identity formation in the discursively constructed pedagogic space of the classroom in post-apartheid South Africa. It is the subject positions students take up in response to the teaching intervention and the classroom discourses that are generated in the interactions between teacher and students that are placed under scrutiny. The research was undertaken in two desegregated secondary schools in Johannesburg in the latter part of 2008.

The purpose of this introductory chapter is to present the rationale for the investigation, to delineate its aims and to state the research questions it seeks to answer. An overview of the thesis is provided at the end of this chapter.

1.1 Rationale for this study

1.1.1 South Africa as a post-conflict society

There exists a growing body of research on educational initiatives with young people in post-conflict societies across the world. Much of this work is located within the school curriculum and explores ways of supporting the younger generation through social transition, often including attempts to engage them meaningfully with the nation's recent past. Limited systematic attention, however, has been paid to the ways in which young people's identity locations are shaping their engagement with

such work in the classroom, and it is in this area that this research study seeks to make a contribution.

The meaning of the label 'post-conflict society' is a contested one (see, for example, Quaynor, 2011; and Elbaz-Luwisch, 2009). From the South African perspective, while it is evident that we do not live in a conflict-free society, that racial tensions persist and that social inequalities continue, it is also equally evident that the political landscape has undergone enormous change in the past twenty years and that the transition to a democratic society has all but eliminated the protracted and widespread hostility and violence of the past. Across the globe, societies emerging from such conflict turn to the educational domain to find ways of interrupting cycles of anger and revenge and facilitate the younger generation's transition to a society where interactions across historically constructed differences can occur in a climate of mutual respect and based on principles of democratic equality. Drawing on Jansen's work in relation to schooling in post-apartheid South Africa (2009a, 2009b; Jansen and Weldon, 2009), I use the term 'post-conflict pedagogy' to consider issues of learner and teacher identity, construction of curriculum knowledge, classroom practices, and institutional culture that need to be engaged with and thought about in a post-conflict society such as South Africa. Similar research, however, is happening in schools as far afield as Northern Ireland, Cyprus, Israel/Palestine, Rwanda and Australia under labels such as reconciliation pedagogy (Ahluwalia et al, 2012), peace education (Salomon & Nevo, 2002); as well as through other educational initiatives, for example, Facing History and Ourselves, an international educational organisation that engages students of diverse backgrounds in an examination of racism, prejudice and anti-Semitism in order to promote humane citizenship (see www.facing.org/); and, in South Africa, the programmes and teaching materials put together by the Institute for Justice and Reconciliation (see www.ijr.org.za/) as well as a branch of Facing History and Ourselves operating in Cape Town.

This is clearly a broad field with many facets and it is the work that is being done in the classroom that is of significance here. Nationally and internationally, this research has attended to a host of issues, such as curriculum reconstruction, including both knowledge production and text book analysis (Christou, 2007; Freedman et al, 2008; Weldon, 2009; Tortsi, 2009); teacher training (Keet et al 2009; Elbaz-Luwisch 2009) and teacher identity (Murphy & Gallagher, 2009). The angle from which I wish to

engage with this field is that of student identity or subjectivity[1]. Specifically, the question that interests me in this post-conflict context is, how are students' identity locations, in the shifting sociopolitical landscape shaping their ability to engage with issues of identity and difference in relation to their experiences of schooling and, specifically, in relation to their classroom experiences and interactions? Or, put differently, how is social change impacting on and being dealt with in the school/classroom, at the level of subjectivity? Over the course of this chapter and the next, I refer to work that has been done in South African classrooms that, even when not specifically framed as 'post-conflict' work, begins to address some of these issues.

1.1.2 Contemporary South Africa as 'ontological hotspot'

Fundamental to this study is its highly situated approach to subjectivity which necessitates that the study's location in time and place be foregrounded. I am interested in young people's experience of societal change in South Africa; an experience which while strongly localised is also inflected by the global.The contemporary moment, or the late modern era in which we – the global 'we' – find ourselves, is an era characterised by Hall (1992a), writing already twenty years ago, as a period of intense and rapid social change. Proliferating forms of knowledge, ever-increasing advances in technology, and a changing communication landscape have overthrown traditional types of social order through change that is unprecedented in both its scope and pace (Giddens, 1991). Such structural changes inevitably destabilise not only our lifeworlds but our senses of self, rendering it increasingly difficult to sustain the narrative of the coherent, unified and autonomous humanist self. Instead we are decentred, unfixed subjects, 'confronted by a bewildering, fleeting multiplicity of possible identities, any one of which we could identify with – at least temporarily' (Hall, 1992a, p. 277). Such thinking remains current even while being continually developed through new concepts such as, for example, Vertovec's notion of super-diversity (2007), i.e. the condition generated in the United Kingdom through recent patterns of immigration. The effects of large scale social change, for Laclau, comprise a decentring or 'dislocation', to use his term, and are not straightforward; for '[i]f on the one hand, they threaten identities, on the other, they are the foundation on which new identities are constituted' (1990, p. 39). Thus

[1] While this thesis uses the terms 'subjectivity' and 'identity', it does not treat them as synonyms. The way in which I understand the relationship between the two terms is elaborated upon in the following chapter (section 2.1.2).

societal change destablises previous identity locations, offering multiple possibilities for new positions, something that can be experienced either as a threat or opportunity – or both.

As a country that has only relatively recently attained the status of an independent, democratic nation, following a protracted struggle for liberation which was itself preceded by centuries of colonial oppression, the social change being experienced in South Africa has a particular flavour. Not only is South Africa attempting to take up its place in a global community, which brings with it the need to negotiate the types of changes alluded to above, but the changes to the political and social domain that have occurred as a result of the dismantling of apartheid are a dominant aspect of the shifting social terrain. Crain Soudien, whose work on education and change is of central relevance to this study, refers to contemporary South Africa as an 'ontological hotspot' and 'one of the world's great social laboratories' (2011). As a nation that seems to be in the throes of re-inventing itself – politically and socially– this seems an opportune moment to research the extent to which broad social changes give rise to new subjectivities or whether old subjectivities are merely recycled and reinscribed in new ways.

According to Laclau, the proliferation of new possibilities for identity formation is particularly prevalent at times of democratic transformation (1990). A number of South African academics dealing with the social construction of identities are making similar arguments about the conditions for identity construction in post-apartheid South Africa. Singh argues that in contrast to the fixed identity positions, premised predominantly on race, that were allocated under apartheid, there is at present in South Africa a more 'fluid and open horizon for identity construction' (1997, p 120). While many have argued that, for all their oppressiveness, apartheid identity categorieswere not uniformly and passively experienced as hegemonic and totalising (see, for example, Posel, 2001), clearly with the fall of apartheid the conditions exist for the emergence of new social identities in post-apartheid South Africa. A similar but slightly more nuanced argument is made by Liebenberg and Zegeye (2001). They understand identities as multiple and shaped by institutional power relations, arguing that at present 'individuals and groups are actively choosing how to express their social identities at the same time as institutions are attempting to shape and construct their existence and options' (p 329).

Given the intensity of the recent political and structural changes, young people in South Africa are having to negotiatea social environment that isradically different from

that experienced by their parents' generation. The young people that are participants in this research belong to a generation that was born before the fall of apartheid yet has no memories of its own of living under that dispensation. As Dolby has pointed out, this generation of young people is

> the first to attend multiracial schools; the first to experience, as natural and common-sense, racially integrated public spaces and facilities; and the first to understand apartheid as a historical, not contemporary, condition of South African life (1999, p. 296).

This raises interesting questions about the ways in which these young people are making sense of the political transition.To what extent does the relative proximity of apartheid resonate with their own lived experience as South Africans, and what meanings might this proximity hold for them, individually or collectively? To what extent, if at all, are their current understandings of their own identity positions inflected by an awareness of their historical location? In many ways they can be seen as the 'hinge generation', to borrow the term from Hoffman's writings on the effects of the Holocaust on the children of survivors (2005, p. xv), a parallel that has been drawn with South Africa (Jansen, 2009b). Are there signs of the inter-generational transfer of apartheid discourses, or are young people challenging old discourses and seeking ways of taking up new kinds of identity positions? Locating this study among youth in their mid to late teens makes it possible to place these issues under scrutiny.

The theoretical perspective on the youth which is adopted here is one which focuses on 'the experiences and behaviours of youth as part of normed sets of practices, behaviours and beliefs common to people of a certain age or generation' (Moje, 2002, p. 213). Thus it is not to physiological changes associated with adolescence that I turn for explanations of young people's behaviour and attitudes since these typically use the 'raging hormone' model to generate predominantly negative constructions of teens, seeing them as naturally deviant and rebellious (Finders 1998/1999). Nor do I subscribe to the notion of 'adolescence as a time of becoming', a position which posits an end-point with a fixed post-adolescent identity (Nielsen, 1998). Instead adolescence is understood as a socially constructed phase and, drawing on studies of youth culture, I remain aware of how youth 'construct and represent themselves in hybrid ways across different spaces and contexts' (Moje, 2002, p. 216), social and political contexts, as well as within the institutional context of schooling.

It is, however, important to make the point that while the argument that social change makes available a multiplicity of new identity positions may be a compelling one, the

idea that identity is simply a matter of open choice – a DIY affair where one picks and choses from all the available options – is misguided, regardless of generation. McLeod and Yates, who have done extensive work on schooling and identity in the Australian context, caution against exaggerated claims for new ways of being in the context of social change, arguing that 'social change [is] taken up and experienced very unevenly by different groups of young people' (2006, p. 4).Therefore while I share the view that South Africa, at this moment of extensive social change and reconfiguration of social identities, is indeed a veritable 'ontological hotspot' (Soudien, 2011), I am also profoundly aware that students' identity locations are racialised, classed and gendered and that these positions influence who they are, how they imagine themselves and who they can become. It is precisely the interplay between the 'open horizon' of possibilities for identity formation and the social and material constraints which narrow this horizon that makes this an opportune moment to carry out such research. Thus not only does the relative openness of the horizon need ongoing qualification but the young people who are the participants in this research can neither be treated as representing 'the youth' in general nor as a homogenous group.The need to pay particular attention to the radical historicisation of subjectivity means that what this study seeks to understand is how these particular students in these particular classrooms under these particular pedagogic circumstances experience and articulate their subjectivities in this particular moment of South African history. However, its aim more broadly is to generate a theorised understanding of some of the possibilities for identity formation, within a pedagogic context, during times of social change. It is this particularity that may help us to understand the workings of time and space in the formation of youth identities more generally.

1.1.3 Schooling and identity in post-apartheid South Africa

In South Africa, the growing body of research on identity and schooling indicates that senses of the self are being recognised as an important area of investigation within the domain of education. This study locates itself, broadly speaking, within the field of research on schooling and identity, even though the poststructuralist analytical lens that I bring to bear seeks in particular to develop insights about the discursively constructed subject. It also needs to be emphasised that thisis not a sociological study. My interest is in what is going on in the pedagogically structured classroom space with regard to subjectivity, and this is therefore a pedagogic study of subjectivity rather than a sociological one. Nevertheless, it should be evident that, given the sociohistorically situated nature of this study, it is informed by the

sociological work done on schooling and identity, and ultimately it does seek to contribute to this work from the vantage point of the classroom and its particular dynamics.I begin this section by delineating the historical conditions that have produced the current state of desegregated schooling. This is followed by a discussion of existing research into schooling and identity.

The historical context

The history of schooling in South Africa has had a profound effect on the conditions of possibility for identity work in the classroom, and thus bears some discussion. Under the apartheid dispensation, the social divisions and inequalities that secured white minority power and privilege were mirrored in and perpetuated by the racially stratified schooling system. The inequitable allocation of material, human and knowledge resources meant that the quality of education for white children far exceeded that of children classified as black, coloured or Indian. Until the early 90s, private, fee-paying religious schools with a social justice agenda were the only schools that were open to all races (Naidoo, 1996; Jansen, 2004).

The early phase of the racial desegregation of state schools, which occurred in the early nineties,was managed by the apartheid government in its final years. Because of this schools 'opened up' in ways that continued to protect the interests of the white minority (Naidoo, 1996; Soudien, 2007a).The now-familiar term 'a Model C school' refers to one of the options for partial desegregation given to white schools and their parent communities. This particular model enabled a school to be run by its own governing body, giving it the power to set its own admission policy, to appoint teachers and to supplement its state subsidybyraising school fees and pursuingvarious forms of fundraising. This move towards the (semi)privatisation of education has been criticised as having been intended to avert a crisis in white state schools (where low student numbers seemed likely to result in large-scale teacher retrenchment and possibly even closure of some schools) rather than a genuine attempt at beginning the process of desegregating schooling. Indeed it was seen as inimical to transformation, not only because access to schooling was becoming increasingly tied to class interests, but because both the curriculum and the cultural ethos of these schools were left unchanged – a critique made as early as 1991 by the ANC (Nzimande, 1991, as cited in Naidoo, 1996, p. 25).

The mid-90s saw all schools being opened up to students of all races and a number of impressive policies, underpinned by the democratic values and human rights

principles of the Constitution, were put in place in an attempt to redress past educational inequalities. This ushered in an era of curriculum change and instability, which is still ongoing, and saw the multiple, racially segregated, provincial education departments being united under a single national education department which now oversees the implementation of a single national curriculum.

The opening up of schools triggered a student population shift which, not unexpectedly, showed movement up the old apartheid hierarchy of racial privilege, towards historically better resourced education (Sujee, 2004). For Soudien (2004), this movement was about the dominant group winning people over to the class project in order to consolidate its own privilege. In the process an expanded, multiracial middle class was configured, made up of 'a new elite comprising the core of the old white elite and selected elements from amongst the former subordinate black groups' (p. 106). However, factors such as historical residential segregation, high school fees, choice of language of instruction and race demographics continue to inhibit large scale integration and mean, ultimately, that most schools in the country remain black and poor (Ndimande, 2007) while racially diverse classrooms tend to be found on the more privileged end of the spectrum. Notably, deracialisation of the educator body has been minimal and even in former white schools where black, coloured and Indian students are now in the majority, the teaching staff remains predominantly white (Chisholm & Sujee, 2006; Jansen, 2004; Mda, 2004; Sujee, 2004).

What are the implications of these patterns of desegregation for identity construction in the school context? A consequence of the migration of students of all races towards former Model C schools is that the prime responsibility for managing integration has been placed in the hands of the former white schools (Soudien, 2007a). Research indicates that the dominant mode of integration has been an assimilationist one (Carrim, 1998; Carrim & Soudien, 1999; Moletsane, Hemson, & Muthukrishna, 2004; Soudien, 2004, 2007a). This is not surprising given that, despite ongoing curriculum reform and demonstrable commitment towards inclusivity, teacher training has been negligible.Teachers have been left to 'work with what they know' which, in most cases, is a form of multiculturalism that does not disrupt inherited forms of white privilege (Soudien, 2007a, p. 452). Thus new racial discourses are emerging as schools attempt to maintain their identities by using 'proxy mechanisms' for race (Soudien & Sayed, 2003; Soudien & Sayed, 2004), such as, for example,

attempting to retain racial exclusivity through insisting that prospective students be proficient in English or Afrikaans.

Alongside this, strong arguments have been made for the need to carry out qualitative research in these now desegregated schools in order to develop our understanding of the role schooling is playing in the shaping emerging South African identities. Chisholm and Sujee (2006) argue that these schools function as microcosms of South Africa's changing society, providing 'a mirror of broader social relationships of inequality between white and black, and provide insights into how these are being dealt with at a social and symbolic level' (p. 143). Similarly, McKinney and Soudien (2007) argue that while former white schools have sought to retain their middle class privilege, they have reconstructed themselves as racially diverse and therefore '[i]t is in this new school system that the country's experimentation with difference is now taking place' (p. 2).

The desegregation of the South African schooling system, for reasons related largely to class and racial demographics, has been an uneven process. In many cases this has resulted in resegregated schools (Orfield 2004), where former white state schools have desegregated and, within a relatively short time, the student body is almost wholly made up of black students. In the case of schools that remain desegregated, it bears pointing out that racial desegregation is not synonymous with racial integration which, as Jansen argues (2004) requires more than just a racially diverse student body. Integration is required at the level of staff, curriculum and institutional culture which, given the strong assimilationist tendencies among the former white schools, is an ideal yet to be significantly tackled. In addition, there is evidence that sociospatial patterns of student seating in the informal public spaces of educational institutions are often racialised (Schrieff et al 2005; Tredoux et al 2005), suggesting that even though such decisions may not be conscious on the part of the students and may reflect friendship groups, students in desegregated educational institutions often gravitate towards racially insular comfort zones (Erasmus, 2005).

While the racial exclusivity of the apartheid system has broken down, it will take time to redress the historical backlog of inequities and provide access to quality education for all. Teachers' purported 'colour-blindness' is a cause for concern given that their students' subjectivities are structured in and through difference, racialised differences being of particular relevance. According to Jansen, at the heart of the problem is 'a lack of consciousness... of the ways in which schools are organised and teaching conveyed that in fact hold direct consequences for learners, identity and

transformation' (2004, p. 118).Ndimande too argues for the urgency of confronting 'the absent presence of race' in integrated schools which are likely to be perpetuating social inequalities through their refusal to engage with race (2007, p. 142). However, given the conflicted and divisive national past, schools need to continue working to create spaces where diverse social, cultural, religious, political and economic backgrounds can be valued (Sujee, 2004). Commentators do, however, emphasise the importance of moving away from homogenised binary oppositions between 'black' and 'white' group identities as these are unhelpful and do not do justice to the complexities of the South African situation (Carrim, 1998; Carrim & Soudien, 1999; Soudien, 2004). In addition, since the majority of schools will remain single-race, all-black schools, particularly in the poorer communities, it is imperative to find ways of teaching about respect for difference that do not require 'race' to be used as a point of departure (Jansen, 2004).

This doctoral study thus takes up this imperative to better understand how difference is being experienced by students in the shared spaces of the desegregated school, specifically the shared classroom space. Locating this research at the privileged end of the spectrum of schooling in South Africa means that while they may be atypical, these are the most suitable schools in which to investigate the ways in which assimilation, power and privilege play themselves out in the classroom.

Existing research into identity and schooling

A considerable amount of research has been done post-1994 on students' lived experiences of schooling which underscores the importance of the institutional spaces of schooling for identity formation, particularly in a context of social transformation. Soudien notes that in this complex post-apartheid climate, where positive attitudes to the new democracy often co-exist alongside a nostalgia for the certainty provided by the old order,

> the different moments of the school experience... offer intensely complex opportunities for young people to receive and make identity. This process of receiving and making ... generates identities that are profoundly heterogeneous, contradictory and susceptible to change (2001, p. 313).

Soudien (1998, 2001, 2007b) draws together research carried out in different types of schools in various parts of the country in an attempt to understand the ways in which young people in different schooling contexts are negotiating their identities in the discursive spaces made available to them. He contends that while there are signs

that young people's subjectivities are able to 'break the mould of apartheid' and draw on discourses that are 'distinctly different from those of their parents' (2007b, p. xiv), the re-making of identity is fraught with complexities and contradictions, not the least of which is the ongoing need to negotiate discursively constructed raced and classed positions.

Gaganakis's research with black and white schoolgirls reinforces these differences. She concludes that 'although race is a significant lineament of black girls' identity, socioeconomic and class-related factors emerge as the most significant feature of definition of self' (2004, 69). For the white girls in her study, 'being white' is an ambiguous space that is at times associated with privilege and at other times associated with feelings of alienation and threat triggered by affirmative action policies and white emigration from South Africa (67).Research done on identity with university students in historically Afrikaans universities (Walker 2005a, 2005b) paints a complicated picture which shifts between discourses of racial diversity, harmony and democracy and 'new racisms', meaning that it is 'not straightforward to read off from the life stories of those young people simplistic connections between biography and structures of race' (2005a, p. 53). Walker alludes to 'elasticity' of particular ways of being (Bonilla-Silva, 2003) functioning to 'absorb changing historical and political conditions barricading if not all, certainly many, conservative whites from a new racial reality' (2005b, 138).

Recent work by Jansen (2004; 2009) tries to make sense of why young university students with no memories of their own of the apartheid past have such strongly ingrained prejudices towards students of other races. He does so by drawing strongly on the writing of Eva Hoffman (2004), which deals with the ways in which children of survivors of the Holocaust inherit particular dispositions and attitudes through the intergenerational transfer of indirect knowledge. Focusing particularly on how these dispositions and attitudes are being reproduced and re-enacted in the current generation of white, Afrikaans youth, he refers to this as 'the inheritance that white and black survivors of apartheid "give" to their children' (p. 121). This work offers a way to understand the persistence of intractable discourses, where these exist. However, while some discourses may persist under certain conditions, it is also important to attend to situations where there is evidence of change.

Taken together, this work, is central in enabling me to understand the identity positions of the student participants in this research project against a broader canvas of South African youth identity, while reminding me to remain attentive to the ways in

which identity is always contingent on the specific conditions of possibility for its specific articulation. Furthermore, what is particularly valuable about this workis the complex and nuanced understanding of identity that it puts forward. Unlike earlier phases of scholarship on the sociology of education which, as described by Unterhalter et al (2004, p. 56), 'set out to examine how the education system reproduced the class, race and sometimes gender hierarchies of society', this body of qualitative research shifts the focus to the micro level. In this way, the lived experiences of students are qualitatively investigated in order to arrive at an understanding of how identity positions – multiple, shifting and contradictory as they are – are constantly under negotiation in the schooling context in ways that articulate with, but are not necessarily reproduced by, the broader formations of inequality in South Africa.

However, from the perspective of this doctoral study, the above research is limited by the fact that it does not venture in any pedagogically motivated way into the classroom space. While there are studies that locate themselves not only in the school but in the classroom and its interactions – which I discuss in Chapter 2 – these are few and far between. Instead most of the available researchtakes a broadly sociological approach to identity in the educationaldomain and is not centrally concerned with the classroom as a site of pedagogical interaction *per se*. And it is here that this doctoral study locates itself and seeks to make a contribution to the existing research.

1.1.4 Pedagogically speaking

While a substantial amount of recent researchexploresidentity formation in desegregated schools, we still know very little about what is happening in the desegregated classroom with regard to identity. Simon, who conceives of teachers as cultural workers, tells us that '[w]hen we teach, we are always implicated in the construction of a horizon of possibility for ourselves, our students, and our communities' (1992, p. 56). It is the ways in which these horizons of possibility shape identity formation in the pedagogically structured classroom spacethat lie at the centre ofthis study.

There is research that works with the implicit notion that practices that are specifically associated with the classroom are inevitably involved in the formation of identity. Many have argued (see, for example, Ndimande, 2004, and Soudien, 2007a) that the cultural bias of the curriculum sustains a white supremacist logic that contributes

towards the ongoing assimilationist orientation of schooling in South Africa. Such arguments are underpinned by the notion that knowledge construction and selection are not neutral acts and that the ways in which students are enculturated into knowledge practices are going to influence their understandings of their own identity locations. But, while this kind of research takes seriously the ways in which pedagogy can shape identity, this work typically occurs at the level of policy and curriculum analysis and critique and seldom subjects the enactment of the curriculum, and its effects, to scrutiny.

This study ventures into the classroom and subjects aspects of the enactment of the curriculum to scrutiny. For the purposes of this research, the classroom is conceived of as a discursively constructed pedagogic space. Each of these terms bears clarification. Firstly, the classroom is not being seen merely as a physical place but rather as a social 'space' that comes into being through the presence and interactions of its participants. It is thus a socially constituted space that is co-constructed by teacher andstudents alike, notwithstanding the asymmetrical relations of power at play. Secondly, as a classroom, this space is primarily concerned with teaching and learning, and therefore is pedagogically structured in accordance with these key functions. 'Pedagogy' is thus understood as the conditions for learning that are created by the teacher and structured both by the curriculum as well as by the various methods, strategies and materials she uses to enact this curriculum. Thirdly, and crucially, poststructuralist theorising on discourse and subjectivity are brought to bear upon this conception of the pedagogic space. So, the teacher and students' interactions are considered in relation to their discursively constructed subject positions; and the pedagogy is understood as being shaped by the discourses of the curriculum content, the classroom materials as well as in the teacher's instructional talk and her methods of mediation. The analysis undertaken here is thus concerned with understanding what kind of subjectivity it is possible to articulate given the various discursive constructions of particular pedagogic spaces.

In South Africa, the only educational researchthat looks at the classroom as a discursively constructed space that is implicated in the construction of subjectivity is that of Carolyn McKinney. McKinney has investigated students' discursive positionings in both university and secondary school classrooms. Her work with university students is of particular relevance to this project since it investigates how students' racialised identities are tied to their difficulties in engaging with the apartheid past (McKinney and van Pletzen, 2004; McKinney, 2004a, 2004b, 2007). More

recently her focus has shifted to the relationship between language and identity in the high school language classroom, with particular attention to processes of assimilation and resistance (2009, 2010, 2011).

While this study is closely aligned theoretically with the work of McKinney, differences in research design are significant. McKinney's work in secondary schools is ethnographic in its approach to the classroom. Thus she subjects everyday classroom practices and interactions to scrutiny but, as a participant-observer, she exerts no control over the curriculum that she is observing. The classroom observation undertaken in this doctoral study is based on a teaching intervention that was designed for the purpose of this research. Thus the contribution that this research hopes to make is the ability to theorise discursive positionings within an intervention-based classroom research project, where students are taking up positions in response to a researcher-designed intervention.My interest is in investigating the classroom discourses that are mobilised in each of the participating classrooms and the positions that students take up in response to the teaching intervention. The topics that are attached to the teaching intervention (e.g.: identity, South Africa's recent past, current lifeworlds, etc.) are deliberately chosen to invite the students to take up positions that are socially and historically located. Thus in the classroom, discussion topics are teacher-initiated but open-ended, allowing for a multiplicity of possible positions to be articulated by students. Thus the question is, given these topics, what trajectories do these conversations take, what discourses are mobilised and what subject positions do students take up?

The definition of classroom discourse that I am proposing takes as its objects of analysis not only the interactional patterns of the classroom but also the topics of conversation and, significantly, the interplay between the two. Thus my analysis will demonstrate that what one is talking about influences the way one is able to insert oneself into the conversation and the positions that are available to be taken up within the conversation, to provide but one example of the way in which this interrelationship might work. This use of the term 'classroom discourse' therefore brings into play two different meanings of discourse, the more linguistic meaning of 'talk in interaction' (Cazden, 2001) and the poststructuralist meaning of discourse as constitutive of subjectivity (Foucault, 1970; Hall, 1996, 2001; Weedon, 1997; Davies 1994, 1997). Notions of power are implicated in both senses since what classroom discourse does fundamentally is shape what you can say and who you can be in the classroom

space. These ideas are elaborated on in the theoretical discussion contained in the next chapter.

1.1.5 The history of the teaching intervention

The teaching intervention used in this doctoral research has its origins in a project in which I and a group of colleagues experimented with ways of teaching reconciliation in post-apartheid South African classrooms. This was a South African contribution to a broader international project that was centrally concerned with the need to '[rethink] reconciliation and pedagogy in unsettling times' (Alhuwaliaet al, 2012). Adopting a multidisciplinary approach, the project sought to generate theoretical and practical knowledge of how, in today's culturally complex global realities, we might all 'get along'. It was against this backdrop that the South African research circle was formed, comprising educators from the disciplines of English, History and Art. Together we explored the conditions of possibility for doing reconciliation work with the young people in the classrooms of three teachers who taught indesegregated secondary schools in Johannesburg. The work was exploratory and developed organically. Over the course of 2005, we conceptualised and implemented a classroom-based action research project which comprised two different cycles of classroom activities.

The first cycle of activities was loosely structured around the act of apologising and the various forms that this could take. The second cycle of activities adopted an overtly political approach to reconciliation, selecting the TRC as the core subject matter. Students were tasked with interviewing two adult members of their communities or social networks to investigate social perceptions and memories of the work of the commission. Having accessed a variety of perspectives on the TRC, students brought these various narratives into dialogue in the classroom space. Following this, students were asked to design a postcard which encapsulated in word and image what stood out for them from their work on the TRC.

Overall the project was stimulating work which yielded useful insights about the pedagogic potential of reconciliation work. In Ferreira et al (2012), we provide a comprehensive account of how the two cycles of work captured a shift from the apolitical personal to the personalised political. Additional analysis pertaining specifically to the TRC cycle of work has been captured in a number of published articles (Ferreira and Janks, 2007; Ferreira, 2008; Ferreira and Janks, 2009), including one where I collaborated with a colleague in Cyprus to consider the affective

potential of narrative in the classrooms of our respective conflict-ridden societies (Zembylas and Ferreira, 2009).

The focus and aims of this doctoral study are different from those of the reconciliation pedagogy project but the form that the teaching intervention takes is derived in part from the TRC work that comprised the second cycle of work in the earlier project. Thus it remains underpinned by the belief that it is important to find meaningful ways of engaging students with the past. The shape of the teaching intervention is discussed more extensively in the methodology chapter but overall it continues to attempt to get students to historicise their identities and to encourage them to engage with the world in all its complexities (Darder et al, 2003).

1.2 The research questions

This research was carried out in two Grade 11 subject English classrooms in separate desegregated secondary schools in Johannesburg, Gauteng. The overarching question which it seeks to answer is:

> What is the relationship between subjectivity and pedagogy in two secondary school English classrooms in post-apartheid South Africa?

This entails consideration of the following sub-questions:

1. What subject positions do students take up in response to a teaching intervention that invites them to historicise their identities? How are these subject positions evident in the talk and texts that students produce? To what extent are these positions inflected by students' spatial and temporal locations?

2. How does the classroom discourse work to position students and how, in turn, do the subject positions that students take up shape the classroom discourse?

1.3 The aims and value of this study

The overarching aim of this research is thus to arrive at a theorised understanding of the identity work that post-apartheid students carry out in relation to the pedagogic constraints and opportunities of a particular intervention in the English classroom. Subjectivity does not exist in a vacuum nor does it reside in some ideal or authentic form, waiting to be uncovered; it is enacted or performed in relation to particular circumstances or activities. It is thus the teaching intervention that constitutes the terrain in relation to which the students take up their subject positions.

Locating this research on identity in the classroom, as a teaching intervention, enables me to put the relationship between identity and pedagogy at the centre of this study. This is made evident in two ways.Firstly, by making the classroom the primary site of investigation I am gaining access to the interactions that occur in the pedagogically structured space of the desegregated classroom. The classroom is thus understood as a contact zone and it is the power dynamics at play as students and teachers engage with one another across socially constructed differences that are central. The aim is thus to investigate how the classroom discourse, that is set up by the teacher and shaped by the students, produces different kinds of classroom spaces and influences what participants can say and who they can be in this space.

Secondly, the fact that this classroom-based research is structured around a teaching intervention means that it is the pedagogic design of the intervention that sets up the framework, broadly speaking, for the interactions that take place in the classroom space. This means that the topics under discussion are researcher-selected, making it possible to explore the positions that students take up in response to content and issues that are deliberately embedded in the teaching intervention. To this end, the teaching intervention consists of two sections, with the purpose of each one being tied to its subject matter.

The content of the first section of the teaching intervention is the work of South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC). It functions as an entry point to our recent, troubled national past and is used as pedagogic device which seeks to construct students as historicised subjects. The aim here is two-fold: to explore ways of engaging young people meaningfully with the past; and to develop a more nuanced understanding of their reasons for engaging with or resisting the past. The second section of the teaching intervention requires students to reconnect with the 'now' by moving beyond the focus on the past and considering the present. The aim is to understand the ways in which these students are locating themselves within the shifting social, political and economic landscape of South Africa. Therefore in working to historicise students' identities, I am seeing them as being 'constructed and produced within a particular historical moment and under particular historical conditions' (Darder et al, 2003, p. 12), doing so by seeking engagement with the sociopolitical context of both the past and the present.

Thus, to recap, this research study and, by extension, the teaching intervention, construct these young people as post-apartheid youth. I am interested in understanding how they are making sense of the political transition and to what extent

their subject positions are inflected by their location in time and place. Situating this research in the classroom enables me to explore how classroom discourses, in a context of social change, shape the possibilities for identity work by drawing on particular discourses and producing certain kinds of subjectivities.

By placing under scrutiny the relationship between subjectivity and pedagogy, this project hopes to generate insights that could be used to inform the teaching practice of those of us seeking to educate contemporary South African youth. It is worth noting that the National Curriculum, taking its lead from the country's Constitution, prioritises the need for social transformation and has as one of its core principles 'human rights, inclusivity, environmental and social justice' (2003, p. 4). However, there are signs that these policy imperatives are not being put into practice. Jansen argues that while the various education policies put into place since 1994 are impressive, 'there are no viable planning strategies within the Department of Education to advance democratic education inside schools... in a sustainable or meaningful way' (2004, p. 127). At the level of schooling, we appear to have teachers whose attention to the content and administrative demands of the new, post-1994 school curriculum allows them little or no time to devise pedagogic strategies for engaging young people with their diverse current and past realities. I refer to my own personal experience as an educator going into schools in Gauteng to assess pre-service teachers in their teaching practicals and finding that teachers are often overwhelmed by the administrative and bureaucratic demands of their everyday activities and do not have the time or energy necessary to commit themselves to pedagogic innovation.

Similar insights have been captured in a cross-national study that looks at teachers' understandings and practices of reconciliation and inclusion in four troubled societies, including South Africa (Zembylas et al, 2009). As I will show the insights we can gain about the interplay between subjectivity and pedagogy will enable us to make sound and more appropriate choices in relation to curriculum and pedagogy.

Work of this kind can therefore contribute to pedagogic teacher knowledge about how to engage young people in complex and diverse societies. In particular, it seeks to contribute to the work that is already being done in post-conflict societies to deal with difference in classrooms where students who occupy historically constructed positions of antipathy towards one another are coming together to be educated. This work therefore seeks to explore the possibilities that exist for prising open spaces that encourage students to engage with politically significant issues in meaningful ways.

1.4 Outline of chapters

Chapter Two outlines both the theoretical framework for this research as well as the previous classroom-based research which is of relevance to this project, and discusses key concepts related to the sociopolitical context in which the study is located.

Chapter Three presents the research design and process. In addition to discussing the sites and participants, I outline the design of the teaching intervention and explain the way in which a poststructuralist framework is applied to the analysis of the data.

Chapter Four, the first chapter of the data analysis, focuses on the way in which students position themselves in relation to the work of the TRC and, more broadly, in relation to South Africa's recent past. Here I look at students' overt resistance to seeing their subject positions as historically constructed and, drawing on different data types, Iexplore their desire to escape the fixed, racialised identities of the past and the possibilities and impossibilities of doing so.

Chapter Fiveshifts the focus to the 'now', investigating how students construct the relationship between themselves and their contemporary social worlds in a multimodal youth poster that they are asked to produce. The analysis of the artefact is extended through a discursive analysis of the students' oral presentation of their posters to their teacher and peers. Here I look at how the students' work on thismultimodal artefact is shaped by their locations in the social, political and economic landscape of South Africa, considering in particular notions of nation, privilege and aspiration.

Chapter Six focuses on the positioning dynamics evident in the discourse structure of class discussions, foregrounding the interplay between the content of the discussion and the dynamics of the interactional patterns. This is highly situated analysis of moment-by-moment classroom interaction and thus each site is treated separately. I use extended extracts of classroom talk to examine how the classroom discourse shapes the conditions of possibility for who students can be and what they can say or do in this space.

Chapter Sevenis the conclusion in which I highlight the most significant findings of this research and examine their implications.

2

THEORY

In seeking to understand the various subject positions that students take up during the course of this research project, I use poststructuralist theories of subjectivity and discourse. This is the theoretical framework that underpins all aspects of this research: it is used to shape the research design and frame the research questions and is employed in the analysis of the data. This chapter lays out this conceptual framework and reviews the relevant literature. It is organised into three sections.

In the first section, I outline the poststructuralist theorising on subjectivity and discourse that forms the overarching framework and I elaborate on key concepts that are of central relevance to my research. The next section re-frames these theories and concepts within a pedagogic context, considering theory and research that has begun to engage with the ways in which the interactional order of the classroom is implicated in the construction of subjectivity. In the third and final section, I look at some of the broad social processes at play in contemporary South Africa with a view to laying the conceptual foundation for situating this research spatially and temporally. In this way, poststructuralist theorising on discourse, subjectivity and positioning frames an investigation of these processes in the two classrooms that are the sites of this research, each with its own contextual particularities even while being located in the same national context. I thereby aim to contribute to the body of work that seeks to ‘link insights into the local interactional order in different educational sites, with the analysis of the changing social and symbolic order’ (Baxter 2008: 78).

2.1 Poststructuralist theories on discourseand subjectivity

> [W]e live in an era in which we are commonly asked to rethink, express, and explain our identities by a wide variety of authority figures and institutions: parents, school guidance counselors, best-selling self-help gurus, talk show hosts, and even advertisers, who encourage us to test out a different form of 'self' expression by purchasing an expensive car, entering a weight-loss program, or trying a new hair color. We are widely led to believe that we have the freedom and ability to create and re-create our 'selves' at will, if we *have* the will, but at the same time are presented with a suspiciously narrow range of options and avenues that will allow us to fit comfortably into society and our particular gendered, regional, ethnic, sexual subset of it (D Hall, 2004, p. 1)[2].

I choose poststructuralism as a theoretical framework for understanding subjectivity for two reasons. Firstly, as I have previously explained, I believe that it is the lens best suited to addressing the experience of subjectivity in complex late modern societies (Hall, 1992a) – an experience partly captured in the quotation above. Secondly, it enables me to bring together subjectivity and power in ways that are attentive to their radical contingency as well as to historical context. It is these ideas that I flesh out in the ensuing discussion.

Poststructuralist theories of subjectivity are often explained in contrast to the humanist model of identity that continues to be the prevailing, commonsense notion of the subject (Mansfield, 2000; Weedon, 1997). This humanist model understands identity as something belonging to the individual and constituting his/her sense of self. Individual identity is seen as comprising a stable core self that unfolds and develops in a unified and consistent way throughout life, with stumbling points commonly referred to as 'identity crises'. The humanist individual is thus considered to be an autonomous, free thinking subject who is endowed with human agency. A more sociologically grounded version of the humanist subject recognises that the individual is influenced by the forces of socialisation and is thus partly shaped by his/her environment. However, even then, the individual remains the originator of meaning and the organising consciousness who still has the luxury of choice in relation to how his/her innate self engages with the world.

A poststructuralist perspective on subjectivity constitutes a radical departure from the humanist conceptions of the individual. The poststructuralist subject is discursively constructed (not born); created in and through socially, culturally and historically located interactions (not universal and transcendent in its nature); and fluid, fragmented, multiple and contradictory (not unified and fixed in its essence). The

[2] All other references made to Hall in this thesis refer to the work of Stuart Hall.

poststructuralist subject is decentred, always under construction and constantly reconstituted through discourse.

2.1.1 The Foucauldian framework: processes of subjectification

Because Foucault provides what I believe to be the most comprehensive explication of the discursive construction of the human subject, his theorising of discourse and subjectivity underpins this project's conceptual framework. I thus begin this section by outlining key Foucauldian ideas on the processes of subjectification, focusing in particular on the relationship between discourse and subject formation. However, like Davies (2006, pp. 425-426), I believe that 'Foucault's interest is primarily on those larger discursive shifts over time through which different kinds of subjecthood become possible' and not on the lives of individual subjects. Since this research requires attention to the individual subject, Foucault's theoretical perspective of subjectivity is complemented by the work of other theorists who, while also working with the discursively constructed poststructuralist subject, develop Foucault's ideas and take them further with regard to individual subjectivity.

For Foucault, there is no founding subject whose organising consciousness imposes meaning on the world (1972, p. 124). In analysing systems of ideas over various historical periods, he uses a genealogical approach which he describes as 'a form of history which can account for the constitution of knowledges, discourses, domains of objects, etc., without having to make any reference to a subject which is either transcendental in relation to the field of events or runs in its empty sameness throughout the course of history' (1980, p. 117). Thus the notion of a unified, trans-historical, pre-discursive subject is rejected, and instead the subject is understood as structured in and through discourse, and subjectivity is viewed as discontinuous and multiple, and as contingent on the historical conditions of the period that gives rise to it.

Within this framework, discourse is central in the processes of subjectification. But this is a notion of discourse that is neither linguistic nor associated with empirical sociological studies of human talk, but rather one of 'discourse-as-knowledge' (McHoul and Grace, 1993, p. 26). For Foucault, discourses are bodies of knowledge that have the power to constitute and delimit the field or discipline that they represent, a process which encompasses the production of a particular kind of human subject associated with that discipline. Foucault argues, for example, that 'Man' is an effect or

product of the discourses that arose around the time of the Enlightenment and that led to the formation of the disciplines that together constituted the human or social sciences and located ‘Man’ as both subject and object of study.

Discourses are thus ‘groups of statements that belong to a single system of formation’ (1972, p. 121) and they function to make the object of discourse ‘appear’ (p. 50). In other words, while an object may exist in a pre-discursive material reality, it is only through the operations of discourse that it can be apprehended and rendered meaningful, and, when it comes to the human subject, different discourses produce different meanings or subjectivities. So, for example, the emergence of the discourses that led to the establishment of psychiatry as a discipline is what enables the ‘mentally ill patient’ to appear; the establishment of the penal system is what enables the ‘criminal’ or ‘delinquent’ to appear; and so on with different discourses producing a different kind of historically located social subject.

Thus power is intrinsic to the workings of discourse for ‘it is in discourse that power and knowledge are joined together’ (1978, p. 100). And this is directly related to the process of subject formation because, as Foucault has said, ‘power produces; it produces reality; it produces domains of objects and rituals of truth. The individual and the knowledge that may be gained of him [sic] belong to this production’ (1977, p. 194). Discourses thus provide discipline-specific ways of conceiving of, looking at and talking about the subject. Thus, in analysing the ways in which discourses produce subjects, Foucault is interested in what experts say when they speak as experts (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1982) and how the ‘gaze’ and language adopted by a discipline constitutes the very objects that it is seeking to analyse and understand, hence the Foucauldian term, power-knowledge. Thus, to sum up, discourses produce subjects through the forms of knowledge associated with them; additionally, discourses also provide subject positions from which their particular knowledges and meanings most make sense (Hall, 2001).

While Foucault talks about discourses opening up a number of possible subject positions for speaking subjects (1972, pp. 119 and 137), one of his key concerns is that discourses be understood, not simply as internally constituted, but in terms of the external conditions of possibility for the production of these discourses, what he refers to as the rules of exteriority (1970,p. 127; 1972). Thus, when a speaking subject speaks, ‘what he says is not said from anywhere. It is caught up in the play of an exteriority’ (1972; p. 138). Elsewhere he expands on this, saying

> we must not go from discourse towards its interior, hidden nucleus, towards the heart of a thought or signification supposed to be manifested in it; but, on the basis of discourse itself, (*its appearance and its regularity*,) go towards its external conditions of possibility, towards what *(gives rise to the aleatory series of these events, and)* fixes its limits (1970, p. 127).

Thus Foucault is dealing with bodies of disciplinary knowledge and looking at the historical conditions of possibility for the existence of such knowledge / formation of these discourses. And it is the fact that these conditions, or rules of exteriority, are external to discourse that makes this a radically historicised and radically contingent perspective on discourse. Flowing from this are implications for subjectivity. If the ways in which discourses are produced and function are shaped by the external conditions in which they are formed, then these external conditions of possibility are also configuring the possible subject positions available to be taken up by speaking subjects. Subjectivity is thus contingent, and, like the discourse, simultaneously enabled and constrained by the play of exteriority.

There is a final point on discourse and subjectivity that needs to be made in relation to the Foulcauldian framework. Foucault has suffered frequent criticism for what is seen as an overly deterministic position and has been accused of representing subjectivity as 'just a form of incarceration' (Eagleton, 1991, p. 146) and for setting us up to be 'prisoners of discourse' (Sarup, 1993, p. 97-98). Nevertheless, following Schaafsma, I believe there is 'room to manoeuvre in discourse' (1998, p. 255).

Firstly, discourses are not rigid, discrete formations imposed from above in a systematic and hierarchical way. Foucault maintains that discourses are discontinuous, juxtaposed in contradictory ways, they exclude and are often unaware of each other (1981). In principle, therefore (and I shall return to this point later), there are always multiple discourses at play and thus multiple subject positions available for the already-discursively-constructed subject to negotiate among, even if this negotiation is happening beneath the level of consciousness. But the process is, at least in theory, a dynamic one that is shaped by the external conditions of possibility, including not only institutions of social control but also factors such as randomness or chance, or what Foucault refers to as aleatory events (1970,p. 127). This makes discourse and its operations significantly different from Marxist notions of ideology as a form of 'false consciousness' imposed by the ruling class, a point he himself makes with great clarity in one of his interviews (1980, p. 118).

In addition, it is true that discourses come into being in ways that are not able to be controlled by the intentions of individuals (even if they are able to be subsequently

harnessed for the interests of particular groups of individuals) and Foucault has made the point that 'it is not easy to say something new' (1972, p. 49). Nevertheless, in his later work Foucault began to consider how the operations of discourse and power contain the possibilities of struggle and resistance within them. Most notably he drew attention to the 'tactical polyvalence of discourses' (1978, p. 100), saying that discourses should not be classified as either accepted or excluded, dominant or dominated but are constantly at play – multiple, shifting and open to being deployed in various ways. Thus

> we must make allowance for the complex and unstable process whereby discourse can be both an instrument and an effect of power, but also a hindrance, a stumbling-block, a point of resistance and a starting point for an opposing strategy. Discourse transmits and produces power; it reinforces it, but it also undermines it and exposes it, renders it fragile and makes it possible to thwart it (1978, p. 101).

A discourse does not, for example, need be changed from within in order to produce a different effect, it can simply be put to use differently, i.e. used as a reverse discourse (1978, p. 101). By way of example, Foucault explains that while the discourses of sexual deviance that began emerging in the nineteenth-century had the effect of pathologising and thus socially controlling a range of sexual behaviours, including homosexuality, the very discourse that defined homosexuals as deviant has since been used to claim a legitimate identity for the homosexual subject. I would argue that Spivak's notion of strategic essentialism (1987) could also be seen as an example of a reverse discourse. In both of these cases, the human subjects that were being subjugated by a discourse that sought to define them as other appropriate the discourse and, by reversing the strategy, use it to their own benefit and empowerment.

Later, Foucault wrote of 'struggles which question the status of individuals' (S&P, 211) and then specified 'three types of struggles':

> …either against forms of domination (ethnic, social, and religious); against forms of exploitation which separate individuals from what they produce; or against that which ties the individual to himself and submits him to others in this way (struggles against subjection, against forms of subjectivity and submission) (1982, p. 212).

Although Foucault did not elaborate in ways that clarify what he understands a struggle against a form of subjectivity to be and how this might play itself out in discursive terms, he did continue to emphasise the point that 'it would not be possible for power relations to exist without points of insubordination which, by definition, are means of escape' (1982, p. 225). Thus while the power of discourse comes from its

ability to define and delimit, and to produce human subjects, and while the subject cannot 'escape' discourse itself, the operations of discourse contain possibilities for resistance within them. So perhaps saying that the Foucauldian subject is a prisoner of discourse (Sarup, 1993) is akin to saying that the biological human is a prisoner of oxygen. While it is true that we cannot survive outside an oxygen-based environment and are thus dependent on oxygen for our very existence, oxygen is also what enables us to function and go about our daily lives.

2.1.2 Moving beyond Foucault

Ultimately, Foucault focuses on the historical specificity of systems of ideas and their bearing on the processes of subjectification, rather than on the individual subject *per se*. In fact, as Hall (1996, p. 10) points out, some of the critique that has been levelled against Foucault's discussions of subjectivity is precisely that 'they offer a formal account of the construction of subject positions within discourse while revealing little about why it is that certain individuals occupy some positions rather than others'; in addition to which he has also been accused of 'neglecting to analyse how the social positions of individuals interact with the construction of certain "empty" discursive subject positions'. Both of these criticisms point to theoretical gaps which are significant in the context of this research project where a fuller understanding of the processes of subjectification as they play themselves out at the level of the individual subject is sought.

Thus I turn to the work of contemporary theorists who, working within a poststructuralist or Foucauldian framework, spell out more clearly the relationship between the individual subject, as he or she is socially located, and discourse, exploring the ways in which social identity categories such as ethnicity, 'race', class and gender are implicated in the processes by which subject positions are made available (or not) and taken up (or not) by individual subjects. For this I draw largely on Stuart Hall, a postcolonial and cultural theorist, and Chris Weedon and Bronwyn Davies, both feminist poststructuralist theorists. There are a number of ways in which these theorists have taken Foucault's ideas on the discursively constructed subject further and thus made them more easily applicable to this classroom-based research project.

Firstly, the notion of discourse is broadened to refer to more than just those knowledges located in the scientific and disciplinary realm. Feminist poststructuralist

theorists have made a particular contribution in this regard since, in attempting to understand and challenge the ways in which women are produced as gendered subjects, they have opened up to scrutiny the interstices of everyday life (Hall 1992a). So, for example, Weedon (1997) defines discourses in Foucauldian terms as 'ways of constituting knowledge, together with social practices, forms of subjectivity and power relations which inhere in such knowledges and the relations between them' (p. 108) but points to the need to 'pay full attention to the social and institutional context of textuality in order to address the power relations of everyday life' (p. 25).

Davies and Harré too see discourses as bodies of knowledge operating on different levels, some of which can be seen as more akin to 'social' or 'everyday knowledges', explaining that:

> a discourse is to be understood as an institutionalised use of language and language-like sign systems. Institutionalisation can occur at the disciplinary, the political, the cultural and the small group level. There can also be discourses that develop around a specific topic, such as gender or class. (Davies and Harré, 1990, p. 45).

Thus there is a shift from Foucault's large bodies of scientific knowledge historicized across chronologically vast time periods to a more scaled-down focus on power relations as they play themselves out in everyday discourses in everyday contexts in relation to subjectivity.

Secondly, the fact that the majority of the data in this research project is in the form of spoken or written language compels me to spell out more clearly the relationship between discourse and language, particularly in light of the fact that the closeness of this relationship must not suggest that I am using the term 'discourse' in the linguistic sense. In his earlier work (1970, 1972) Foucault applied considerable attention to language and, in particular, to the statement and rules for speaking. But as he developed his theory of discourse and the workings of power/knowledge, language as a social practice continues to underlie all his discussions but is engaged with less explicitly because it is subordinate to discourse. Thus when Pennycook (1995, p. 115) asks the question, from a Foucauldian position, 'Which is bigger – language or discourse?', his answer is, of course, discourse, since it is 'the condition by which language as a structure or a system exists'. He emphasises that discourse is the superordinate term, saying that discourse 'does not refer to language or uses of language, but to ways of organizing meaning that are often, though not exclusively, realized through language' (128).

Accordingly it is often through language that we construct and organise our understandings of who we are, or our subjectivity. Therefore the data analysis attends to the language produced by students not because language is being seen as a transparent means of self-expression which 'assumes an already existing individual subjectivity which awaits expression' (Weedon, 1997, p. 79), but because it is in language that discourse is made manifest and that the discursively constructed subject takes up a speaking position.

Thirdly, the ways in which the individual subject takes up a position in discourse is expanded upon by these contemporary poststructuralist theories, and here there are various aspects to consider. In the first instance, the poststructuralist subject is always under construction and continually reconstituted through discourse. Identity formation is seen as an open-ended, ongoing process or, to use Weedon's words, this is a 'theory of subjectivity in process' (p. 83). Of course this is not the smooth, unfolding process associated with the unitary subject that is evolving as an individual; it is a discontinuous process of needing to continually take up particular, socially recognisable identity positions, a process that is radically historicised because available positions vary across contexts, situations, interactions and even from moment to moment. Hall is emphatic about this, stating that

> identities are never unified and, in late modern times, increasingly fragmented; never singular but multiply constructed across different, often intersecting and antagonistic, discourses, practices and positions. They are subject to radical historicization, and are constantly in the process of change and transformation (1996, p. 4).

In the second instance, within such a maelstrom of discourses, discursive practices and available subject positions, we need to return to the question of why it is that certain individuals take up certain subject positions rather than others. In order to do so, argues Hall (1996), it is necessary to reengage with and reconceptualise the notion of identity – a decidedly un-Foulcauldian term which evokes the commonsense idea of autonomous, free-thinking individuality. Hall, of course, does not seek to reanimate the humanist definition of the term but neither does he attempt to merely redefine it as synonymous with 'subjectivity'; instead he undertakes an exploration of what identity might mean for the discursively constructed subject. He concludes the following:

> I use 'identity' to refer to **the meeting point**, **the point of *suture***, between on the one hand the discourses and practices which attempt to 'interpellate', speak to us or hail us into place as the social subjects of particular discourses, and on the other hand, the processes which produce subjectivities, which construct us as subjects which can be 'spoken'. Identities are thus **points of**

> **temporary attachment** to the subject positions which discursive practices construct for us (1996, pp. 5-6; original italics, my bolding).

I find Hall's argument compelling because of the distinction it draws between process and 'point'. Thus, if subjectivity is an open-ended process of becoming then identities are the points, or *moments*, along this process when particular subject positions, structured in and through discourse, are taken up. Hall sees these identities as being produced by the 'chaining' (p. 6) of the subject to the flow of discourse. I therefore understand these points of suture as the moments when, because the subject is momentarily fixed or 'chained' to discourse, subjectivity becomes momentarily visible and temporarily fixed – almost like a snapshot that captures or fixes a moment belonging to a process that both precedes and escapes the moment. Identities understood in this way are therefore inextricably linked to issues of representation. Thus, as Hall states,

> identities are about questions of using the resources of history, language and culture in the process of becoming rather than being: not 'who we are' or 'where we came from', so much as what we might become, how we have been represented and how that bears on how we might represent ourselves. Identities are therefore constituted within, not outside representation' (1996, p. 4).

This goes some way towards explaining *how* individual subjects come to take up certain positions in discourse. To understand the *why* it is necessary to consider both the struggle between discourses as well as the notion of identification. Hall explains that the suturing of the subject into a subject position is only successful if the subject invests in that position and thus it is not sufficient to understand 'how individuals are summoned into place' but it is necessary to supplement this 'with an account of the practices of subjective self-constitution' (p. 13). In other words, we need to attempt to understand

> what the mechanisms are by which individuals as subjects identify (or do not identify) with the 'positions' to which they are summoned; as well as how they fashion, stylize, produce and 'perform' these positions, and why they never do so completely, for once and all time (Hall, 1996, pp. 13-14).

What Hall therefore seeks to do is to link suturing with identification. Weedon provides a not incompatible discussion of the process of subjectification, maintaining that because discourses 'are continually competing with each other for the allegiance of individual agents… individuals are both the *site* and *subjects* of discursive struggle for their identity… In thought, speech or writing individuals of necessity commit

themselves to specific subject positions and embrace quite contradictory modes of subjectivity at different times' (1997, pp. 93-94).

What seems clear, however, is that without taking a psychoanalytic perspective (which Hall (1996) flirts with but does not expound upon at length), or any perspective that would provide a theory of the mind, the mechanisms whereby individuals take up particular subject positions and reject others are difficult to pin point in the abstract.

This study thus makes considered use of both the term 'subjectivity' as well as that of 'identity'. The term 'subjectivity' is used in the title of this thesis because at the centre of this study lies the attempt to arrive at an understanding of the processes of subjectification underway in the interactions which take place in these particular classroom contexts. However, the only access I have to students' subjectivities is through the subject positions they take up in the talk and texts that they produce. The talk and texts, i.e. the data, make discernible the 'points of suture' or identities that constitute the analysable terrain of this study. In the data, the students are either taking up subject positions in available discourses, or locating themselves in relation to social identity categories, or consciously seeking to represent their own identities. Thus while I frequently use the term 'identity' to refer to moments when students take up socially recognisable identity positions (something that is particularly evident in the youth posters, for example), I do so because I see these moments as contributing to the understanding of the broader, underlying and unconscious process of subjectivity. In other words, it is the intention of this study to show that an accumulation of subject positions or identities, limited and partial as they each are, can generate insights about the much larger process of subjectification.

Discursively constructed agency

Within a poststructuralist paradigm there is no prediscursive subject making choices of its own free will. The poststructuralist subject does not possess the kind of agency associated with the autonomous human subject but this does not mean that the subject is fully determined. Instead poststructuralism works with a theory of agency where discursive practices reinstate or reinscribe an agency of a different sort (Hall, 1996) which contends that a discursively constituted subject is not a fully determined subject. For

> to claim that the subject is constituted is not to claim that it is determined; on the contrary, the constituted character of the subject is the very precondition of its agency (Butler, 1992, p. 12).

Weedon (1997) and Davies and Harré (1990) argue that it is precisely because discourses are multiple and contradictory that opportunities exist for resistance and change. Davies and Harré, while acknowledging the constitutive force of discourse, maintain that in taking up a particular available subject position rather than another 'a possibility of *notional choice* is inevitably involved because there are many and contradictory discursive practices that each person *could* engage in' (1990, p. 46; my italics). Similarly, Weedon understands subjectivity as a discursive location which is a site of constant struggle over multiple meanings and the conflicting subject positions which they make available. It is in this discursive power struggle that she identifies the possibility of some agency:

> [a]lthough the subject in poststructuralism is socially constructed in discursive practices, she none the less exists as a thinking, feeling subject and social agent, *capable of resistance and innovations produced out of a clash between contradictory subject positions* (1997, p. 121; my italics).

Elsewhere she makes the important point that '[w]hile there is no place beyond discourses and the power relations that govern them, resistance and change are possible from within' (2004, p. 19). A poststructuralist theory of subjectivity thus provides us with a subject that is both constrained and enabled by its discursive location. In a sense, it is the fact that subjectivity is always in process and the subject positions are multiple and contradictory that generates a degree of agency by requiring the subject to negotiate among them.

Positioning and positioning theory

The effects and dynamics of taking up a subject position in discourse lie at the heart of this research project and segue into notions of positioning and positioning theory. There are a number of important aspects to this.

Firstly, a subject position is made available within a discourse and it is from this discursive position that 'its particular knowledge and meaning make most sense… we become the subjects of discourse by subjecting ourselves to its meanings, power and regulation. All discourses then, construct subject-positions, from which they alone make sense' (Hall, 2001, p. 80). Identities are constituted in those moments when individuals take up subject positions offered by their governing discourses – and these are the moments of suture, when an individual invests in a particular subject position.

Positioning as a metaphor is, in fact, an extremely useful way of considering the effects of what it means to take up a subject position in discourse. The notion of positioning, as it is used in theorising subjectivity and discourse, is a metaphor derived from literal physical position which has spatial and visual dimensions. Spatially speaking, positioning refers to a person's placement or location in space. Metaphorically, this physical positioning comes to stand for attitudinal orientation, evident in expressions such as one's 'stance' or 'position' on an issue. This is carried through into the visual dimension. Any physical location in space offers the individual a particular view or visual perspective of their surroundings.

Metaphorically this visual perspective comes to signify a 'viewpoint' or 'point of view' and, taken to its logical extension, a 'worldview'. To extend the metaphor, therefore, ways of standing and ways of seeing become, at a discursive level, conceptual, emotional and psychic ways of interpreting and interacting with the world. And, as our positions shift, so too do our ways of seeing, being, thinking and doing, and vice versa.

These positions do not only provide us with access to particular ways of being thereby structuring our senses of self (Weedon, 1997, p. 32) but also invite us to view and interact with the world in particular ways. While positioning is a notion widely used in poststructuralist talk, it has been formally theorised by Davies and Harré (1990, 1999; Davies, 1994). They elaborate as follows:

> A subject position incorporates both a conceptual repertoire and a location for persons within the structure of rights for those that use that repertoire. Once having taken up a particular position as one's own, a person inevitably sees the world from the vantage point of that position and in terms of the particular images, metaphors, story lines and concepts which are made relevant within the particular discursive practice in which they are positioned (1990, p. 46).

Weedon, however, points out that when an individual takes up a particular subject position and gains access to its qualities, they are simultaneously being denied access to the qualities associated with other subject positions that they have not taken up (1997, p. 92). The significance of this is considerable for it suggests that taking up a subject position means determining the limits of what is thinkable, doable, sayable and thus 'be-able'.

A great deal of the work on positioning focuses on spoken interaction. This is not only because a speaker's position can be identified through his/her use of language since 'to speak is to assume a position in discourse' (Weedon 1997,

p. 116), but also because subject positions are necessarily always relational. According to Davies and Harré, interactions tend to unfold according to patterns, or culturally and historically specific narrative conventions – referred to as 'story lines' (1999) – to which the participants contribute according to their relative positions. Positioning is thus comprehensively defined as follows:

> the discursive process whereby selves are located in conversations as observably and subjectively coherent participants in jointly produced storylines. There can be *interactive positioning* in which what one person says positions another. And there can be *reflexive positioning* in which one positions oneself. However it would be a mistake to assume that, in either case, positioning is necessarily intentional (Davies and Harré, 1999, p. 37; my italics).

Even though in the process of social interactions, subject positions are constantly shifting and different modes of subjectivity are continually being taken up (Weedon 1997, p. 94) in ways that are not always obvious and signalled only through subtle discursive shifts, it is nevertheless useful to differentiate between positioning oneself and positioning others. As Hall has said, 'identity shifts according to how the subject is addressed or represented' (1992, p. 281). An analysis conducted within this framework, as explained by Davies and Harré, requires positions to be identified by 'extracting the autobiographical aspects of a conversation in which it becomes possible to find out how each conversant conceives of themselves and of other participants by seeing what positions they take up and in what story, and how they are then positioned' (1990, p. 48).

Part of the purpose of the data analysis undertaken by this research project is to attempt to gain some understanding of why certain individuals occupy some subject positions rather than others (Hall 1996, p. 10). Hall argues that Foucault, in beginning to look at the 'double-sided character of subjection/subjectification', acknowledged that entry into orders of discourse is 'determined by and constitutive of the power relations that permeate the social realm' (McNay, 1994, p. 87). Taking a different but not incompatible view, Weedon proposes that the greater the match between an available subject position and the individual's interests, the more likely they are to take up the position; conversely the greater the gap between the individual's interests and the subject position, the more likely resistance becomes (1997, p. 109).

Davies and Harré point out the enabling nature of taking up a subject position (it renders you agentic). They say that 'the discursive practices constitute the

speakers and hearers in certain ways and yet at the same time [positioning] is a resource through which speakers and hearers can negotiate new positions' (1999, p. 52).

Problems with identity

One of the advantages of drawing on feminist, postcolonial and cultural theorists' interpretations of poststructuralist identity theory is that the ways in which subjects are socially located is brought to bear, importantly, on discussions regarding the processes of subjectification, rendering such discussions increasingly attentive to issues of politics and power. For while in principle the individual is open to all forms of subjectivity, in reality the individual's access to different forms of subjectivity is governed by history and power. Consequently not all forms of subjectivity are equally available to all individuals. While this is key, it is nevertheless necessary to proceed cautiously into this terrain lest we replace old assumptions with new ones.

Weedon maintains that

> individual access to subjectivity is governed by historically specific social factors and the forms of power at work in a particular society. Social relations, which are always relations of power and powerlessness between different subject positions, will determine the range of forms of subjectivity immediately open to any individual on the basis of gender, race, class, age and cultural background (1997, p. 91).

Thus while subjectivity is an open-ended process and the subject is continually reconstituted, subjects do not work with a limitless horizon of possibility and the range of available subject positions varies according to power and position in the particular society. So, for example, Walkerdine, who sees the economic and the material as influencing the range of discourses and subject positions to which an individual has access, argues that 'girls and women do not take up any subject position in any discourse… the positions available to them exist only within certain limits' (1990, p. 14).

Skeggs takes the argument further, however, saying that the 'techniques for producing a self are central to how the concept of identity is forged and used, but not equally accessible to all' (2008, p. 12). Furthermore, she argues (drawing on Haraway) that the price of identity politics, where political claims for identity are mobilised, is that it fixes location so that labels such as class, gender, race, etc. – which should be seen as partial and intersecting, with different identities receding or coming to the fore in different moments, depending on the context – trap those who

mobilise around the identity categories that were used to subjugate them in the first place.

Ultimately she argues that for those without the necessary cultural resources and who are not speaking from privileged locations identity becomes a 'fixed visible cultural characteristic' which is usually imposed, to which there is no alternative and which has little value – all in stark contrast to those who have the resources to produce themselves and therefore are able to use identity as a 'mobile resource'.

The importance of Skeggs's argument for this research is two-fold. Firstly, it alerts us to the need to be aware that individuals' social locations influence the range and types of subject positions available to them. But secondly, we are reminded that not only do social locations operate across multiple categories simultaneously but that they are, of necessity, only partial. For this reason, the analysis of student text and talk is not preceded by a checklist of social categories. Instead I consider individual students' social identity locations if and when they are rendered relevant through the dynamics of the interactions and/or the content of the student talk.

2.2 Pedagogy, subjectivity and classroom discourse

This research is located in the classroom, a pedagogically structured context whose participants are teachers and students. Thus in this section poststructuralist theories of discourse and subjectivity are brought to bear on this particular kind of context and these particular kinds of participants. The school classroom is recognised as one of the most formative sites for the production of young people's subjectivities (Walkerdine, 1990; Baxter, 2002a, 2002b). My interest lies in understanding the discourses at play in the pedagogic space, the implications of this for subjectivity and the ways in which this affects students' engagement with pedagogy. In the discussion that follows, I consider the ways in which pedagogy and classroom practices are conceptualised in this study and I then consider some of the existing classroom-based research –South African and international – that is working with poststructuralist notions of subjectivity and discourse.

2.2.1 Conceptualising the classroom space

The classroom is the place where teacher and students commonly come together for the purpose of teaching and learning; however, I am working with the notion of classroom as a pedagogic 'space' in order to foreground that the classroom is a

socially and discursively constructed space generated by the actions and interactions of its participants. This signals a shift away from the more conventional conception of context-as-container to an understanding of context as constituted through the practices and the speaking positions that exist within it. Additionally, however, 'spaces themselves have an influence on what people can do and can become in them' (Blommaert et al, 2005, p. 203). In the classroom space, speaking subjects are expected to take up positions as 'teachers' or 'students', and undertake certain practices associated with those positions. The discursive space of the classroom thus is co-constituted by students and teacher, subject positions that are themselves mutually constituted. This can be understood in the following way:

> A teacher cannot maintain the positioning of a teacher without the help of students. … [T]he people in interaction, speakers and listeners, teachers and students, take on characteristic postures at the same time, in concert with one another. In this way, people are each others' contexts in that they form an environment for each other (McDermott 1976; as cited in Davies, 1994, p. 21).

Within this framework, pedagogy too is a discursive construction – a discursive field that is structuring of and structured by schooling institutions and that concerns itself with ways of bringing about conditions for learning. It is pedagogic discourses that enable the teaching subject and the learning subject to 'appear', to use Foucault's term (1972, p. 50). And to understand the practices that constitute the field, one would need to consider, among other things, what the rules are for speaking in the classroom; what 'regimes of truth' (on a micro-scale) would be operating; how discourses are being policed and how the policing of discourses sets up limits and generates exclusions.

Additionally, in the pedagogically structured space of the classroom, the curriculum is centrally implicated in the production and circulation of discourses. Thus the subject matter or topics that form the basis of the work being engaged with, as well as the materials used, need to be considered as being in themselves discursive productions that enter into the play of available discourses. In the following chapter, I therefore spend some time mapping out the teaching intervention and the various pedagogic discourses embedded in its design and materials. The purpose is thus to investigate how the interactions between teaching and learning subjects, the classroom practices and the curriculum all come together to produce particular conditions of possibility for the construction of subjectivity. In other words, given these discursive regularities, what kinds of subject positions is it possible to take up and articulate in the classroom space?

And, within the classroom, the role of power in the play of discourses and in the production of subjectivity continues to be conceived of in Foucauldian terms. Firstly, power is productive since it defines and delimits discourses and constitutes the subjectivities attached to them. Secondly, in terms of its workings in the classroom – notwithstanding the asymmetrical relations between teacher and students which provide the 'teaching subject' with expertise and authority over the discourse – power nevertheless circulates, and thus:

> [p]ower must be analysed as something which circulates, or rather as something which only functions in the form of a chain. It is never localised here or there, never in anybody's hands, never appropriated as a commodity or piece of wealth. Power is employed and exercised through a net-like organisation. And not only do individuals circulate between its threads; they are always in the position of simultaneously undergoing and exercising its power (Foucault, 1980, p. 98).

Thus the discursively constructed pedagogic space is fluid and dynamic and always in the process of being (re)constituted. In relation to the power of discourses and powerful discourses, it bears reminding that discourses are not dominant or dominated in and of themselves (Foucault, 1978, p. 100). However, when looking at the play of discourses, it is clear that in a particular context bounded by space and time (such as, for example, a particular classroom during one lesson or over a number of consecutive lessons), a certain discourse can come to occupy the position of preferred discourse thus being dominant over, however temporarily, other less welcome discourses. Given that the teaching intervention is set up to encourage a range of discursive positions, I am interested in finding out whether multiple and contrasting positions do indeed emerge and, if so, whether the classroom discourse is such that conflicting positions are able to co-exist alongside one another. It should be clear from the above discussion that the way in which I am using the term 'classroom discourse(s)' is one that is aligned with Foucauldian and poststructuralist ways of conceiving of discourse and subjectivity. As such, I am drawing strongly on a field that has emerged relatively recently and is making its mark particularly in relation to classroom-based research, namely Poststructuralist Discourse Analysis (PDA) (Baxter, 2008). The central aims of PDA are to analyse 'the ways in which speakers (teachers, learners, non-teaching assistants) constantly shift between positions of powerfulness and powerlessness within competing cultural and educational discourses…, highlighting the diverse subject positions, viewpoints, voices and fragmented messages that classroom research data often presents' (Baxter, 2008, p. 69).

I am aware that the more common use of the term ‘classroom discourse’ is that attributed to it by researchers of classroom practice who are not coming from poststructuralist orientations, most notably Cazden (2001), Mehan (1979), and Sinclair and Coulthard (1975). By and large, they are working with an understanding of classroom discourse as naturally occurring classroom talk (hence close associations with Conversation Analysis) and their interest is in understanding the interactional patterns and underlying participation structure of this talk and how this relates to student learning. My orientation is somewhat different because, while I am interested in the interactional order of the classroom, I understand these interactions to be discursively structured; moreover, my interest in these interactions is with a view to understanding the various ways in which students take up available subject positions and thus not in learning *per se*. Therefore, while I draw on techniques and methods that are traditionally associated with conversation analysis approaches to classroom discourse, these are subsumed by an approach that is epistemologically tied to poststructuralist analysis instead. Ultimately, classroom discourse is constituted through moment-by-moment classroom interaction, which includes the classroom activities and materials, the topics of discussion and the underlying participation structure. In the following chapter, I elaborate on the techniques and principles of the poststructuralist classroom discourse analysis that I undertake, drawing out the ways in which it is both similar to and different from the existing types of analyses of naturally occurring talk.

2.2.2 Classroom research on discourse and/or subjectivity

Although there have been calls for the need to continue developing models of poststructuralist discourse analysis in the classroom (Baxter 2003, 2008), there is a considerable amount of research that has already been done in this area, particularly in relation to gender. Walkerdine’s work in the early 90s was possibly the first to employ poststructuralism to explore the construction of female subjectivities in education, doing so in a way that challenged the binary structure of oppressor/oppressed by arguing that people are always multiply positioned in discourse and therefore constantly shifting between powerful and powerless identity positions (1990, p. 3). Her now classic illustration of this is a scenario showing two nursery school boys swearing at their female teacher, using gendered insults which position them as dominant in a male/female dimension, while being simultaneously constrained by their positions of powerlessness in student/teacher and child/adult positions.

Baxter develops this further, saying that

> [a]s a 'site of production of subjectivity' [quoting Walkerdine] the school classroom constructs a range of subject positions, some formalized and institutionally acknowledged such as teacher/learner, adult/child, peer learner/peer learner and authority figure/subordinate; and others that are culturally produced often as acts of resistance, such as conformist/rebel, or favourite/outcast/'dork' (2002a, p. 830).

She argues that being attentive to the ambiguities of power at play in a co-educational secondary school English classroom enables the researcher to see that while the girls in her study tend to conform to the rules of the classroom discussion and often have their contributions undermined by the boys, they are nevertheless able to construct themselves as key players in the discussion and as effective public speakers and are thus not positioned as powerless across all discourses (2002a, 2002b).

While Walkerdine's work is central and Baxter has played a key role in delineating the field of poststructuralist (feminist) discourse analysis, the most extensive work in this regard has been conducted by Davies (1989, 1993/2003,1994), much of it at the primary school level, not all of which takes place in the classroom. Some of this work has included exploring children's gendered responses to feminist fairy tales. Davies uses young children's readings of these narratives to understand the ways in which they learn to position themselves as male or female in order to ensure they are recognised as legitimate members of society. She argues that in a manner not dissimilar to that in which discourses provide subject positions from which we speak ourselves into existence, narratives invite the reader/listener to position herself/himself as a particular character and engage with the world from that perspective and – in the case of the feminist tales she uses – they invite certain gendered positions to be taken up. In the context of this research project that does not focus primarily on the gendered nature of subjectivities, it is nevertheless useful to consider how this approach to analysing reading positions in narratives might be fruitfully applied to other identity categories, such as culture, race or class.

Another such concept is the notion of 'category maintenance work' (1989) which Davies describes as occurring when individuals punish those whom they perceive to be transgressing the boundaries of the discursive practices that stand for 'male' and 'female' behaviour. This can include, for example, derogatory name-calling of girls who engage in unacceptably 'masculine' pursuits (calling them 'lesbos'); or, as in the case of the girls' treatment of a boy who routinely took up both masculine and feminine positions, simply ignoring his attempts to engage them. Again, in the context

of this research project, it would be particularly interesting to find out what form this kind of 'boundary work' might take with older students in the classroom context, in relation to identities other than gender.

Throughout her work on classroom practice, Davies demonstrates an understanding of the classroom as a space that is collaboratively constituted by teacher and students. While formal ownership of knowledge is assumed by the teacher through the everyday practices that constitute 'teaching-as-usual' (2003, p. 40-41), or what she has referred to elsewhere as 'familiar rituals' (1983, p. 55), the obviousness of these practices belies the fact that the classroom is nevertheless the site of struggles about existence and power (1997, p. 282).

Davis and Baker (1989) have also undertaken classroom-based research that shows how, in a lesson with a seventh grade class that was intended to be a discussion on sex roles across various historical periods, the teacher's inability to move beyond the IRE pattern of interaction (Mehan 1979) undermined the lesson's progressive aims. By structuring the lesson in terms of initiation-reply-evaluation, the teacher framed the classroom knowledge in such a way that he retained control of the topic and his own position of authority was reinforced while potential, alternative student contributions were marginalised. Davies and Baker conclude that, in addition to becoming 'trapped by his own technology' (1989, p. 74), neither the teacher nor the students had at their disposal the discourses necessary to challenge received knowledges about gender. This highlights the importance of having access to the kinds of discourses and interactions practices that are necessary to envisage a different set of social relationships, and clearly has relevance to a range of identity positions.

But, like other feminist poststructuralist theorists, Davies too is at pains to point out that gender does not operate alone and is always only one of the various identities at play at any given moment. This is what Walkerdine is alluding to when she talks of a 'nexus of subjectivities' (1990, p. 3), maintaining that multiple subject positions (re)inflect one another endlessly although there are moments when a particular subject position may be more salient.

It is not easy to find models of PDA that foreground aspects of subjectivity other than gender and, to a considerable degree, it is this gap in the research that this doctoral study aims to address. Nevertheless there is a small number of studies that have looked at issues of race and class. Classroom-based research undertaken by Alison Jones (1989) in a working class Polynesian school and a middle class 'European'

school in New Zealand suggests that students' conceptions of what counts as 'good teaching' are shaped by their socioeconomic, raced positions. Jones also finds that 'the form of cultural production rewarded at school is that of the middle-class girls… [who] are enabled by the school to transform their cultural resources – which are a product of their dominant social position – into educational credentials' (28).

In a study on Aboriginal identity and schooling, Luke et al (1995) maintain that as a cultural and racial group who are consistently marginalised, urban Aboriginal and Torres Islander children are routinely positioned as both invisible and as 'other' in classroom texts and practices. They contend that whilst this constitutes symbolic violence (Bourdieu, 1991), it should be viewed as more complex than an act of straightforward racism. Instead, they argue, 'the problem rests with an apparent lack of discursive resources for talking about race and culture' (1995, pp. 230-231) which inevitably leads to a 'colour-blind' curriculum which, unintentional though it may sometimes be, universalises white middle class knowledge and culture and silences difference.

Empirical research in South African classrooms

Above I have discussed various international studies that have sought to work with gender and other aspects of identity in the classroom within frameworks that are either poststructuralist or engaging with issues of pedagogy and power. Now I turn briefly to a few examples of empirical research in post-apartheid South African classrooms, all of which analyse classroom interaction in ways that are informed by an understanding of these classrooms as being socially and politically located.

School history curricula are frequently the site of ideological struggles, nowhere more so than in post-conflict societies. A 'victor curriculum' (Jansen and Weldon, 2009, p. 107) may not be an effective way of repairing past anomosities, especially when classrooms contain students from different sides of the conflict who carry contrasting 'martyrological memories' (Jansen, 2009a). However, attempts to promote social cohesion and integrationare seldom compatible with teaching a critical approach to history (Freedman et al, 2008). Moreover, the knowledge that is constructed by the curriculum and its various teaching materials are the often racialised ways in which teachers mediate this knowledge (Gamede, 2005; Hues, 2011). Hues's observations of History lessons in two white, Afrikaans schools, lead him to conclude that it is not sufficient for curriculum reform to occur at a content level since teachers' own ideological positions can undermine the democratic and reconciliatory ethos of these

changes. Hues observed that, through the use of teacher-centred pedagogies that provided no room for debate, teachers ignored aspects of the textbook that presented the liberation struggle and Nelson Mandela in a positive light, instead presenting an idealised image of South Africa's past and presenting 'Mandela and the other boys [in Umkhonto we Sizwe]' as guerrilla fighters and terrorists (2011, p. 86).

There is additional work that has been done in and beyond the History classroom which looks at ways of engaging young people meaningfully with the apartheid past. Geschier's research into the pedagogical practices of the History classroom looks at the use of primary narratives and how the ways in which teachers and students position themselves in relation to these narratives can either open up or close down spaces for meaningful engagement and critical dialogue (2010a). Of particular interest is her work on 'volatile conversations' which she defines as classroom dialogue that facilitates the 'process of asking difficult, uncomfortable questions about one's society and one's position in that society, questions which may not be answered or solved' and which 'challenge learners to reflect upon the links between past and present' (2010b, pp. 31 and 27). Issues of uncomfortable conversations, some of which take place across differences, are central to this research study.

McKinney's work teaching university teaching students South African literature in a historically Afrikaans university (2004a, 2004b, 2007; McKinney and Van Pletzen 2004) contributes further useful insights. McKinney explores what lies beneath her students' reluctance to engage with the course, concluding that their racialised identities result in their feeling interpellated as white oppressors by the anti-apartheid texts they are reading (2004a, 2004b). She argues that while their reading responses may be socially constructed, students are nevertheless engaging with race in ways that are shifting, contradictory and thus emblematic of the inbetween-ness of this period of transition. McKinney's more recent work focuses on language and identity (2009, 2010, 2011) within the broader assimilationist framework of black students needing to adapt to the white culture and ethos of former Model C schools. McKinney argues that students are drawing on their African languages to take up hybrid identity positions that simultaneously expand and subvert official curriculum knowledge (2009; 2010). Furthermore, she finds evidence that some students resist being positioned as outsiders to the kind of valued knowledge that the teacher constructs and insert counter-discourses into the discussion thereby momentarily disrupting the usual, racialised asymmetrical relationships of knowing that prevail in the classroom (2011).

Lastly, I turn to one of the more significant findings of the Reconciliation Pedagogies earlier study discussed in Chapter 1. When gathering narratives about the TRC from their communities, the racial diversity of the student body in one of the classrooms meant that students tapped into different communities' 'funds of knowledge' (Moll, Neffe and González, 1992; González, Moll and Amanti, 2005) on the TRC, accessing multiple stories of trauma, suffering and indifference. Bringing their different and racialised knowledges into dialogue in the classroom space produced a shift in the classroom dynamics. Black students who frequently occupy marginalised positions, were instead positioned as the having the cultural capital, or funds of knowledge, currently being valued by the curriculum. In addition, there were students who were unable to access memories or stories of the TRC who were moved by their peers' narratives and disappointedin their own interviewees' lack of awareness of the TRC. The presence of these different knowledges thus created opportunities for 'borderwork' (Anzaldúa, 1999) and for students to rethink their own identity locations in relation to their classmates.

These empirical studies indicate that students' subjectivities are inflected by broader social discourses and that these are often brought into play in the different classrooms, particularly when pedagogic choices render them relevant. In the following section I outline some of the key discourses that circulate in the public domain and frequently shape classroom discourses.

2.3 Identity in the South African context

A pedagogic space such as the classroom does not transcend place and time. Classroom spaces may be discursively constituted but classrooms, and indeed schools, are materially and socially located. These structural and spatiotemporal locations mean the classroom is subject to broader social processes, and thus the respective conditions of possibility at work in each of the classrooms in this research study are determined in significant ways by their political and historical location in a South Africa that is still emerging from under the apartheid regime. This influences what students and teachers can do, say and be in them.

I use the remainder of this chapter to delineate this context by outlining concepts that I believe are key to a discussion of subjectivity which locates itself in post-apartheid South Africa. Such a discussion seems important because, as I will show, students' subjectivities are inevitably inflected by the identity positions that they occupy in the

sociopolitical terrain. Furthermore, as these concepts inform aspects of the data analysis, it is necessary for me to provide some indication of how they are being understood within the overarching poststructuralist theoretical framework with which I am working. However, it does not lie within the scope of this study to engage in a detailed and nuanced discussion of these concepts, most of which are contested terms which defy easy definition and come with considerable discursive 'baggage' of their own. My aim is to provide a sense of the 'ontological hotspot' (Soudien, 2011) that is current-day South Africa, taking into account various intersecting social identities, their shifting meanings as well as the shifting conditions for their articulation. In an attempt not to oversimplify issues by treating each concept as a fixed and discrete entity, I have clustered them into groups so as to enable each concept to be discussed in relation to at least two others thereby highlighting their dynamic, contingent and context-sensitive nature.

2.3.1 Race, culture and ethnicity

How should we talk about race in post-apartheid South Africa? It seems impossible to escape race even now. Race looms large in the imagination of South Africans (Distiller and Steyn, 2004). It persists in the form of 'racial reasoning' (Posel, 2001) or racial logic (Soudien, 2012), and it continues to structure people's lives, remaining a 'key marker of inequality – political, economic and social' (Bentley and Habib, 2008, p. 9). The subjectivities of students in this study are unavoidably influenced by these broader social preoccupations with race albeit often in unconscious ways. High levels of racial sensitivity and a widespread desire to avoid offence, or culpability – or at least to appear politically correct – often result in race appearing to 'go underground', as it were. This is frequently associated with discourses of colour-blindness which, while purporting to work within a post-race framework, have been severely criticised precisely for masking racialised power relations.

Therefore while it is imperative to engage with race in post-apartheid South Africa, we need to do so in ways do not simply reinscribe race but instead place it under erasure, in the deconstructionist sense. In other words, we need to see race as a concept that is fictional and inadequate but that we cannot yet manage without and therefore are compelled to deploy it in ways that call attention to its inadequacy. Such an approach necessarily rejects earlier, essentialist theories of race which saw it as a fixed, biological characteristic and gave rise to discourses used to justify large-scale social injustices such as colonialism, the holocaust and, of course, apartheid.

Current scholarship on race understands it as ‘a social construct, embedded in history and politics, with fluid and changing rather than fixed and given identities’ (Erasmus, 2008, p. 174). However, Soudien maintains that while suchscholarship has rendered race a nonsensical category, it has made very little impact on everyday views and uses of race. He thus argues for a dismantling of race and the development of ‘new political vocabularies’ (2012, p. 242) which would facilitate a post-race society while still engaging with oppression and exclusion. Certainly ongoing attention to social historically constructed racial inequalities would be needed for the myth of race as a biological category does not undo its enduring symbolic and material effects and much work would need to be done to dismantle the workings of race as ‘a fundamental principle of social organisation and identity formation’ (Omi and Winant, 2005, p. 5).

In apartheid South Africa, the fixing of identities was a political project of the state, with apartheid legislation being used to construct essentialist, homogeneous identity categories according to race. While the effects of such a system on people’s lived subjectivities are never fully deterministic, ‘it would be difficult to deny the extent to which the demarcation of South African society into whites, Indians, coloureds, and Africans has been normalized – for many, a ‘fact’ of life’ (Posel, 2001, p. 109). In addition, race categories remain at the forefront of many social transformation initiatives, for example race-based affirmative action and Black Economic Empowerment (BEE, or now BBBEE, Broad-based Black Economic Empowerment), both of which address the need for racial redress. Thus despite the many cautionary discussions on proceeding with ‘seamless continuity’ (Maré, 2001, p. 89) from the race categories of the apartheid past to race categories of the post-apartheid present (see, for example, Maré, 2001; Posel, 2001), it would seem that race categories remain necessary both to implement and measure the success of social redress.

It is thus unsurprising that race emerges as a salient discursive category in the data analysis, even when this occurs through various proxy forms such as culture, language, or class. Durrheim et al (2011) argue that racial dynamics have become increasingly complex under the new democratic dispensation, maintaining that

> transformation in South Africa has reshaped patterns and practices of encounter and exchange between historically defined race groups… Race continues to feature prominently in these new forms of social interaction and, by participating in them, South Africans are cast once again as racial subjects, advantaged or disadvantaged, included or excluded, colonisers or colonized (p. 24).

However, identity work in contemporary South Africa cannot be reduced to race since race 'is never the whole story about who we are as individuals and as members of communities' (Soudien, 2007b, p. xii). It is here that the notion of intersectionality becomes particularly useful. It dovetails with the poststructuralist theories of subjectivity by attending to the ways in which multiple identity locations intersect, working with or against one another in dynamic, open-ended ways. Viewed in this light, subjects who occupy the same racial locations can have vastly different experiences of the same kinds of things – such as schooling, crime or HIV/AIDS for example – based on their different classed, ethnic and gendered locations. This is so even while these locations may always be overlain with race and its particular power differentials. For this reason, it is important not to minimise the ongoing significance of race but rather to complicate its workings. I attempt to do this by adopting an approach which highlights intersectionality and seek to complicate race by drawing on the concepts of culture, ethnicity and whiteness.

Culture and ethnicity are concepts that resist easy definition and need to be approached with caution. Both have suffered from problematic historical and political usage in South Africa and continue to be susceptible to being understood as operating in fixed, essentialist ways themselves or of being tied to notions of authenticity. Despite this, there are reasons why it may be useful to rehabilitate, in the current South African context, notions of culture and ethnicity. Both notions can be fruitfully used to deconstruct race and challenge the homogeneity often ascribed to different, 'naturally-occurring' race groups (Sharp, 1988). This, of course, is only the case if culture is conceived of not as mapping neatly onto discrete race groups but instead as a socially constructed and fluid boundaries whereby members of a group have come to 'observe, learn and finally internalise the rituals and habits of speech, the dispositions and dress of the bodies and modes of though to the extent that they become entirely automatic and unconscious' (Thornton, 1988, p. 27). It is the fact that these groups do not map neatly onto perceived racial differences that enables them to work against ideas of racial homogeneity, challenging thinking that conceives of 'all black people', or 'all white people', as having the same 'culture'. It would however be necessary to remain alert to the conflation of race and culture (Gaganakis, 2004), particularly when notions of 'cultural differences' are used to justify new forms of racism (Gilroy, 1993).

The concept of ethnicity too is often regarded with suspicion either because of being seen as potentially divisive for the nation state or because of the obvious problems of

ethnic separatism and ethnocentrism (Gilroy, 1993). In the case of South Africa, it suffers from the additional problem of having been historically tainted through its use as a political tool of the previous regime. Part of the apartheid government's divide-and-rule strategy over the black majority was its exploitation of ethnic differences that have subsequently been exposed as being 'partially invented, reinforced and entrenched by Apartheid' (Adam, 1994, p. 25). The deployment of state-constructed ethnic divisions, or 'ethnicity from above' (Pieterse, 1992) is most clearly evident in the way in which ethno-regional identities were used to justify the homeland policy (Sharp, 1988; Zegeye, 2001). In order to counteract this and develop solidarity among the oppressed majority, the liberation movement had to sidestep ethnicity and mobilise around a common black/African identity. Making the move back into different ethnic identities thus needs to be treated with caution because by speaking of a 'coloured' or 'isiXhosa' ethnic identity we run the danger of 'invok[ing] racial/biological claims to difference' (Soudien, 2012, p. 14).

But that need not be the case if one works with a dynamic and multifaceted definition of ethnicity. Hall proposes that ethnicity needs to be redefined in new ways which work with hybridity and difference rather than attempting to suppress it. Ethnicity, as he works with it, is discursively constructed and 'acknowledges the place of history, language and culture in the construction of subjectivity and identity' (1992b, p. 257). Culture and ethnicity thus provide us with ways of thinking about differences that are historically, culturally and politically constructed – and that are overlain with race but are not about race alone. Such an approach is useful in the context of this research project for it necessitates that race be constantly thought about alongside other features of identity.

A considerable number of students participating in this project are white (17 out of 46); they constitute the majority in one of the classes (16 out of 22); moreover the school with the predominantly black class could be classified as 'former' white schools, an issue that I discuss further in the following chapter. It is thus necessary to consider the various ways in which white cultural practices may operate normatively in these environments and what implications this may have for students' subjectivities. According to recent research on white students' identities in South Africa (McKinney, 2004a), it would appear that white students seldom interrogate – or even show awareness of – their subject positions as white and, in this case, privileged South Africans. One of the central aims of Whiteness Studies, a rapidly growing area of scholarship, particularly in the United States (McIntosh, 1988;

Frankenberg, 1993; Fine, 1996; Dyer, 1997), is to interrogate white racial identity by exposing 'the ideological practices that render white privilege invisible' (Twine & Gallagher, 2008). This requires the taken-for-granted cultural capital of whiteness and its unearned nature to be challenged.

Within this vein, research on whiteness in South Africa (Steyn 2001, 2003, 2005, 2008, 2012) has shown that the loss of political supremacy has destabilised whiteness and left it in need of reconstruction. The variety of ways in which this is being tackled by white South Africans demonstrates the heterogeneity of white positionality (2001). There are a number of analytical concepts which Steyn has provided which are useful for understanding some of the discursive manoeuvring students carry out in relation to (not) taking up their subject positions as white South Africans. Firstly, Steyn argues that white South Africans occupy a position of 'diasporic whiteness' by virtue of their simultaneous positions of marginality and centrality – with the former relating to their dislocation from European 'centres of identification' (2005, p. 124) and the latter alluding to the taken-for-granted privileged positionality of whiteness. Secondly, she looks at how 'white talk' is deployed as 'a resistant and flexible set of ideologically-charged discursive strategies which attempt to perpetuate privilege into the new dispensation while paying careful attention to self-presentation' (2003, p. iii). This white talk is characterised by, *inter alia*, strategic anti-essentialism, a privileging of the global over the local, a refusal of the past, and a tendency to Afro-pessimism (2005). Thirdly, she draws attention to the strategic deployment of 'ignorance' by white South Africans to shield them from the realities of the racial order and to enable its ongoing reproduction (2012).

It bears reminding that much of Steyn's work focuses on resistant whiteness and is not purporting to be typical of white South Africans in general. There are always many ways of being white. Despite this, however, the resilience of whiteness and its ability to change and constantly re-position itself to its own advantage is nevertheless striking, and it seems clear that in South Africa there is a pressing need to interrogate whiteness in a principled and intellectually rigorous way. I therefore seek to contribute to work already being done on how whiteness is being re-made in the formal and informal places of schooling (Soudien 2007a, 2007b, 2010, 2012; Dolby 2000, 2001a, 2001b).

2.3.2 Class, race and place

The intersection between race and class has always been, and in many ways continues to be, at the centre of debates about the social order in South Africa, and has particular relevance to schooling. In the previous chapter I discussed how the racial inequalities of the apartheid education system have increasingly given way to class inequalities which continue to be strongly racialised. This leaves us with an education system that has officially undergone a legislative process of racial desegregation that has, on the whole, not resulted in racial integration.

Because apartheid was also a spatial engineering project (Shephard and Murray, 2007, p. 5), apartheid geographies have been deeply inscribed into the landscape and lingering forms of racial segregation continue to be able to be read off the geographic and social terrain. Particular races belonged in (and did not belong in) particular residential areas – and thus in particular schools corresponding to those areas. Whose bodies can move in and through which spaces is now largely a matter of class mobility, although again still overlain with race. These historically constructed spatial locations are also discursive, making the relationship between place and identity a significant one. Thus the intersectionality between race, place and class is interesting to consider in relation to students' subjectivities.

Under apartheid, the discussion about the relationship between race and class, or the 'race-class debate' (Posel,1983), generally recognised that apartheid and capitalism were inextricably linked but opposing sides of the debate prioritised different terms in the debate and thus proposed different routes to liberation. One side believed that racist ideologies were at the root of apartheid and thus people should mobilise around an expanded black racial consciousness to overthrow white supremacy. The other side held that capitalist structures were at the root of apartheid because it was fundamentally a system of economic exploitation of the (black) masses which drew on racist ideologies to justify this exploitation (Wolpe, 1988); thus the 'struggle to destroy white supremacy is ultimately bound up with the very destruction of capitalism itself' (Slovo 1976, cited in Durrheim et al, 2011, p. 68). The fact that liberation in 1994 took a political rather than an economic form has implications for the subsequent realignment that has occurred between race and class.

Because post-1994 there has been no significant shift in economic policy, inequalities are proving resistant to change (Seekings and Nattrass, 2006). Economic policies under apartheid were designed to support a privileged minority and to entirely negate

a disenfranchised majority – with race serving 'as a mechanism to select who gets to be privileged' (Seekings and Nattrass, 2006, p. 34). The distributional regime was structured around privilege and insiders and outsiders were defined along racial lines. While the middle and upper classes have now significantly deracialised (because insiders and outsiders are no longer defined in terms of race), poverty and unemployment have worsened. The system designed to protect all employed whites (i.e. all whites, since job reservation ensured that all whites were employed) has been extended to protect all employed blacks but is unable to provide for the growing mass of unemployed (black) people that is forming an underclass suffering acute disadvantage. There is therefore considerable continuity between pre- and post-1994 class relations, particularly in relation to the perpetuation of white privilege, since

> 'the very success of this [apartheid] regime in advantaging white people allowed the basis of exclusion to shift from race to class: white South Africans acquired the advantages of class that allowed them to sustain privilege in the market and ceased to be dependent on continued racial discrimination' (Seekings and Nattrass, 2006, p. 6).

What are the implications of this for subjectivity, particular those of young people in de(re)segregated classrooms? While racial segregation has occurred unevenly, the emergence and growth of the black middle class as well as of the black elite represent the most conspicuous pattern of social mobility occurring in South Africa over the past decade or so. The kinds of schools in which this research takes place are thus precisely the kinds of sites where the ongoing middle class project is underway (Soudien, 2004). For these students, therefore, the nexus between their abstract metaphorical locations in the South African sociopolitical landscape (i.e. their positions as raced and classed subjects) and their literal locations in this physical landscape (i.e. where they live(d), where they go to school, etc.) functions discursively as a site of identity construction. Simply put, students inhabit and move through various spaces which they relate to in ways which are shaping of – and shaped by – who they are. The relationship between place and identity, overlain as it is with race and class, is therefore of significant interest.

The construct of 'place-identity' as developed by Dixon and Durrheim (2000) is a useful theoretical tool for analysing the ways in which the discursively constituted subject is spatially located. This locatedness produces both a sense of belonging to particular places as well as discursively constructing and legitimating particular social practices in and relations to those places. Explorations of place-identity thereby aim to 'disclose the links between constructions of place-identity and relations of power' (Dixon andDurrheim, 2000, p. 33). Such a construct taps directly into the enduring

nature of apartheid geographies. Johannesburg, as an apartheid city, is seen as the result of the 'spatial framing of race and the fixing of social forms in space aimed at creating an essentially white suburban city' (Mbembe and Nuttall, 2008, p. 20). Moreover, the post-apartheid city continues to embody the enduring divisions between city, suburb and township 'that characterise lines of wealth and poverty, access to resources, forms of exclusion, crime and violence, and many other aspects of life' (Shepherd and Murray, 2007, p. 6).

Within the framework of a study whose research participants live in Johannesburg and, collectively, have ties to both the townships and the suburbs, how these areas are imagined and re-imagined have a bearing on these young people's subjectivities and senses of place. Discussions about crime and fear of crime, for example, are strongly framed by racialised perceptions of differences between townships and suburbs. The point has been made that being from a particular place organises references to other places, and 'organises the moral economy by means of which judgements of people and activities [related to particular places] are made' (Blommaert, 2005, p. 222). Thus while a growing body of scholarship and autobiographical writing is challenging stereotyped portrayals of crime-ridden, impoverished townships (see for example, Murray, 2004; Matlapeng, 2005; Mbembe, Dlamini & Khunou, 2008; Bremner, 2008; and Dlamini, 2009), and attempting to dismantle the township/suburb binary (Mbembe and Nuttall, 2008), these perceptions endure. This suggests that spatial desegregation has not yet been significant enough to meaningfully undo racialised perceptions of place which seem likely to be tied to constructions of self and other.

This is borne out by research which demonstrates that spatial practices are still racialised in post-apartheid South Africa and continue to be structured through racialised discourses of belonging and exclusion (Dixon et al, 1994; Dixon, 1997; Dixon et al, 2005; Durrheim, 2005; Tredoux et al, 2005). Durrheim (2005) argues that 'desegregation is not a simple event, according to which black and white attitudes can be measured, but is a set of spatio-temporal social practices in which blacks and whites are differently implicated' (455-456). Accordingly, he maintains that lived experiences of desegregation are highly contrasting, with whites experiencing desegregation as 'invasion' and dislocation, and blacks experiencing it as entering into spaces that were previously off-limits and 'witnessing whites running away' (455). Research on spatial segregation, crime and suburban security is not limited to South Africa (see, for example, Caldeira, 1996; McCarthy et al, 1997; Davis, 1998; Keith

2005) but the post-apartheid experience of spatial desegregation has generated a considerable amount of attention among local researchers (Dixon et al 1994; Dixon 1997; Bremner, 1998; Hook & Vrdoljak, 2002; Czeglédy, 2003; Jürgens et al, 2003; Ballard, 2004a, 2004b, 2005). Ballard (2005) has argued that white suburban residents have sought to generate racialised comfort zones by withdrawing into gated communities in a movement he has termed 'semigration'. Such communities – various referred to as 'fortress architecture' (Czeglédy, 2003); 'ghettos', 'ethnic enclaves' (Jürgens et al, 2003) and 'bunkers for the psyche' (Ballard, 2005) – are seen as a response to the encroachment of informal settlements and rising levels of crime. Crime is widespread and responses to it typically range from the 'militarized laagerization' in affluent suburbs to vigilantism in poor communities (Dawson, 2006, p. 137). While statistics continue to indicate that black South Africans are more likely to be the victims of crime than whites (Durrheim et al 2011), discourses of crime, particularly in relation to the media, routinely portray white people as prime targets. Perhaps of even greater discursive significance than crime itself is the fear of crime which, Dawson (2006) contends, is a 'coded form of racial discourse', arguing that 'with the demise of formal apartheid and its official racist lexicon, the discourses of crime and security have become the primary conceptual frame through which the economically hegemonic white minority represents national culture' (132). Students' subjectivities are thus classed, raced and placed in complex and shifting ways which are at times discernible in the talk and texts that they produce hence the need for this particular conceptual lens.

2.3.3. Nation, history and reconciliation

The notions of nation, history and reconciliation require some discussion because this project can, in some ways, be seen as an attempt to understand how these students construct and represent – to themselves and to others – their national identities. Being located within the post-apartheid 'moment', these identities are automatically historicised. While the students themselves are too young to have their own memories of life under apartheid, the narrative of the apartheid past has been conjured for them in a myriad of different ways – through the media, through the collective memories of families and communities and other affiliations, through school curricula – and they therefore have their own ideas and positions on it which pre-exist their engagement with this research. At the intersection of nation and subjectivity lies national identity, and subject positions taken up in relation to narratives of the recent past have a role to play in the construction of an individual's national identity.

In discussing nation, I am drawing on Anderson's notion of nations as 'imagined communities' (2006). While this idea has been critiqued for representing nations as horizontal communities and not devoting sufficient attention to the political domain or to differences in power (Chipkin, 2007; Lomnitz, 2000), the idea that we belong to a community most of whose members we shall never know or meet face-to-face yet hold in mind as fellow-members remains a useful way of conceptualizing national identity. Thus 'people participate in the *idea* of the nation' (Hall, 1996, 612; original italics), even as the meanings of 'nation' remains fluid and open to ongoing re-definition.

Immediately after 1994, discourses of democracy and nation-building circulated strongly in the public domain, with the dominant impulse being to develop ways of overcoming the deep racial divisions of the past and imagining ourselves as a united, democratic nation. Certainly there were many symbols and metaphors that were used to develop a shared sense of national imagination, perhaps the first of which was dubbing the country the '*New* South Africa' with its metaphoric suggestions of the birth of a nation. In a manner characteristic of new dispensations, official symbols derived from the state stressed notions of unity, equality and reconciliation. These were evident in, for example, the new South African flag; the new anthem which fused *Nkosi Sikelel'iAfrika* and *Die Stem* in an effort 'to balance ethnic linguistic sensibilities' (Muller, 2001, p. 29) by drawing on multiple languages; and the new national coat of arms whose motto is inscribed in the Khoisan language of the /Xam people and means 'diverse people unite'.

After all, 'sounds and images, if numerous and powerful enough, can create a nation' (Coetzee, 2001, p. 353). In addition, Bishop Tutu coined the metaphor of South Africa as a 'Rainbow Nation' in an attempt to symbolise the ability of diversity to co-exist harmoniously. This idea has been seized upon and used not only 'as a tool to market the "new South Africa" to itself, and to international tourism' (Distiller and Steyn, 2004,p. 1) but also as a 'master metaphor… set to work to reverse the mindset of a population locked by its former masters into ethnic-political compartments' (Coetzee, 2001, p. 352). This discourse of rainbowism has been subject to critique for constructing a national unity that is 'based on the erasure of difference and the minimizing of the continuing effects of power differentials on members of the South African body politic' (Gqola, 2001, p. 100) and for being about 'polite proximities, about containment' (Nuttall and Michael, 2000, p. 6) while remaining premised on apartheid discourses of race and culture.

Despite the critique, the popularity of this metaphor in the public domain was enduring, in part because these were the Mandela years, characterised by their focus on social cohesion and reconciliation (Posel et al, 2001, p. xi). Indeed while Mandela continues to enjoy the status of a global icon embodying the values of forgiveness and reconciliation, his presidency has received critique for what has been perceived as a premature move towards reconciliation which left racial tensions undealt with and structural inequalities intact (Mda 1996, as cited in Gqola 2001). The question of reconciliation, however, was firmly on the national agenda from the start through the promulgation of the Promotion of National Unity and Reconciliation Act of 1995 which created the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC).

This research study required students to engage with the work of the TRC. Thus some background is necessary to contextualise the kinds of discourses that emerge in the section of the data that pertains to the TRC. Part of the rationale for the construction of the TRC was that given the severity and scale of the injustice and oppression under apartheid, the transition to democracy could only be effected if we collectively confronted our conflicted past and acknowledged past divisions rather than took refuge in amnesia. The mandate of the TRC was to establish as full a picture as possible of the atrocities committed under apartheid, specifically during the period from 1960 to 1994, while also striving to '"reconcile" previously warring factions, with histories of deep mutual suspicion' (Chipkin, 2002, p. 9) and thus participating in nation building. The process, however, is widely understood to have been 'born of a political compromise' (Mamdani, 1999, 33) since, in order to get the apartheid government to buy into it, amnesty was made available to perpetrators who fully disclosed their involvement in political atrocities. South Africa's TRC was not the first commission to be created using a transitional model of justice to facilitate regime change in the aftermath of a politically oppressive government. However, it remains one of the most elaborate and well developed examples worldwide (Parlevliet, 1999). Its success, however, was uneven as is made clear in the massive body of literature that has sprung up in its wake.

The TRC process was a long and complex one but for the purposes of this project it is the public hearings that are of greatest significance. Public hearings were held during which victims came forward to tell their stories of loss, degradation, suffering and death; and perpetrators came forward to disclose their involvement in apartheid violence, both physical and symbolic, and seek forgiveness. The process was underpinned by a Christian worldview in which the confession of one's sins and true

remorse is understood to lead to forgiveness and redemption and, under the leadership of Archbishop Desmund Tutu, this process 'often assumed the contours of a religious ritual', to use the words of Njabulo Ndebele (Krog, 1999, p. 17). The hearings received extensive daily media coverage across multiple media – television, radio, newspapers – making it very difficult for ordinary South Africans to avoid witnessing the unfolding events. Indeed one of the TRC's most significant achievements has been that in exposing to public scrutiny the scale of the violence, torture and murder perpetrated by the apartheid regime, 'it narrowed the range of impermissible lies that one can tell in public' (Ignatieff, 2001, p. 20) and thereby also managed 'to discredit apartheid in the eyes of its beneficiaries' (Mamdani, 1999, p. 40). In addition, it provided some closure for individuals or families that had questions about missing family members answered.

But there has also been extensive criticism on the failings of the Commission (Mamdani, 1999; Posel, 2001; Posel & Simpson 2001; Simpson 2001; Bell and Ntsebeza, 2003; Morris, 2004). By focusing narrowly on what was considered 'political' violence and specifically on acts that were considered gross human rights violations even under apartheid law, it left uninterrogated the everyday, structural violence perpetrated by the apartheid system. Concomitantly, the focus on individual acts and personal responsibility meant that apartheid was, as it were, let off the hook. Additionally, the reliance on simplistic moral binaries of 'victim' and 'perpetrator' was problematic for not only did this not engage adequately with the moral complexities of reality under apartheid but it also meant that the economic beneficiaries of apartheid were not confronted thus leaving historically entrenched inequalities undisrupted.

Using the TRC as a pedagogic device through which to encourage students to think of their identities in historicised ways means that the classroom space was opened up not only to ideas of nation building and reconciliation but also to a range of discourses on the past. One of the key aspects of the data analysis is understanding the ways in which students position themselves in relation to this past and how this shapes their subjectivities.

2.3.4 Globalisation, youth and popular culture

While this research has a strong local focus in that it is its situatedness – both temporally and spatially – in post-apartheid South Africa that is its core interest, it is essential to take into account the ways in which global flows are also inevitably at

play. In its most basic form, globalisation is about global connectivity, the ever-increasing networks and flows that occur transnationally, in relation to information, knowledge, capital, commodities, ideas and bodies (Tomlinson, 2007). We live in a 'networked society' (Castells, 2000) where new media and information technologies are shaping cultural change, and where the ability to communicate instantaneously across vast distances means that human interactions can occur in the simultaneity of time without requiring physical co-presence in space. One of the most significant aspects of the experience of globalisation is therefore the collapsing of conventional time/space and local/global boundaries (Harvey, 1989; Giddens, 1991; Castells, 2000). This necessitates a rethinking of borders or, in some ways, a partial erasure of the physical border of the nation state and a 'deterritorialisation'.

For the young people in this study, engaging with global society can take various forms, for example: awareness of so-called global issues and events of international significance (e.g. environmental issues, the economic recession); engagement with global forms of popular culture (e.g. celebrity culture, music); diasporic connections to other parts of the globe (e.g. families who have immigrated to/emigrated from South Africa); and international travel. I should like to emphasise, however, that I am not setting up a local/global binary, where the 'global' is seen as dominant geographic scale which influences the substantively different and geographically subordinate 'local' but wish instead to talk of the interpenetration of the local and the global.

Culture does not flow in a unilateral way from the 'centre' (i.e. America and other powerful western nations) to the 'periphery' (usually Africa, South America and other 'third world' areas). In fact, not only are 'global flows' multidirectional but the consumption of a globalised culture does not occur in wholesale, uncritical ways in local contexts but is modulated through selectivity, resistance and irony (Appadurai, 1996, p. 7). Globalisation is complex and contradictory process whose ebb and flow combines both homogenising and heterogenizing forces, resulting in a mingling of the global and the local in new forms of hybrid cultures (Storey, 2003, p. 112). Thus even when talking of 'local' youth culture, this is not 'a closed system of social relations but a particular articulation of contacts and influences drawn from a variety of places scattered, according to power relations, fashion and habit, across many different parts of the globe' (Massey, 1998, p. 124).

The point also needs to be made that participation in global culture is tied to material and economic conditions and is not able to be evenly taken up by all. Because of this 'global conditions of mobility are both affected by, and are instrumental in producing

and reproducing, class formation' (Rizvi 2005: 84). For example, the young people in this study all have access to global culture via television, newspapers and magazines; the majority also have access to the internet and other digital media and therefore can drawn on this additional type of connectivity; a more limited number would also be able to include global travel as part of their experience of other places. Thus, to a significant degree, socioeconomic class has a bearing on connectivity and access to global culture as well as on physical global (im)mobility.

The ways in which the process of global exchange opens up new spaces for young people to produce new identities – whether through literal geographical global mobility or through connecting with and moving through the cultural spaces of global flows – continues to be the subject of scholarly interest (see for example, Morley and Robbins, 1995; Skelton and Valentine, 1998; and Dolby and Rizvi, 2008). Young people in particular seem to be 'caught up in the continual circulation of global culture, through the media, movies, fashion, the Internet – their identities are now inextricably linked to the currents of modernity that flow across the world at the speed of a mouse click' (Suarez-Orozco and Qin-Hilliard 2004, quoted in Dolby and Rizvi, 2008, p. 5).

These global flows that facilitate the dual process of the consumption and production of popular culture are implicated in processes of subjectification and self-representation. Consumption can thus be seen as 'perhaps the most visible way in which we stage and perform the drama of self-formation' (Storey, 2003, p. 78). Within this framework, Bourdieu's work on distinction (1984) is frequently used to understand how socioeconomic class is linked to aesthetics of taste. He argues that preferences of taste are used to depict one's status and to distinguish or distance oneself from those of a lower socioeconomic class. From this perspective global consumer-media culture does not simply 'produce affective connections, longing and belonging, but also separation and distinction' (Kenway and Bullen, 2008, p. 19), and the consumption of culture can therefore be seen 'as a means to produce and to legitimate social difference, and to secure social deference' (Storey, 2012, p. 208).

A number of studies of youth culture in Johannesburg (Bogatsu, 2002; Farber, 2002; Motsemme, 2003; Nuttall, 2004, 2008; Nkuna, 2006) suggest that the aesthetics of taste, particularly with regard to self-presentation, are inflected in interesting ways not only by class but also by race. Motsemme argues that while new sartorial practices are participating in shifting social hierarchies by inserting the black female body into urban fashion production and consumption and displacing the conventional 'white look', they are also simultaneously remaking social distinctions among black women

(2003). Farber's research (2002) – and later Nuttall's (2004, 2008) – investigates the politics of identity underway at the Zone, a trendy, cosmopolitan semi-urban shopping area in Johannesburg, associated with the emergence of 'Y culture'. Farber maintains that the middle class black (and white) youth that 'hang out' there are largely depoliticised and have adopted a homogenised style of dress associated with globalised consumerist aesthetics, demonstrated in part through a heightened preoccupation with labels and logos. She argues, however, that for black youth this does not constitute assimilation to white youth culture but, in the context of the recent political emancipation of South Africa, this represents a form of 'conspicuous consumption that overrides any notion of either racial identity or national identity' (2002, p. 17) and represents instead an alignment with the middle class. Nuttall finds in Y culture intersections between the local and the global, reformulations of representations of the past, present and future as well as of the township and city, and crossover in cultural and racial codes. She argues that these urban, black, middle class youth are engaged in a process of self-stylisation which is intensely aspirational and driven by 'a remaking of the black body, its repositioning by the first postapartheid generation… [signalling] the supercession of an earlier era's resistance politics by an alternative politics of style and accessorization' (2008, p. 151). Importantly she also suggests that this preoccupation with the aestheticization of the self, may be an attempt to silence material conditions beyond the text of the self, a refusal 'to engage with the agony, conflict, and exploitation', pointing to a disconnect between the aspirational nature of Y culture and real material conditions (2004, p. 451). The point needs to be made, however, that the Zone is a highly exclusive, classed environment which breaks down easily into 'insiders' and 'outsiders' (Nkuna, 2006). In the absence of evidence to show the extent to which this emerging black youth culture is taken up beyond this circumscribed area, it is therefore important not to over-generalise these findings.

The ways in which popular culture can be articulated in the informal spaces of schooling has, however, been the subject of a seminal ethnographic study carried out by Nadine Dolby at Fernwood, a working class, co-educational, urban, multiracial school, in 1996, the early years of widespread desegregation. This was a school where the student body had become predominantly black rather rapidly, leaving the minority white students feeling displaced and marginalised. Within this shifting context where the official apartheid racial categories no longer held sway, Dolby shows that popular culture becomes a site of potential conflict as race is reinscribed as 'taste' in relation to students' tastes in music and clothing, fracturing along racial lines. Black

students show evidence of looking to and identifying with the kinds of practices engaged in by African-American sports and music celebrities, drawing on African-American hip-hop culture and, for the girls particularly, looking to the more expensive European fashions (2000; 2001b). The white students' style is distinctly different, being influenced by surfer and rave culture and overall more casual (2001b). Additionally, however, their feelings of displacement from their position of privilege result in their disconnecting from the local and 'suturing whiteness to techno music', a global practice associated with white youth (2001a, p. 13; 1999). This 'global whiteness' is not tied to identifications with the nation-state but converges on a broader international circulation of identity where whiteness, now locally under threat, is able to rearticulate and reassert itself. Notably, however, there are individual students who engage in border-crossing practices and work with the available identity position in more hybrid ways. The global popular thus emerges as a site for the negotiation and re-making of new identities, re-worked in response to the current moment and thus still inflected by race.

In this chapter I have outlined the poststructuralist framework that I use to theorise subjectivity and discourse, looking at the ways in which it draws on and goes beyond key Foucauldian concepts. I have then applied this theorising to the classroom space in order to prepare the groundwork for developing an understanding of the relationship between subjectivity and pedagogy, as this study attempts to do. Finally I grounded this theoretical discussion in space and time by locating it in the contemporary sociopolitical South African landscape. In the following chapter I discuss the research design and methods, showing how they are framed by the theory and shaped by the research questions.

3

METHODS

3.1 Research design

The aim of this research is to investigate students' engagement with a teaching intervention carried out as part of the Grade Eleven English (Home Language) curriculum by their own English teacher, making this empirical classroom-based research. The research design used is a case study approach using a qualitative methodology with some ethnographic tools.

The focus of the research is on how students position themselves and negotiate these subject positions in relation to the opportunities and demands of the teaching intervention. The case study approach, widely understood as an in-depth, holistic method of investigating a bounded contemporary phenomenon in a real-life context (Knobel and Lankshear, 1999; Yin, 2009), is therefore ideally suited to this type of classroom-based research. The students' discursive engagement with the teaching intervention is the phenomenon under investigation and the two Grade Eleven classrooms are the real-life contexts, making this a multiple case study. As Yin points out, the case study is particularly suited to a phenomenon whose 'understanding encompasse[s] important contextual conditions' (2009, p. 18). This is clearly the case with a study which investigates the relationship between subjectivity and pedagogy with each of the given classrooms constituting its own context and shaping the conditions of possibility in relation to each iteration of the teaching intervention.

As befits a case study approach, the phenomenon was investigated as it happened with the aim of generating a detailed, contextualised and multi-layered understanding

of the students' engagement in all its forms. In this way, the case study method is used to generate thick descriptions of the particular and to identify trends and patterns that could be useful 'for refining theory and suggesting complexities for further investigation' (Stake, 2000, p. 448) with regard to the relationship between subjectivity and pedagogy. It is thus an exploratory case study concerned with theory building (Yin, 2009, p. 178), aiming to be analytically generalisable in terms of its theoretical propositions and not statistically generalisable to a population. It makes no claims about understanding South African youth identities in general in relation to pedagogy but deals with the specific in order to generalise to the theoretical. For this study, the question is: using these classrooms, with these students and their socially located identities, what can we learn about the relationship between subjectivity and pedagogy?

Following Yin, I understand multiple case studies – specifically a 'two-case' case study, in this instance – as variants of the case study approach and as operating within the same methodological framework (2009, p. 53). Multiple case studies, however, are known to provide more extensive descriptions and explanations of the phenomenon under discussion and to produce evidence that is frequently more compelling than a single case study would. Ideally, therefore, a two-case case study should produce a more robust study and be capable of making more powerful analytical conclusions than the single case study (Wiebe et al, 2009; Yin, 2009).

It is, however, important to point out that this study does not employ a comparative case method which is understood to be a distinctive form of the multiple case study (Yin, 2009, p. 19). Each case is treated as a single case, having been conducted separately and analysed separately but cross-case presentation and/or discussion of the data is used when this is understood as speaking directly to key theoretical issues.

Two further reasons for the suitability of the case study method to this research project are the case study's reliance on multiple sources of evidence and its dependence on 'the prior development of theoretical propositions to guide data collection and analysis' (Yin, 2009, p. 18).The fact that this research is underpinned by a poststructuralist conception of subjectivity requires students to be provided with multiple opportunities to take up subject positions, and to be able to do so in a variety of different modes. This kind of classroom-based school research, though not as in-depth nor as extended over time as traditional ethnographic research, can nevertheless be enhanced by incorporating ethnographic tools into its research

design. By drawing on ethnographic elements, the need for behaviour and data to be seen as 'socially situated, context-related, context-dependent and context rich' (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2000, p. 137) is foregrounded as is the aim of rendering social behaviour comprehensible by eliciting sociocultural knowledge from participants. This is informed by an understanding of social realities as multiple, constructed, holistic and open to contradictory interpretations (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2000). The use of a number of data collection techniques commonly associated with ethnographic research – namely observations, interviews, and journals – is therefore an important aspect of this research.

Ultimately, it is important to retain an awareness that 'research constructs realities' (Knobel & Lankshear, 1999, p. 88) and that, as a critical researcher, it is imperative to question my own frames of reference (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2000, p. 303). And, with regard to the research imperative of generating meanings and understandings, it is necessary to acknowledge that this process is always partial and incomplete. As a researcher, humility is needed to understand that 'the whole story exceeds anyone's knowing, anyone's telling' (Stake, 2000, p. 441).

3.2 Research site and participants

3.2.1 Locating the research sites

As indicated in Chapter 1, my interest has been in investigating student subjectivity in schools that have desegregated, meaning that likely schools would be drawn from among former Model C schools and/or independent schools. Because this research is based on a teaching intervention that is designed by the researcher and taught by the Grade Eleven teacher of the class who is participating in the research, it seemed necessary to select the research site by identifying teachers who would be interested in participating.

Working with practising teachers in their classrooms tends to be a process that is as exciting as it is fraught with difficulties. Teachers are often stretched to the limit in terms of their teaching responsibilities, their administrative loads and their participation in extramural programmes. Since the mid-nineties in South Africa, this has been exacerbated by continuous waves of curriculum change and a growing dissatisfaction with teacher salaries and various aspects of teachers' working conditions. In addition to the usual demands made of teachers when their classroom practices are being researched, I needed to find teachers who were willing and able

to set aside three weeks of teaching time for this intervention. While this severely narrowed the playing field, the process of finding such teachers was facilitated by the earlier reconciliation study as well as by another project I had recently been involved in that had identified and interviewed teachers with an interest in reconciliation and inclusion (Zembylas, 2009).Nevertheless in the end it was only feasible to work with two teachers in two separate schools. In the section that follows, I introduce the two sites and the research participants.

3.2.2 Site 1

The school

Site 1 is a co-educational, state secondary school catering to approximately 1000 students. It is located in the eastern region of Johannesburg in a well-established middle class suburb, its feeder areas ranging from fairly high income areas through to mid-to-lower income areas. It is close to major routes in and out of Johannesburg and to Alexandra, a large township with particularly high levels of poverty. It is a former Model C school, having only opened its doors to students of all races in 1990. The medium of instruction has always been English, with Afrikaans and, more recently, IsiZulu offered as additional languages.

According to the teacher, in the early years of desegration, the student body remained predominantly white with small numbers of black students tending to be the children of returning exiles who were unable to afford the more expensive private schools in the area. In recent years the numbers of black students have increased steadily while those of white students have dropped as they have migrated to nearby schools which are perceived as ‘more white’ or have moved into the private schooling sector.

By 2008, the racial demographic of the student body was: 75% black; 12% white; 7% Indian. The student:teacher ratio was approximately 30:1 and the school consistently obtains a 100% matric pass rate, and boasts an extensive extra-mural programme which included multiple sports as well as a number of cultural activites. Alongside this, however, school facilities, from the computer centre to the palisade fencing, were in need of urgent upgrading and the school was making efforts to raise money via alternative means, such as its alumni.

According to the Principal, the difficulties the school was experiencing included discipline, a perceived lowering of standards and financial problems. At the time of

this research, the school fees were R8 800 per annum although a considerable percentage of the students were paying reduced fees. The Principal maintained that approximately 30% of the students were the children of domestic workers. In some cases, these parents – often single mothers – were paying as little as R100[3] per month for their children's fees; in other cases, these fees were being paid by the domestic worker's employees whose own children would often be attending the same school.

The teacher

The participating teacher, whom I have called Beverley, is a white female in her mid-40s with over 20 years of teaching experience, thirteen of which have been at this school. She considers herself privileged to have experienced the changing demographics of the student body, having taught during the apartheid era, during the transition period and now in the post-apartheid era. She sees herself as constantly striving to develop innovative ways of engaging the shifting and diverse body of students. She speaks with contained passion about her love for words and their power, and her efforts to find ways of connecting her students' lives to literary setworks and creative writing.

According to Beverley, the school is one of rich diversity. She points out that the School Governing Body is multiracial and multilingual, and that the students themselves are racially integrated, sitting at multiracial tables at formal social events and with inter-racial dating having become normalised over time. The school is also religiously diverse and caters to a broad spectrum of socioeconomic class.

The students

The Grade 11 class in which this research was conducted consisted of 24 students with slightly more female than male students (F: 14; M: 10), and ages ranging from 16 to 18 years of age. Twenty of the 24 students were black; 3 were Indian; and 1 was white. Fourteen students speak only one language at home: 4 IsiZulu; 3 English; 2 IsiXhosa; 2 Sepedi; 2 Setswana; 1 Sesotho. Ten students reported speaking only two or more languages at home and for 8 of these, English was one of those languages with the other language(s) being either an African language (Sesotho, Setswana, IsiZulu), Afrikaans, or another language (Hindi, Portuguese). The majority of students lived in one of the suburbs near the school (13); but a number of them (10) lived in a township, either Alex (5), Tembisa (3) or Soweto (2). One student lived in Hillbrow, a

[3] During the time of this fieldwork, in the second half of 2008, one hundred South African Rand would have been the equivalent of between US$10-12.

high density, urban area towards the city centre. The majority of students (15) had started at the school in Grade 8, their first year of high school and had come from feeder schools in the surrounding suburbs.

3.2.3 Site 2

The school

Site 2 is a private secondary school,for girls only, located in the affluent northern suburbs of Johannesburg. It was established in the mid-90s and has been open to students of all races since inception. While it is a religious school, enshrining those values in its mission and offering Religious Education as a subject, it has a strongly secular feel about it and is explicitly open to students of all religions. English is the medium of instruction and Afrikaans, IsiZulu, Sotho and French are offered as additional languages.

At the time of this research, the school was catering to about 500 students and had a student:teacher ratio of approximately 10:1. The student body comprised 80% white students and14% Black students, with Indian, Asian and Coloured students making up the remaining 6% in almost even numbers. Lali, the participating teacher, explained that the school was concertedly attempting to develop a more representative racial profile, particularly since diversity is a central aspect of its mission. An equity team exists at management level to attempt to racially diversify both the student body and the staff body, although the latter continues to have only a handful of non-white faculty members, most of whom teach African languages. Diversity workshops are frequently held for staff and issues of diversity are formally inserted into the curriculum.

The annual school fees at the time of this research amounted to just over R58 000. Full scholarships are available for students with potential from impoverished schools. In 2008, 16 students were on these scholarships. Emphasis is placed on academic excellence and the school markets itself as having South African roots yet working with global standards. It also has strong ties with global networks for international student exchange programmes. The school has extensive grounds with extensive facilities. It offers a range of sports, including water polo, horse riding, rowing and diving; offers cultural activities, such as debating and music; and has a strong community service ethos.

The teacher

The participating teacher, whom I have called Lali, is an Indian female in her mid-40s with over 25 years of teaching experience. Because she began her career when segregated schooling was still in place, her early teaching experiences were in Coloured and Indian schools. She also spent some time in Canada teaching English to adult immigrants, and since the opening up of schools, she has taught at both state and private schools. She has been teaching at this particular school for the past 6 years.

Lali believes that her experiences teaching a range of students in multiple contexts has given her a strong awareness of the importance of knowing who your students are.In her position as teacher, she values the part she plays in the shaping of the new generation by helping students clarify their identities and values. She frequently uses literary texts as a way of engaging students with controversial issues, stimulating healthy debate by encouraging students to voice their opinions and to listen to one another. She makes the point, however, that one has to be mindful of all students and their various perspectives when dealing with sensitive issues, such as South Africa's recent past, particularly since one may have in one classroom students whose parents were historically on different sides of the conflict.

The students

The Grade 11 class in which this research was undertaken consisted of 22 students, all of whom were female. Most of them were 17 years old at the time, although five were still 16 years of age still. Sixteen of the 22 students were white; 3 were black; 2 were Asian and 1 was coloured. Of the 16 students who indicated that they spoke a single language at home, 10 spoke English; 5 Afrikaans and 1 Sesotho. The remaining 6 students spoke English as well as at least one other language, namely Mandarin (2); Afrikaans (2); Setswana (1); Shona (1); and Spanish (1). Most of the students lived in suburbs around or near the school, although some (4) lived in areas further afield. In all cases these were either well established, affluent suburbs or newer residential areas to the north of the city which cater to the growing upper middle classes. Almost all the students started their first year of high school at this school, having attended primary schools in the area; 15 students attended private primary schools and 7 attended state primary schools.

3.3 The teaching intervention

3.3.1 The outline of the lessons

The teaching intervention was designed to take about three weeks and require approximately 9 lessons. The following steps comprise the broad outline of theselessons. See **Appendix A1** for a more detailed outline provided to teachers.

Step 1: Introductory discussion on identity
The work began with the teacher asking students to engage with issues of identity in relation to the contemporary South African moment. Whole-class discussion is followed by a journal-writing task where students respond to a designated question.

Step 2: The TRC & briefing on interviews
After eliciting any previous knowledge that the students may have of the TRC, the teacher uses a handout containing information and commentary on the TRC to introduce it formally. I designed this handout for a similar activity in the earlier reconciliationstudy. See **Appendix A2**.

Students are then briefed on their interview task which requires them to gather general perceptions about the TRC from adult members of their communities. The briefing sheet provides students with a number of pre-set interview questions. See **Appendix A3.**

Step 3: Students reporting on TRC interviews
Students share their interview experiences in an informal whole-class discussion.

Step 4:Students discuss relevance of the TRC (class discussion)
Students discuss their responses to the question of whether or not the TRC is still relevant today to them and their generation.

Step 5: Re-connecting to the 'now'
The teacher generates a class discussion designed to make the shift from the TRC work, which has focused on the recent past, to the present and the contemporary lifeworlds of the students. A handout on 'The youth today…' was designed for the purposes of facilitating this discussion. See **Appendix A4**.

Step 6: Designing youth posters
Students are briefed on working in pairs to design a youth poster that uses both words and images to capture what it is like to be a young person in South Africa

today. They are instructed to use the space multimodally, drawing on whatever design aspects best suit them. See **Appendix A5.**

Step 7: Presentations of youth posters
Students present their posters to their teacher and peers, describing and explaining the meanings of their designs.

Step 8: Final written reflection
The teacher provides students with a final question to be answered in their journals. This question was left relatively open-ended in order to be able to be responsive to the way in which the unit of work unfoldeds in each site.

3.3.2 Why the English classroom?

This unit of work hasa multidisciplinary flavour, due in part to its origins as collaborative work done by teachers and researchers drawn from the disciplines of Art, History and English. There are, however, several reasons why it was important for this particular incarnation of it to be carried out in the English classroom, despite its continued interest in history and on the TRC in particular.

Firstly, a core objective was to investigate the extent to which the subjectivities of these young people are historicised by closely considering, among other things, their positionings on the recent past. By Grade Eleven, History is an elective subject and therefore a History classroom would be unlikely to provide access to a broad range of everyday attitudes to history among the youth. It was also important, for the purposes of this research, not to work with formal, textbook notions of History which foreground historical facts and figures but instead to work with the idea of history as lived experience captured informally in the everyday memories and narratives of ordinary individuals. In this vein, the TRC functions not as a historical event intended for formal, in-depth study but asa marker for South Africa’s recent past. For these reasons, it seemed more suitable to engage students in ways that were not directly tied to the formal History curriculum.

Secondly, the English classroom – or, in principle, any 'Home Language' classroom – seemed ideally suited to this work because of its focus on multiple modes of making and conveying meaning (interviews, discussions, multimodal artefacts, oral presentations and journal writing); its deployment of key skills in the English curriculum (listening, speaking, multimodal design and writing); and its focus on

classroom talk and interaction. Discussions have a particular status in the English classroom since they are important means of developing students'thinking and argumentation skills. A subject in which discussion and debate are seen as ends in themselves is thus ideally suited for the an exploration of positioning and an analysis of classroom talk and texts.

A word on embedded pedagogies

While it is the pedagogy that is enacted during the course of the teaching intervention that is of central interest to this study, it is important to acknowledge that pedagogic principles are already implicit in the design of the teaching intervention and are inevitably embedded in the activities and classroom materials.

A core pedagogic principle is the idea that learning occurs through action and interaction. The predominance of discussion-based lessons is intended to generate maximum interaction and debate. Open-ended discussion where students are encouraged to think through and articulate their stances of various issues are a key feature of the teaching intervention.

This valuing of multiple perspectives is evident in the classroom materials. The introductory handout on the TRC combines multiple, conflicting viewpoints on the TRC; while the handout on 'The youth today…' also gathers multiple text types which represent the youth in a range of different ways. In both cases these handouts are intended to signal that no single 'correct' perspective exists on these issues and to encourage students to construct their own position.

The activities students are required to carry out are also significant. The gathering of oral narratives from the community in the form of interviews on the TRC constructs students as agentive researchers (Egan-Robertson and Bloome, 1998) and places their communities' funds of knowledge (Moll et al, 1992; Gonzalez et al 2005) at the centre of the classroom curriculum. The task of designing a multimodal poster constructs students as producers of their own artefacts and later as presenters of their own products. In both cases, students are given the floor and asked to report back on or present their work.

It bears reminding, however, that the implicit pedagogy of the unit of work is necessarily subject to interpretation and mediation by the teacher and that this plays itself out differently in the two classrooms.

3.4 Data collection techniques and instruments

The primary methods of collection are classroom observation, interviews and artefact collection. These are supplemented by the collection of student journals.

3.4.1 Classroom observation

In keeping with the need to understand social behaviour, including teaching and learning, as deeply contextualised, my observation of teacher and students in interaction with one another and in relation to the content and pedagogy of the planned teaching intervention is of pivotal importance. Although I did not participate in any of the discussions or activities, I am mindful that my presence in the classroom is likely to have had an impact on the interaction that takes place (Swann, 1994) and that this renders the distinction between 'observer' and participant observer' ambiguous. Nevertheless, it has also been noted that after a period of time patterns of interaction stabilise as the research participants become accustomed to being observed (Robson, 1993).

Various tools have been used to record observations.

Video recordings: All the lessons that form part of the planned teaching intervention were video recorded. In each classroom, a video camera was placed in a stationary position in one of the front corners of the classroom. Although a static camera provided limited access to facial expressions and gestures, it nevertheless made the process of transcribing open discussions with multiple participants possible and obviated the difficulty of discerning different voices from audio recordings. Every lesson was transcribed in full in order to be able to discern positioning patterns and shifts over the course of the entire teaching intervention before selections for in-depth analysis were made.

Field notes: The video recorded data was complemented with field notes written 'in the heart of the moment' (Knobel & Lankshear, 1999, p. 92). This enabled me to make observations and preliminary interpretative comments *in situ*. These field notes captured both description and interpretation of key moments of classroom discussion and interaction and were helpful pointers as to which classroom moments were most significant to the research and the most likely to be selected for analysis.

3.4.2 Artefact collection

The texts produced by students during the course of the teaching intervention constitute artefacts for data analysis.

Youth poster: The activity requiring students to design a multimodal youth poster generated the main student-produced artefact.
Student journals: Student writing was required in response to a limited number of designated questions at key moments during the teaching intervention. Students were also informed that if they felt so inclined, they could also use this informal space for spontaneous writing that emerges in response to any aspect of the teaching intervention but this suggestion was not taken up.

3.4.3 Interviews

While I view interviewing as an important method of data collection in this research project, I am mindful that 'interviews are not neutral tools of data gathering but active interactions between two (or more) people leading to negotiated, contextually based results' (Fontana & Frey, 1998, p. 62). For this reason, interview transcripts were subjected to the kind of reflexive and discursive analysis that is in keeping with the overall poststructuralist orientation of the study.

Semi-structured teacher interviews: I conducted two in-depth interviews with each teacher – one before the teaching intervention and one after. The pre-intervention interviews were conducted in order elicit relevant biographical information from the teacher, basic information about the school, about each of the Grade 11 classes who participated in this research, as well as each teacher's pedagogic orientations and comments and/or input on the planned teaching intervention. See **Appendix B1** for the pre-intervention teacher interview schedule. In each case, the post-intervention interview was conducted quite soon after the end of the intervention and was designed to capture each teacher's response to the intervention, in particular her experience of pedagogy of the intervention as well as her reading of her students' engagement with it. See **Appendix B2** for the post-intervention teacher interview protocol. All interviews were audio recorded and transcribed.

Informal interactions with teachers during the course of the teaching intervention were captured in my field notes and researcher's journal.

Focus-group student interviews: Once the teaching intervention and classroom observation was concluded, I conducted three focus-group interviews in each site. Each focus group consisted of four to six students. In the vein of focus group interviews, the attention was on the interaction among the participants and the approach was one of dialogue and sharing rather than of interviewing (Jayanthi & Nelson, 2002). The interview schedule (see **Appendix B3**) consisted of a limited number of open-ended questions. These questions were designed so as to provide opportunities to clarify issues which emerged during the research process as well as to provide space for students to reflect on salient aspects of the teaching intervention and share their responses and insights with me in a less formal, 'extracurricular' context. These multiple participant interviews were video recorded with the camera in a stationary position in the corner of the room.

All students were also asked to complete a brief questionnaire gathering demographic information (see **Appendix B4**).

3.5 Data analysis methods

This study produces an interpretative analysis of classroom data using discourse analytic tools informed by the poststructuralist theory that underpins it. As I have argued earlier, the methods and tools used for data collection, including the case study design, are not inherently aligned to a particular theoretical framework but require the selection of a suitable theoretical framework in order to guide the data collection and analysis (Yin, 2009, p. 18). Given the research focus, it has been important to gather a range of data, often in different modes, which provides multiple snapshots of students' varied and shifting subject positions. Nevertheless, even data that starts off as audiovisually recorded talk is ultimately transformed via the process of transcription into written text, hence the predominantly 'linguistic character of field data' (Silverman, 2000, p. 340). This should not suggest, however, that I am working with a linguistic notion of discourse for I continue throughout to use the term in the Foulcauldian sense, in keeping with my theoretical framework.

While poststructuralist theories on subjectivity and discourse underpin the research questions and research design, it is in the data analysis that this theoretical framework is most strongly evident. The data analysis constitutes, in effect, a particular 'reading' of the classroom practices and interactions occurring in the two designated classrooms. I am mindful of the fact that 'the same event can be read in different ways' (Baker, 1991, p. 6), depending on the analytical lens that is applied.

My aim is thus not to suggest that my reading, effected through the lens of poststructuralist discourse theory, is the only possible reading but to be explicit about how this reading is effected and to elaborate on what insights it provides about the relationship between subjectivity and pedagogy. In the ensuing section, I outline how this framework shapes my general orientation to all of the data. I then discuss how particular types of data are subjected to particular methods of analysis which, in some cases, include drawing on methods that are neither qualitative nor conventionally associated with poststructuralist orientations to data. As I will show, however, even when multiple tools of analysis are deployed these are always inevitably subsumed by a poststructuralist epistemology.

3.5.1 The poststructuralist orientation to analysing the data

The discursively constructed subject lies at the heart of this analysis and thus a Foucauldian orientation to classroom interactions enables me to ask the following kinds of questions of my data:

- What kinds of discourses are in circulation in the classroom space?
- How do these discourses determine available subject positions?
- What are the conditions of possibility that give rise to these discourses?
- How do the ways in which these discourses are deployed produce effects of power?
- How do different deployments of these discourses produce different possibilities for subjectivity?

In order to break down and extend some of these questions, I draw strongly on the framework that Davies provides for 'looking at the detail of classroom practice from a poststructuralist perspective' (1994, p. 45), reproduced in Table 3.1 below.

Table 3.1 Davies's framework for poststructuralist analysis of classroom practice

- What kind of context are the participants creating for one another?
- How are they positioning each other in that context?
  - What positions or subject positions are available?
  - How are those positions created and maintained?
- Where does the authority lie? Where there is a text being used, what is the relation between teacher and textual authority?
- How is experience made relevant?
- What binary or dualistic thinking is evident in their discursive practices?
- Are gender, race, class or other relations visible in the text of this classroom? What types of identities are being made available in relation to any of these?*

- What storylines are being made relevant?
- What discourses are mobilised:
  - in the content of the teacher's talk?
  - in the content of the students' talk?*
  - in the teacher's pedagogical and interactive practices?
- Whose interests are being served by each of these discourses?

** These points have been adapted or added in order to more directly address the interests of this research study, namely, a broader focus than gender relations and a focus on student talk.*

These questions, and others like them, are what enable my theoretical framework to also function as an analytical framework. The process of data analysis consisted of multiple readings of transcripts and artefacts, conducted over extended periods of time during which I directed and re-directed these questions at the data with a view to looking for patterns and ruptures in the ways in which students took up subject positions in the pedagogic space of the classroom.

While this approach is evident throughout all three chapters of data analysis, it is most apparent in Chapter 4. In this chapter students' positionings on history are analysed with the aim of understanding the extent to which they see their identities as being inflected by their sociohistorical locations. Transcripts of classroom discussions form the primary data which is analysed in terms of discourses mobilised and subject positions taken up. The analysis is done in a multi-layered way which eschews easy closure and allows a multiplicity of positions to co-exist. Secondary data drawn from student focus group discussions and journals is drawn on where necessary to extend and even potentially disrupt some of the patterns that emerge in the class discussion.

While this kind of approach is adopted with all the data presented in this study, Chapters 5 and 6 also employ additional types of analyses to suit the form which the data takes, as I explain below.

3.5.2 Analysing a multimodal artefact

A central task of the unit of work was students' production of a multimodal artefact in the form of an A3-sized poster in which they used a combination of words and images to work in the genre of the collage. In order to properly engage with the ways in which a multimodal artefact can represent discourses and subject positions, I draw on the work done by Gunther Kress and colleagues on multimodal discourses (Kress 1993, 2000; Kress and Van Leeuwen, 1996, 2001; Jewitt, 2006). Multimodality offers an approach that extends beyond linguistic texts and attends to 'the prominent role of

visual and other “non-linguistic” semiotic resources’ (Jewitt, 2006, p. 16). Kress and Van Leeuwen make the point that ‘[a]ny discourse may be realised in different ways… [y]et discourses can only be realised in semiotic modes which have developed the means for realising them’ (2001, p. 5). Thus the process of selecting and using available resources to make meaning is a process of (re)design during which students draw on available representational resources, recombining them to generate particular subject positions. An aspect of this analysis involves visual content analysis which involves the coding of multiple visual and verbal images in order to ascertain their frequency. Despite introducing this quantitative aspect, I argue, following Rose (2001), that this type of analysis is inevitably interpretative from the start and, in this case, is used primarily as a starting point for the deeper qualitative discursive analysis which follows.

3.5.3 Analysing oral presentations of the multimodal artefact

The second part of the poster task involves the students presenting and explaining their posters to the class. Here Lillis’s notion of ‘talk around the text’ (2001, 2008) is particularly helpful in framing the analysis of this presentation according to three levels. In the first instance the poster talk is understood as being an authentic and meaningful explanation of the poster by its makers; in the second instance, it is seen as functioning as further terrain for the discursive construction of identity; and, in the third instance, it is understood as also being performative and thus as being strongly shaped by the discourses of the pedagogic space in which it takes place. The value in this approach to the analysis of the poster talk is that it treats the presentation of the poster as a distinct discursive event thus allowing for the emergence of meanings, discourses and subject positions that may not have been evident in the analysis of the poster as multimodal artefact.

Chapter 5 is devoted to the analysis of the multimodal artefact and its presentation to the class. It begins with an analysis of the poster as multimodal artefact, drawing on various (visual) content analysis techniques, and then undertakes a more discursive analysis of the students’ poster talks. In this way, the chapter attempts to understand the shifts and ruptures that occur between the predominantly visual mode of the poster collage and the verbal mode of the poster talk and their implications for subjectivity, particularly within the discursive structure of the poster task.

3.5.4 Analysing moment-by-moment classroom talk

The final type of data analysis undertaken in this study is a fine-grained analysis of open-ended classroom talk. In this discursive analysis I track the ebb and flow of multiple discourses over extended extracts of classroom talk which occur, in some cases, over a number of lessons. In order to do this I consider three interrelated aspects of the classroom talk. Firstly, I analyse the underlying participation structure of the classroom discourse (in the non-Foucauldian sense), considering such things as turn-taking, turn function, open/closed questions, evaluative comments and other features of talk-in-interaction usually associated with various forms of conversation and interaction analysis (Cazden, 2001; Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975; Mehan, 1979). Secondly, I look closely at the discussion topics, or sub-topics, to see what trajectories classroom conversations take when students are able to set the agenda, so to speak. Thirdly, I look at the discourses that are mobilised and the subject positions that are made available through the interaction between participation patterns and topics of discussion, and at how – in the process – the power relations among students are being continually (re)negotiated.

I am aware of the ongoing debates among researchers about the similarities, incompatiblities and relative merits of various methods of analysing naturally-occurring conversation (see, for example, Wetherell, 1998; Billig 1999; Schegloff, 1999; West, 2002; Baxter, 2003), but am drawn to those approaches that, while retaining a clear methodological focus, employ various methods to derive their analyses. Martin-Jones and de Meija (2008) point to the general trend in combining approaches to the analysis of classroom discourse, maintaining that 'significant insights can be achieved through interaction among research traditions' (2008, p. xv). Wetherell, for example, has compellingly argued for a more eclectic approach to the analysis of discourse, suggesting that drawing on the more technical aspects of Conversation Analysis can be 'extremely revealing about the formation of subject positions' (1998, p. 404). This is similar to the way in which Baxter (2003) works with Feminist Poststructuralist Analysis (FPDA), where she combines the micro or denotative level (working with concrete descriptive interaction and commonsense meanings) with the macro or connotative level (working interpretatively with discourses in broader ways). Such analyses aim 'to create a multi-faceted interpretation of spoken interactions in educational and classroom contexts that reveals, rather than suppresses, the discursive struggles to fix meaning according to different and competing interests' (Baxter, 2008, p. 77).

Chapter 6, the final chapter of data analysis, carries out fine-grained discursive analysis of classroom talk. My aim is to understand the ways in which the structure of the classroom discourse and the content of the participants' utterances work together and how these are both consitutive of and constituted by the pedagogic space. Each site is dealt with separately since the focus is on understanding the kinds of interactions which each site makes (im)possible.

3.6 Ethical considerations

All the necessary ethical procedures were followed in conducting this research. The project received ethics clearance from the Ethics Committee at the university. Permission was obtained from the school principals to conduct research in their schools and for Site 1, a state school, permission was also obtained from the Gauteng Department of Education.

During preliminary discussions, the two participating teachers were provided with letters of invitation to participate in the research and, with a view to obtaining their informed consent, the overall aims and procedure of the research were made clear. Their signed permission was obtained separately for conducting interviews and for observation of their teaching; in each case permission was obtained to audio/video-record them.

Letters were prepared to inform both students and parents of the research project and to obtain their permission. In each case, before the start of the teaching intervention, I addressed the class, outlining the research project to them and making myself available to answer questions. Although students were given the option of not participating in the research, all of them agreed to participate and all permission letters from both parents and students were returned with the requisite signatures for the various aspects of the research.

This chapter on research design and method concludes what can be seen as the first section of this thesis. Together with the preceding chapters, it sets up the contextual, theoretical and methodological framework for this research. The following three chapters constitute the data analysis, with each one seeking to address the research question(s) in a particular way and thereby to generate its own set of insights on the relationship between subjectivity and pedagogy.

4

POSITIONINGS ON THE PAST

> *[P]eople have a sort of black and white past and present sort of thing they don't think about anything in the middle or about concepts like culture or how we can sort of intersect. It's always it's set like black people were like this, white people were like that and that's it. So maybe if they could change their way of thinking maybe broaden the subject a bit we'd get further in* (Leila, S1, Focus Group comment).

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the positions that students take up in response to the TRC section of the teaching intervention are explored. The TRC functions as a starting point for students' engagement with the recent South African past and and it is against the shifting meanings of the TRC that the students' positions are read. Following Davies and Harré's (1999) approach to positioning, I therefore seek to render visible the 'autobiographical aspects' of students talk not only when they are referring directly to themselves and explicitly voicing their positions but also when they do so in more unconscious ways. I am thus working towards answering my first set of research sub-questions, namely:

- What subject positions do students take up in response to a unit of work that invites them to historicise their identities?
- How are these subject positions evident in the talk and texts that students produce?
- To what extent are these positions inflected by students' spatiotemporal locations?

To answer these questions I apply the discourse analytic methods I outlined in the previous chapter. (See section 3.5.1.) Most notably I consider the discourses that are mobilised in the content of the students' talk; the binary thinking that is evident in

students' discursive practices; and the gender, race, class and other relations rendered visible in the pedagogic space of the classroom.

As explained in the outline of the unit of work (see section 3.3.1), students were tasked with gathering interviews on the TRC from adult members of their communities. Their engagement with these interviews across a number of lessons was designed to generate discussion both in relation to specific tasks as well as in fairly open-ended ways. It is these discussions that are subjected to analysis in this chapter.

The ensuing analysis is structured into two sections with each section taking a particular classroom task as its starting point. Part 1 begins by looking at the discourses that are mobilised when students report back on their interview task. Part 2 begins with a focus on the positions students explicitly take up when they answer the question about whether or not they believe the TRC and its work is relevant to them and their generation. Each part consists of a number of layers of analysis. The first layer presents and analyses transcript data of student talk pertaining to the particular task. A second, and sometimes a third, layer of analysis takes the original analysis further by drawing on student talk that is germane to the topic at hand but does not fall within the narrow task parameters. I refer to this secondary discussion as the 'spill-over' discussion. Sometimes the spill-over discussion occurs in the in-between spaces of the same lesson, for example, when students break out of the mode of reporting back on their interviewees' positions on the TRC and begin to speculate about why they might have such positions; at other times a more open-ended discussion in another lesson returns to similar ideas, approaching them in ways that may be similar or different. In addition to this, I also draw on student talk from the focus group discussions, where this can contribute to the meanings being generated.

This multilayered method of analysis eschews easy closure, aiming instead for a multiplicity of possible meanings, with each consecutive layer of analysis re-framing the previous one, unsettling some meanings and reinforcing others. In order to provide a sense of the range of discourses mobilised by students and the subject positions they take up, I move between the two classrooms, sometimes discussing the data in an integrated way – when the commonalities call for this – and at other times dealing with each site discretely so as to ensure that differences are not being elided.

4.2 Discourses mobilised by the TRC interviews

This section takes as its focus the discourses on the TRC that students access via their interviews with adult members of their communities. When students report back, the discourses which they have accessed through their communities are imported into the classroom talk and become part of the pool of discursive resources that each class collectively has access to.

The first layer of the analysis is a synthesis of what students report on from their interview tasks. Since, at this stage, I am primarily interested in the discourses which students have accessed, I approach the reporting back process as a 'revoicing' (Bakhtin, 1986) by students of others' sentiments and perceptions. Thus while I acknowledge that the comments attributed by the students to their interviewees are inevitably mediated and shaped both by students' own interpretations as well as by the ways in which they are inserted into the flow of classroom talk, I deliberately foreground interviewees' remarks and, for the time being, background students own voices. The second layer of analysis takes a comparative look at the similarities and differences in the discourses accessed by the students in the two sites, which are discussed separately to begin with. In the third layer of analysis the focus shifts away from the interviewees' discourses to the students and the ways in which they take up or challenge these discourses when they break out of report back mode in the 'spill-over' discussion. This effectively re-frames and in some cases destabilises the discourses previously accessed by students, suggesting that some students are seeking alternative subject positions for themselves.

4.2.1 First layer of analysis: students reporting on their interviews

In both classrooms, the lesson in which students report back on their interviews is primarily structured around whole-class discussion. In Site 1 the discussion is rather laboured, with individual students speaking one by one and generally leaving their responses unelaborated. Nevertheless 22 students report on their interviews in the space of half an hour. In Site 2 the discussion flows more easily with students often engaging in conversation with the teacher and sometimes with one another. The lesson is an hour long, with 16 students reporting back and the remainder overflowing into the next day's lesson.

Site 1

These students report attitudes on the TRC that range from the disillusioned to the critical to the outright cynical. The discourses mobilised cluster around the following notions,: truth; apology & confession; the emotional dimension; reconciliation; and justice, with the evidence for each presented below.

The comment most frequently reported on the notion of **truth** was that the *'whole truth'* was not achieved. This was sometimes negatively framed, as in the comment that *'the whole thing should be renamed... because no truth came out'* (reported by Thabiso, L4, 47) or that the TRC was *'nonsense'* because if someone confessed to killing your family member *'you wouldn't know that it is the real truth that he's telling you'* (reported by Nkosana, L4, 53). At other times, it was framed more positively, as in the comment that *'the TRC was a good thing although it didn't fully get to the truth'*(reported by Luis, L4, 45). An interviewee who was a member of the PAC (Pan Africanist Congress) at the time was reported as believing that the stories that emerged represented *'only 75% of the truth'* (reported by Thabang, L4, 53).

The discourses that emerged around **apology and confession** were uniformly critical. Apologies were seen to be insincere and meaningless. One interviewee felt that the apologies had been *'random'* and that people had *'apologise[d] to any random person with their eyes closed without knowing why they were apologising'* (reported by Patrick, L4, 49). Another interviewee, who had been part of *'the ones that would fight against the police'*, had said that *'he didn't really care about the apologies from the police and everyone because he'd done what he thought was right'* (reported by Kelebogile, L4, 51). A number of interviewees questioned the value of confessing, one of them saying that he didn't agree with the TRC process because *'even though they confessed, it didn't undo what had happened'* (reported by Jayesh, L4, 57).

Some interviewees had focused on the **emotional impact** of the TRC hearings. For them the distressing and painful side of the experience was a given: *'it opened up old wounds'* (reported by Puseletso, L4, 49); it was *'an emotional and painful experience especially for blacks'* (reported by Sithandi, L4, 65); and even if *'you have forgiven... it still runs in your head'* (reported by Lebohang, L4, 45). Nevertheless such comments were often tempered by an acknowledgement that *'hearing what the people who hurt you had to say... it kind of helped'* (reported by Lebohang, L4, 45) and, as one interviewee remarked, *'many people found closure'* (reported by Moipone, L4, 53).

The notion of **reconciliation** did not emerge strongly. One interviewee suggested that little had been achieved in that regard while another indicated that it had been achieved. Another interviewee had felt that *'the TRC was a good thing to do in trying to achieve reconciliation in a fragile democracy'* (reported by Kabelo, L4, 51), making this possibly the most favourable comment and the only one that contextualises the TRC politically and historically.

Apart from one interviewee who approved of the TRC because she felt *'justice was served'* (reported by Motshedisi, L4, 57), the notion of **justice** emerges only by implication. Mention is made of how the TRC *'was challenging guilty parties'* (reported by Ntombi, L4, 47). Interviewees criticised the TRC for not being *'from the heart, more of a show'* (reported by Leila, L4, 47) and for being *'a political scheme'* (reported by Enoko, L4, 59). One interviewee claimed that *'the process wasn't really clear at the time and it only worked for like the political people'* (reported by Thabiso, L4, 43).

Site 2

The views of the TRC that these students reported on traversed the spectrum from *'witch hunt'* to *'brilliant'*. Dominant notions were those of reconciliation and healing, ignorance or various degrees of lack of interest, truth, judgement and amnesty.

A discourse which emerges strongly constructs the TRC and its achievements in a positive light by drawing on notions of **reconciliation** and **healing**. These interviewees believed that the TRC process had been unprecedented in the world and had enabled the country to move on (reported by Sonia, L4, 61), that it had probably *'averted a civil war'* (reported by Susan, L4, 77), and that it was *'a good start of a new country... for equality and the new rainbow nation'* (reported by Alice, L5, 113). There were also interviewees who supported the TRC process even though they did not believe it had been entirely successful. One interviewee had been *'quite into the whole thing'* and had found it very emotional but did not think that they had *'achieved their goals though'* (reported by Jody, L4, 97); another interviewee felt that *'it was good that they were forgiving the past although you forgive but you don't forget'* (reported by Kelsey, L4, 81). These ideas were often closely aligned with notions of catharsis, healing and closure. For example, one interviewee had said that *'it was brilliant because if you understand how people heal like for them to let everything out and get the truth out there whether you get forgiven or not it helps people heal'* (reported by Julie, L5, 123).

Many students reported that the people they approached for interviews on the TRC were **ignorant** of the TRC or *'didn't know much about it'*. A number of interviewees had been in their early teens during the time of the TRC hearings and therefore had at best only the vaguest recollections of it. There were also interviewees who were either out of the country at the time (reported by Kate, L4, 83) or who knew nothing about it because they had only recently immigrated to South Africa (reported by Lily, L5, 107). In addition to this, there were interviewees who did not know much about the TRC because they **lacked interest** in it and their awareness of it was simply a consequence of being unable to avoid the widespread media coverage. One student who reported that her parents had not had any *'personal experiences'* with the TRC and that their only engagement with it had been via the media, nevertheless reported that Wouter Basson and Dirk Coetzee were two people who had stood out for her father and that he had commented on the *'amazingly terrible things that people did for political gains'* (reported by Kathy, L4, 73).

Two interviewees had, for very different reasons, **deliberately blocked out** the TRC hearings. One had said that *'she didn't take it in because she just felt so guilty about the whole apartheid thing and how she didn't really pay any attention to it or do anything about it when it happened that it was just too painful for her to listen to it now'* (reported by Alice, L5, 113). Another had stopped watching the news or buying the newspaper during the time of the TRC hearings because, as someone who believed he had helped to resist the apartheid system, he objected to the fact that the TRC had *'no system for rewarding heroes, it was just a punishment system'* (reported by Michelle, L4, 65).

Notions of **punishment** and **judgement** were also raised. One interviewee felt that although the TRC had been an attempt to heal wounds through confession and understanding that ultimately *'it was only about judgement'*; another referred to the TRC as a *'witch hunt'* that *'focused on one specific group and no one else had a say in what it was'* (reported by Kylie, L4, 59). A third interviewee questioned the government's claim that they were doing this for the people, saying that *'they were doing it... for their own punishment and wanting to get at other people'* (reported by Nguvi, L4, 67).

In relation to the notion of **truth**, students reported being told that the TRC was only able to expose part of the truth (reported by Susan, L4, 77) or that the truth-telling was selective since *'not everyone's truth came out'* (reported by Nadia, L4, 87) and that *'only the big stories'* that suited the political agenda were told (reported by Nguvi,

L4, 67). One interviewee was vehemently opposed to the TRC and felt it should not have been given that name (reported by Antoinette, L4, 69).

Competing discourses emerged on the notion of **amnesty**. In some instances, it was seen as a positive thing because if you *'let everything out and get the truth out there whether you're forgiven or not it helps people heal'* (reported by Julie, L5, 123). Similarly, because of amnesty *'a lot of people made peace with themselves... [although]... it was good for the people who were like able to get amnesty but... what about the rest of them?'* (Antoinette, L4, 71). Another student reported that it was *'good because people actually got to go and ask for amnesty for the things they did'* (reported by Jenny, L5, 105). Alternatively there were instances where amnesty was seen as *'just a way for the government to get rid of their bad conscience'* (reported by Nadia, L4, 87) and conscience-clearing does not rectify anything since *'they've ruined so many lives so why try now 'cos it's a bit too late'* (reported by Bontle, L4, 79).

A word on reluctant interviewing

Across both sites there was clear evidence that a significant number of students had put limited effort into meaningfully conducting the two interviews that had been required of them. Although this played itself out slightly differently in each site, in neither case is it possible to do more than speculate as to what the reasons for this might have been.

In Site 1, during the focus group interviews, it emerged that a number of students had not conducted any interviews at all and that most of them had conducted only one. During the course of the interview briefing, many students had expressed great concern that they might not find anyone who would know anything about the TRC. Could these expectations have been so deep-seated that they had felt it was pointless even to try? Or could this lack of effort simply reflect a general lack of motivation or interest in schoolwork in general, something the teacher had alluded to before the start of the teaching intervention, or was there something about the topic that had been off-putting? In Site 2, some students admitted to conducting only one interview, while others selected unsuitable interviewees based on simply on how easily accessible they were, resulting in some rather unsuitable choices such as au pairs or domestic workers who were only a few years older than them or people who were not even in the country at the time. This site is a highly competitive academic environment and there were indications during the focus group discussions that some students had questioned the value of this unit of work and considered it to be taking

up valuable time intended for examination preparation. In both sites it seems likely that a lack of interest in, boredom with or even an antipathy towards dealing with the past may have been a factor.

Ultimately this trend of reluctant interviewing simply becomes another finding of the research and although the questions that it raises are not able to be decisively answered, there are aspects of the ensuing discussion that offer possible interpretations for this behaviour.

4.2.2 Second layer of analysis: A comparative discussion

What can be made of the significance of this data as a starting point for class discussions? Firstly, what we have here is a range of relatively clear opinions on the TRC drawn from members of the communities to which students belong. Students have thus, via the interview gathering process, imported some of the broader social discourses on the TRC into the classroom. For example, the TRC was first accused of being a 'witch hunt' by the National Party and other right wing parties (Simpson, 2002, p. 227). Also the criticism that the TRC focused only on 'big stories' is not new and has been put down to the 'performative priorities' of the electronic mass media through which the TRC's public hearings were broadcast to national and global audiences (Posel and Simpson, 2002, p. 7). In addition, among some of the white adults interviewed by students in Site 2 there are traces of 'strategic ignorance' (Steyn, 2012), which included one parent whose awareness of this ignorance and its consequence had resulted in considerable guilt.

Secondly, a comparison of the discourses gathered by each class reveals various notable differences and suggests that students have tapped into different communities. Interestingly there is only a single discourse that is common to both classrooms (and cuts across race). In both classrooms students reported on interviewees who believed that the 'truth' that was achieved was a partial and selective one, with varying degrees of cynicism being attached to this. The differences in the discourses, however, are more extensive and can be divided into three types: firstly, there are discourses that arise in one classroom and not in the other; secondly, there are several issues that arise in both classrooms but which are attached to significantly different discursive positions in each; thirdly, there are a number of discourses which the black students in Site 2 seem to share with the students in Site 1 rather than their own classmates. I elaborate on each of these below.

Peculiar to Site 1 are discourses that foreground the painful and emotional experience of the victims and their families, as well as discourses that construct perpetrators' apologies as meaningless and insincere. There is also one brief mention of retaliation against the apartheid police which is the only reference to a discourse of political activism. Peculiar to Site 2 are discourses which construct the TRC as a great achievement in terms of the model of transitional justice it represents, and its political and social impact. Discourses of ignorance of or lack of interest in the TRC also seem, at this point, to be specific to this classroom, as is the discourse of 'white guilt' which arises once.

There are times when surface similarities in the discussion belie significant underlying differences. For example, in both classrooms there are students that draw on a psychological discourse which foregrounds the healing value of truth-telling. In Site 1, this was orientated towards the possibility of victims' families obtaining closure through hearing painful truths about what had happened to their loved ones; while in Site 2, the focus was on the perpetrators' ability to make peace with themselves through confessing.

In addition, two students from the different classrooms report identical-sounding statements from their interviewees which, when considered in a more contextualised way, reveal significantly different discursive positions. Thabiso (Site 1) and Antoinette (Site 2) both report that their interviewees believed that the process should not have been named the 'truth and reconciliation' commission. However, Thabiso's interviewee is his father who is angry with the TRC for not having addressed his own victimisation by the police under apartheid; while Antoinette's interviewee is her grandfather, an Afrikaans satirical poet whom she describes as 'a very racist man' (L4, 71). Thus family labels come to operate as markers of race during this discussion and begin to suggest that sentiments and perceptions of the TRC are fractured along racial lines. Overall when students report on their interviewees' anger or bitterness towards the TRC there seems to be a racialised difference in the underlying reasons for this anger: black interviewees feel betrayed by the TRC for not having lived up to its expectations of redressing past wrongs at the level of ordinary people; white interviewees feel unfairly judged or, as in one case, even see themselves as victims of a 'witchhunt' (S1, L4, 60).

A final point which reinforces the notion that interviewees' positions were often racialised is that black students in Site 2 accessed discourses that had more in common with those accessed in Site 1 than with those of their own white classmates.

For example, the criticism that amnesty served only to clear consciences and did not repair ruined lives, reported on by Bontle (S2, L4, 79) and Nadia (S2, L4, 87) speaks to similar discourses in Site 1. Similarly, the anger and bitterness reported on by Nguvi (S2, L4, 67) came from an interviewee who had turned his back on the TRC because it had not addressed his brother's death, an attitude represented in Site 1.

Given that the very subject matter of the TRC is our history of racial conflict and oppression, it is unsurprising that perceptions of the TRC are racialised. The difference in the pattern of the discourses that are accessed by these students do appear to be inflected by race and by perceived racial(ised) identifications with opposing sides of the conflict generated by apartheid and being addressed by the TRC. One of the criticisms that has been levelled against the TRC is that the understanding of 'truth' that it was working with took the form of a simple moral binary of victim/perpetrator which held no room for moral ambiguities wrought by political and structural complexities (Posel and Simpson, 2002, p. 10). Against the political backdrop of the apartheid system, such a binary invokes a more specific binary of black victim/white perpetrator, already as problematic (Jansen, 2009a). And it is this binary that seems to underlie the pattern of discourses accessed by these two sets of students. Almost without mentioning race, there is some indication that many of the black voices take positions that have the interests of the victims at heart, while some of the white voices take positions that foreground the perpetrators' interests.

Not all the discourses gathered can – or should – be read through the lens of this binary and its problematics. However, in relation to positioning theory (Davies and Harré1990, 1999), if one asks what positions the official narrative of the TRC offers for its readers, one can argue, as I do, that the victim, the perpetrator and the bystander are the dominant positions offered and that each of these positions suggests a particular historically constructed racial and cultural identity. Ultimately, for the purposes of this research, there are a number of important question to ask: To what extent do the students take up these discourses? Which discourses do they modify, challenge or dismiss? Do they continue to occupy historically constructed racialised positions? Or do they negotiate these discourses to arrive at new positions for themselves? These questions underpin the discussion for the remainder of this chapter and, to a degree, all four of the data analysis chapters since they explore in various ways the positions students take up. The following section looks at aspects of the early spill-over discussion and begins to provide some tentative answers.

4.2.3 Third layer of analysis: The spill-over discussion

During these lessons, students frequently break out of report back mode, either spontaneously or in response to a comment from the teacher which opens up the discussion. Here they are no longer simply revoicing their interviewees' opinions on the TRC but are either voicing their own opinions or commenting in some way on the interview process. These moments, fleeting though most of them are, provide some insight into how students managed the interviews and how they begin negotiating the discourses they accessed.

Among the interviewees, it seemed as though black South Africans had victims' interests at heart and white South Africans had largely perpetrators interests at heart. Yet there is a moment in each class where this dynamic is unsettled. In Site 1, Puseletso introduces a new perspective into the discussion with the following statement:

> *...standing up and confronting the truth or what you think is the truth it takes a lot of courage and I think that like those people [perpetrators] need to be like honoured and everything for telling the truth unlike leaving it unsettled and everything* (S1, L4, 57).

This is the first (and only) time in this classroom that the perspective shifts to one which shows some understanding for the perpetrator. In a related move, Kelsey in Site 2, questions the sincerity of amnesty-seekers' remorse, saying that if they really had desired forgiveness they would have sought it themselves and not relied on the TRC (S2, L4, 91).

A couple of students made explicit their expectation that perspectives on the TRC would be racialised. Thabiso (Site 1) and Bontle (S2) both remarked that they would have liked to have interviewed a black person and a white person in order to get different perspectives. Bontle, who had interviewed her aunt and had apparently not succeeded in finding a second person to interview, said *'I want someone who was like maybe a white person because I wanted like black and white perspectives'* (S2, L4, 79). Thabiso made the following comment:

> *I'd like to go to Boksburg one day and just hear what a like how can I say? a reformed white man would say about the TRC ... and go to Alex and interview a black man and hear what he has to say and compare the two* (S1, L4, 61-63).

While these comments seem to take for granted the idea that interviewee perspectives are racialised and that white and black people will inevitably have opposing views, they also indicate these students' willingness to consider both

perspectives and not limit themselves to taking up positions based solely on their own racial identifications.

Nguvi, in Site 2, tackled the notion of race in a different manner. Twice during the lesson she made the point that although one might stereotypically expect black and not white South Africans to support the TRC, her experience of trying to interview black South Africans taught her that *'they're also bitter about it and also ignorant'* (S2, L4, 95). She made this comment in agreement with Lesego who had just pointed out that she had not been able to interview her helper because she knew nothing about the TRC. In the context of Site 2, where she and Lesego represent two of the four black voices, her use of the word 'also' signals an attempt to de-racialise interviewee perspectives by saying that similar attitudes are reflected across race.

A number of students make it clear that, despite the fact that they interviewed members of their families, their interviewees positions do not reflect their own. Thabiso, reporting back on his interview with his father, makes this clear by saying twice, in response to the teacher's query, '*no **he** said no truth came out [T: okay] that's what **he** said*' (S1, L4, 47). When Antoinette – one of the five students who identifies herself as Afrikaans upfront – reports on her grandfather's extremely negative views on the TRC, she does not take up the teacher's offer to attempt to make sense of his bitterness, she simply states '*he's a very racist man'* (S2, L4, 71), suggesting that there is no reasonable explanation for his sentiments and simultaneously signalling Antoinette's disapproval of his views.

Alice and Julie go one step further, reporting on how they challenged the views of their mother and aunt, respectively, during their interviews. Julie reported that her aunt very much approved of the fact that perpetrators were given the opportunity to reveal the truth because even if they are not forgiven, it enables them to heal. Julie describes her reaction to this in the following way:

> *I said so are you actually supporting the fact that people went and they killed innocent people and they didn't get their punishment? and she said no I don't agree with that they should get punished but if you understand the healing process it's good for people to get everything out...* (S2, L5, 123).

Alice, the student who reported on her mother's inability to engage with the hearings because she felt so guilty about not having done anything to help anyone, says she felt sorry for her carrying all this guilt and then adds:

> *I kind of guilt tripped her I said how could you have not done anything? how could you have not noticed that things were going on? and she just said because we lived in such a protected environment you know* (S2, L5, 113).

These are examples of comments made in the spaces within and between the reporting back on the interviews. While there is a danger of overstating the significance of such tiny moments, they nevertheless gesture towards some reluctance on the part of some students to merely repeat past discourses, something they demonstrate by not confining themselves to the kinds of racially inflected discourses that were accessed by the interviews. It was important to begin by looking at what attitudes to the TRC students reported from their interviewees; however, it is equally important to acknowledge from the start that students are not inevitably positioned by the discourses to which they have gained access. These discourses become part of the available discursive resources that students can draw on in their ongoing classroom discussions but, as the ongoing analysis shows, they are as open to being taken up and recycled as they are to being challenged and disrupted.

4.3 Students' positions on the relevance of the TRC to their generation

In this section, I continue to analyse students' classroom talk on the TRC but I turn to the subsequent activity where students were required to answer the question:

> ***How, if at all, is the TRC work relevant now, to me and my generation?***

The **first** layer of this analysis is the presentation and analysis of the students' direct answers to this question. This begins with a broad look at student positions across both sites and then looks more closely at the discursive positions suggested by students' answers which are organised into five patterns or categories which cut across both classrooms. In the second layer of analysis I work across the categories, identifying salient issues which are not category-specific and discussing these in relation to transcript data from other lessons as well as from focus group discussions.

It bears reminding that the focus of this research is not on students' attitudes to history per se but on the extent to which they see their identities as inflected by their historical locations. In other words, do students conceive of themselves as being 'constructed and produced within a particular historical moment and under particular historical conditions' (Darder et al, 2003, p. 12)? The question on the relevance of the TRC is thus intended to surface discourses around the relationship between self and

history, and to determine the extent to which students' own subject positions are shaped by their locations in the sociopolitical landscape of South Africa.

4.3.1 First layer of analysis

Students are asked to respond to the above question in writing in their journals for homework once they have finished the section of the teaching intervention that deals with the TRC. These journal entries form the basis of the classroom discussion in the subsequent lesson. Few students read their entries verbatim, although this is an option. Most use them as a springboard for their own free talk, explaining their positions orally to their teacher and peers. This data therefore comes from a single lesson in each site and it is significant for a number of reasons. The question is worded so as to invite students to consider what relationship there might be between South Africa's past and its present, and to consider this from their own perspectives as young South Africans. The question invites a focus on the self and the analysis thus provides some insight into the kind of self or subjectivity that students invoke and begins to suggest some of the ways in which they relate not only to history but to the sociopolitical context more broadly.

As the discussion in the previous section shows, there were significant differences between the two classrooms in terms of their engagement with the interviewing process and particularly in relation to the types of discursive communities they tapped into for their interviews. Nevertheless, despite these differences, there is a remarkable degree of similarity in the discursive positions that sets of students take up when they come to discuss the relevance of the TRC. The data in fact shows a greater degree of difference within each site than between the two sites.

For a preliminary, broad sweep of the data, students' responses can be divided into 3 categories which capture how many students felt the TRC to be relevant, irrelevant or both. Table 4.1 shows the resulting distribution.

Table 4.1: Distribution of answers on TRC relevance

Relevance (or qualified relevance) of TRC	Both 'relevant and irrelevant'	Irrelevance (or qualified irrelevance) of TRC
16	3	15
S1: 7 S2: 9	S1: S2:	S1: 8 S2: 7

The almost even split between those who assert the TRC's relevance and those who

assert its irrelevance is replicated in each site. In each class there are a number of students who do not contribute an answer or whose responses do not produce direct answers to the question – these students are not represented in the figures above. From the fairly even distribution it is clear that no single dominant view prevailed. Students felt able to express different views and were not constrained by a perceived 'right answer'.

Although students' stances on the relevance of the TRC constitute a useful starting point, there are few conclusions about students' identity positions that can be drawn from this. Even within the relevant/irrelevant groupings, attitudes and reasoning can differ markedly. It would be a mistake, for example, to assume that students who find the TRC's work relevant are more socially aware and historically attuned than those who find it irrelevant. For example, Saskia and Patrick fall into the same category since they both feel that the work of the TRC is not relevant. However, Saskia's reason for not supporting it is that she's personally '*not that interested in it'* (S2, L8, 177), while Patrick doesn't support it because he feels that '*things are like still the same… and the TRC thing isn't really much of a difference'* (S1, L5, 81). Clearly very different interpretations can lie behind similar stances, calling for a more careful consideration of the discursive content of students' responses.This analysis follows.

Students' direct responses to the question were closely analysed with a view to identifying the discursive positions which they take up. Despite the fact that responses are often short statements with limited elaboration, a number of clear patterns are evident. These have been grouped into the following five categories which are expanded upon below.

1. I am not affected
2. History is important
3. Split between self and nation
4. Explains how we got here
5. Perceptions of social change

Individual categories are explained in the analysis below but, as a group, they are sequenced so as to move from positions that denote highly binarised forms of thinking (evident in Category 1) to positions that begin to dismantle some binaries (Category 3) or to attempt to move beyond them (Category 4). In discussing each category, I therefore look closely at the role that binaries may play in students'

discursive positions and consider the kind of subjectivity that such a position might suggest.

Each student's response is allocated to only one category. Where a student's response seems to imply more than one of the possible discursive positions, it is placed in the category of the more salient position, identified as being the one which is central to the point being made. Categories are therefore not homogenous. While each category draws together responses that denote similar positions, there is nevertheless a degree of diversity in that students may come at that position in several different ways. No attempt is made to derive quantitative data from the analysis of these responses since the focus is on identifying the kinds of discourses that these young people draw on when engaging with the recent past. Although each category is populated with between 4 and 8 student responses, I do not attempt to present all responses within the category but instead I delineate the trends within the category, drawing on key responses that illustrate these trends. Once again, it is of considerable interest and significance that most categories have almost equal representation from both sites. For this reason, an integrated approach is applied to the data in this section of analysis and I draw on responses from both sites as I discuss the overall patterns of the data. Differences in the discursive positions across the two sites are addressed as they arise.

Category 1: I am not affected

The defining characteristic of this category is the overriding belief in the primacy of direct personal experience. Students assert the TRC's irrelevance by claiming that because it took place too long ago to have been part of their own lived reality, it has no effect on them:

> *To me it's not really relevant because it's something that happened a long time ago. It didn't have an effect on the people now so it hasn't affected me* (Kholiswa, S1, L5, 65-67).

Nkosana makes a similar point, stating *that 'it's what happened in the past, only the people then were affected by it'* (S1, L5, 77). Clear lines are drawn between 'then' and 'now' – the past and the present – and position themselves squarely in the present. 'The past' seems to be a large, undifferentiated mass of time; all past events seem to fit into the same category of remoteness, regardless of their actual location in chronological time. So much so that the TRC's public hearings that had run from 1996 to 1998 – coming to an end only 10 years before this research took place, were considered as remote as the darkest reaches of the apartheid era itself.

Tumelo demonstrates this lack of awareness of the gradations of historical time when he starts off by saying that the work of the TRC has not affected him *'because [he] wasn't born at the time'*. He is immediately challenged by teacher and peers about his inaccurate sense of time but he clings to his position of being unaffected, saying *'But I was young at the time … and I wouldn't know about it if I didn't do it in English or History'* (S1, L5, 67). The assumption here is that one cannot be affected by something of which one has no experience and no knowledge. A similar logic is evident when another student, Mei-Lin, says: *'I don't find that it's particularly relevant – I've never heard of this thing before'* (S2, L8, 167). For these students the past has no bearing on their lives and thus holds no interest for them, a position clearly articulated by Saskia, who says:

> *To me personally I don't find it that relevant because I'm not that interested in it because I think it's like the past, that we learn from the past and we move on – we don't want to go back all the time like because I didn't live in that time so I don't know the effect of everything* (S2, L8, 177-79).

For these students, the world of the self is the present and the direct experience that it offers them; the past has no place in their imaginaries. Underlying these positions are binaries which fall into me/not me, my experience/not my experience, my present/not my past. The kind of subjectivity that is suggested is one which is autonomous and tightly circumscribed, able to be impacted on only through the self's lived reality.

There are, however, a number of students who, without displacing the centrality of direct personal experience, introduce a concession: it is possible to be affected if people close to you were directly involved themselves. Mei-Lin thus qualifies her earlier statement about the irrelevance of the TRC by adding: '*I don't think it's really gonna affect you unless you had a family member who was someone who got amnesty or someone who was really badly treated during that time'* (S2, L8, 167). In a similar vein, Jody makes the following statement:

> *I think you're more affected by the situation if you have relatives in the situation… I mean obviously you're going to know because that's your family history. If you don't have anything to do with it then it's kind of it's just like…* [shrugs shoulders] (S2, L8, 175).

Thus although the students whose responses fall into this category view the past as largely inaccessible to them, some of them concede that they can gain access to the past via family members who may themselves have direct experience of the past. In this way, they derive some sort of direct experience by proxy via close familial relationships in which they are personally invested and thus can provide a degree of

access and a degree of interest. But there is no evidence of a broader social landscape having any significance and history is meaningful only in terms of 'family history'. The split between 'family history' and a national history is naturalised and it is only when the two overlap that there is potential for engagement with the latter. In this way, by looking beyond the autonomous self and including those to whom one is close in one's personal world, one potentially gains access to some of their direct experiences. So while this does not dismantle the past/present binary, the possibility of a degree of engagement with the past, under the right circumstances, is introduced.

Category 2: History is important

The defining characteristic of this group of responses is the belief that a knowledge of history is important because it can inform one's actions in the present. In keeping with the notion that history is instructive, these responses are peppered with words such as 'learn', 'know', 'teaches' and 'taught'. In some cases, responses remain unelaborated and confined to formulaic expressions, such as: needing to know about the past so that *'history won't repeat itself'* (Sithandi, S1, L5, 69); that '*in order for us to know where we're going, we must know our history'* (Motshedisi, S1, L5, 73); and that *'it still teaches us not to do this, not to discriminate, not to push boundaries… we are kind of like the future leaders and if we make sure we don't make the same mistakes again, the world will probably be a better place* (Julie, S2, L8, 177). A more extended response makes a new point:

> *The TRC does have relevance because the TRC is the history of our country and we need to learn more about what happened in the past. Just because maybe we were young back then and we didn't know anything doesn't mean that because like it's all in the past something similar could happen now and we might need to bring the TRC back. … like the xenophobic attacks that happened they might want us South Africans to apologise to those foreigners who were attacked* (Moipone, S1, L5, 67).

Moipone begins by challenging the kinds of attitudes to the past represented in category 1, and proceeds to illustrate how, in a somewhat literal way, a past process like the TRC may be made to apply to the students' present.

Of significance, however, is that all responses in this category are premised on a clear separation between the past and the present. However, in contrast to the way in which the past/present binary is employed in the previous category, these responses valorise the past rather than deeming it irrelevant. But here too there is no sense that the past has exerted any impact on the way society is in the present or that there is

any continuity between past and present. History is important not because it has shaped the present in any way but because it delivers neatly packaged lessons on political governance that have the potential to be applied to the present.

In fact, some students explicitly state a desire to separate or dissociate the past from the present:

> *The TRC is relevant because the people of my generation must learn how to respect and tell the truth so that our future gets different and improved from the apartheid era. And I also said we must be able to tell the difference between the old times and the new times (Lebohang, S1, L5, 71).*

Lebohang, along with Calista who talks about the TRC being important because it marks the end – or comes 'after' – apartheid (S2, L8, 163), calls for a break with the past: they crave a '*difference between the old times and the new times'*. These particular students are not denying the value and importance of history but nevertheless feel the need to partition it off from the present, actively seeking evidence that the past is over and that the present is markedly different.

There is, however, one student in this category who does, in fact, posit some continuity between past and present, and then further to the self. Luis makes the following assertion:

> *I think our past reflects our future, that's today, so by them bringing the TRC it taught a lot of people that what they were doing then was wrong and now it teaches us okay now we can forgive but we can't forget and we should learn to live as one and respect each other whether we're black or white or any other colour* (S1, L5, 73).

Luis's response is characteristic of this category in that his focus is on lessons that can be learned from history; however, he takes this further in two ways. Firstly, in saying that *'our past reflects our future'*, he seems to be suggesting that the present is in some way shaped by the past. Secondly, the learning he discerns from the work of the TRC is not limited to the level of governance but crosses over into moral learning. According to Luis, the past and what can be learned from it has personal and social consequences for individuals in society, affecting their emotions, behaviour and values – it teaches forgiveness, respect and the ability to live together harmoniously. While this may be an idealized vision of present-day realities and lessons learnt, it stands in contrast to the need to keep history at arm's length and to engage with it merely in a cognitive, knowledge-based way.

What is also evident in this category is that these students take up a collective South African identity from which they engage with both the past and the present. They

speak about ‘our country’, ‘our history’, ‘our future’ and ‘us South Africans’. For the students in the previous category there was no ‘we’, only an ‘I’ through which all perceptions were filtered. Thus although the distinction between past and present continues to strongly underpin the thinking evident in all of the responses cited above bar one (Luis’s comment), this is a markedly different conception of self from the tightly circumscribed one that could only relate to political or social events via their own personal experience or close relationships.

Category 3: Split between country and self

In this set of responses, students consider the issue of relevance from two perspectives, shifting between the personal and the social. Thabiso’s response, captured in this brief interchange with the teacher, is a case in point:

Thabiso:	*I think the TRC was both irrelevant and relevant because like we needed to start from somewhere and that was like/*
T:	/the starting point/
Thabiso:	*/ja like a foundation where we could all start at the same level.*
T:	So you’re saying that’s why it is relevant. Why’s it not relevant?
Thabiso:	*It was irrelevant because I wasn’t there* [much laughter] *it’s not my time I know nothing about it* (S1, L5, 81).

This double-edged sentiment is echoed by all the students in this category, such as Nadia who says: *‘it’s important to the extent that in a way it moulded the country and because of that and the reconciliation we have now – we can be known as the rainbow nation. But I don’t think it affects me personally or our generation… So yes it involves the country and what we stand for but not really affects us’* (S2, L8, 179); and Alice, who says:

> *...as a historical lesson it’s important – the fact that there’s been so much trauma in the world we have to reconsole each other and you know move on with our others towards the future. But I think as students as a generation that it isn’t relevant to us. It’s a good historical lesson but I mean, what does it mean to me? I didn’t experience apartheid myself, I was never really affected by it, and the TRC you know it floated above my head…’* (S2, L8, 163).

These stances are an interesting combination of the two previous categories. They demonstrate the focus on the individualized self which is interpreted as ‘unaffected’ by the broader social context as well as the acknowledgement that, at a national or historical level, the TRC played a role of some significance.

The fact that these students are able to take a stance, argue for it and then are able to shift perspective and look at it from an alternative point of view shows the degree to which they are consciously bringing together two discursive positions. Unlike the

students in the first category, they do not confine themselves to seeing only their lived experience as important; they suggest some awareness of the broader social context and the ways in which it can be shaped by history.

This goes some way towards dismantling the past/present binary of the previous categories but seems at first to reinforce the 'me'/'not me' binary of the insular, unaffected self. By pulling together these two perspectives and setting them up in contrast to each other (note the frequent use of the contrastive conjunction 'but') what these students seem to be doing, even more explicitly than either of the previous categories, is to highlight the dissociation between identity and place, or between the self and the broader social context. However, upon closer inspection it becomes clear that these students, like those in the previous category, fashion and inhabit a collective South African identity. In fact, as they shift from the personal perspective to the social perspective, there is often a corresponding pronoun shift from first person singular 'I'/'me' to plural 'we'/'us', or else a shift from a 'we' as the youth to a 'we' as the nation. This is a discursive means of constructing a national identity by including themselves as part of the imagined nation, demonstrating a sense of belonging and of ownership, of South Africa, its past, its mistakes. As part of this national identity, there are students who imagine a common future: *'as a group I think because South Africa's past – because we've had so much trouble I think it [history/the TRC] should influence our futures'* (Leila, S1, L5, 81).

What this data therefore seems to suggest is not that these students do not feel any connection between themselves and the broader society in which they live, but that they inhabit or move between separate subjectivities, keeping the 'I' of the familial and interpersonal domain, separate from the 'we' of the imagined national subjectivity.

Category 4: Explains how we got here

The students whose responses are grouped into this category posit direct continuity between the past and the present and relate this to the self. However, the way they do so differs in interesting ways across the two sites and falls into two distinct sub-categories.

In Site 1, two student responses demonstrate an understanding of the present as being shaped by the past, making the following statements:

> *Uh it's not quite relevant to us and it does affect us cos? if we say that it doesn't affect us it's like saying that what happened in the past doesn't affect us. Because those people fought for us so we can be free so in some way it does affect us and it's relevant to us because it shows us our history and how we got to be here through other people suffering and hardships we're free now so it does matter* (Sebolelo, S1, L5, 73).

> [Reading from journal] *It is very vital and relevant for South African youth to have knowledge of the TRC. This will enable them to be aware of what happened to people in order for them to have the privileges they have today and we need to know what happened in the past for us to be where we are today and be able to move forward as a united nation* (Kabelo, S1, L5, 77).

While Sebolelo takes a more ambivalent stance towards the relevance of the TRC than does Kabelo, both girls construct the relationship between the past and the present as continuous, showing that they understand the present in light of the past. In the past people struggled, suffered, endured hardships in order to bring about our current state of freedom and our privileged lifestyle. And they include themselves among those who have ultimately reaped the benefits of this protracted struggle. This is significantly different from those students in category 2 who believe that our history is important but, in a desire for a present of a different kind, seek to dissociate the past from the present. These students see South Africa's current reality as different precisely because actions undertaken in the past have brought about change. For them then the past is not simply a place full of 'mistakes' from which we can learn but is shaped by agentive subjects (those who 'fought for us') whose actions have had positive consequences for their own current realities. A past seen in this light need not be avoided, ignored or denied but can be acknowledged and even admired. The reference to the 'privileges' they have today is the only allusion thus far to the socioeconomic context. These comments are also interesting because they convey a conscientised 'born-free'[4] perspective.

In Site 2, the variation on this theme is that the past is continuous with the present in the sense that is explains how parents and those of their generation have come to be who they are. This is captured in the following two comments:

> [reading from journal] *We are constantly impacted on due to our parents' political events and can't seem to understand the depth of what happened, why so many people carry so much hurt and hostility within them even in today's life. The investigations that we have completed have helped us grasp and understand the different views of different people and the attitudes to the TRC. This whole exercise did not in any way seem relevant to me and/or our generation in the beginning but slowly became intertwined, interested and impacted by the history of our country, a forgotten past and a past I had no*

[4] A term used to refer to those born in post-liberation South Africa, i.e. either in or after 1994.

> *idea existed. It is important to know events such as this so that our youth can have an understanding of the attitudes of our elders* (Nina, S2, L8, 161).
>
> *It's only relevant to me because I've grown up in a society where I've been conditioned to [?] hypersensitivity to race … and I think I've grown up second-hand to that hypersensitivity so it's like … I don't see the TRC as good or bad I just see it as like an event that changed history and that has forced us to consider like everything in a whole new light and like our parents were the generation that lived through that and they like – it's made them ultimately who they are* (Michelle, S2, 165-7).

Michelle's comment touches on the idea, raised in the first category, of students having access in a second-hand way to their parents' experiences and interests. But the point made here by both Nina and Michelle goes further: it is not so much their parents' – and those of their generations' – past experiences that they are concerned with but rather their parents' attitudes, ways of thinking and ways of feeling. They are suggesting that living through the conflicted recent past has impacted on the identities of those of the previous generation. Nina does not elaborate on the kinds of attitudes she is referring to but what Michelle alludes to here – and explains elsewhere – is that her parents' eventual realization that they had lived through apartheid in privileged ignorance has made them *'exceptionally compassionate'*, an attitude that Michelle feels they have passed on to her.

Of all the categories, this is the only one which contains responses suggesting a conception of self that is located in a sociopolitical context (to some degree) and that, because of this, is able to be shaped by events that have occurred in the past and have lingering or ongoing social and political consequences. The difference between the two sites is racialised and while it may seem self-evident that young black – rather than white – South Africans are the beneficiaries of the struggle, this does bring to mind a question that is not asked often enough: How have white South Africans benefitted from the struggle and what are the moral imperatives attached to this?

Category 5: Perceptions of social change (or lack thereof)

All but one of the student responses in this category construct current-day South Africa as having benefitted – to at least some degree – from a process of social change . Some students attribute this change to the work of the TRC thereby arguing for its relevance, for example:

> *If the TRC hadn't happened there wouldn't be forgiveness rather and people would have grudges* (Dipuo, S1, L5, 73).

> *I think it's relevant. I said in my journal I realise how important this event was in regenerating our rainbow nation and learning how to live together in peace... We are more at peace now than we were before the TRC happened if it hadn't happened then people wouldn't have [reconciled?] their issues and like forgiven – not forgotten – but like forgiven what happened to them and like moved on in a way. Like learned to live together, learned to accept other people and their differences and what they've done* (Kelsey, S2, L8, 163).

Here the suggestion is that the TRC has indeed brought about reconciliation on a national level. Susan, quoted below, draws the connection to the interpersonal domain, suggesting that the TRC helped to disrupt the racialised socialisation practices that exist both in public spaces and in the home:

> *I find it very relevant because I was thinking what if it didn't happen – how black people and white people would socialize, how their parents influence their children and how it would still be the same now* (Susan, S2, L8, 165).

A somewhat different point is made by Sonia:

> *I think it's so relevant to where we are because I think that's the reason why – like part of the reason why the nation is where it's at this moment. And it's part of the reason why we can – I don't know – why we've moved on from the past and aren't hanging on to what happened* (Sonia, S2, L8, 163).

She sees the importance of the TRC as having enabled South Africa as a nation to work through the past to the extent that it can now be put to bed, so to speak.

All the above students credit the work of the TRC for what they see as positive social change, expressed largely at the level of social dynamics and race relations. Jayesh, who seems to be working with a definition of 'relevance' as 'applicable to', argues against the relevance of the TRC, saying that it is no longer applicable to today's society. Interestingly, however, in doing so he constructs a similar, idealised image of reconciled South African society, saying: *'the country's moved on from the past and has changed and the country is more stable, and people and races and everyone has an understanding and respect'* (Jayesh, S1, L5, 69).

Boikanyo too argues against the relevance of the TRC, attributing social change to the democratic elections in 1994 rather than the work of the TRC, saying: *'when the TRC took place South Africa was already said to be democratic and all that. So the TRC doesn't really affect me anymore as long as South Africa's already democratic'* (S1, L5, 67). Unlike the students in the first category, however, she is not denying that her life as an individual is impacted on by past events; she is being specific about which past events have had an impact, and to her mind the TRC is not one of them.

In this exercise, Patrick is the lone voice, among all students across both sites, who argues that there has been no change, saying:

> *things are like still the same. If you meet people out there they have like iron curtains in them. Like when you look at them you see a different face but like for instance when I stop in Alex or in the township like he let himself out like he was hiding… he expressed himself out like physically, he had all the pain himself inside him. So like he still has like you know the apartheid days inside him. There are racists still so he hasn't forgotten and the TRC thing isn't really much of a difference* (S1, L5, 79-81).

Although Patrick's formulation is not clear (we don't, for example, know who 'he' is), he does convey two things quite vividly: racism persists; and black people are still living with the unresolved trauma of apartheid. His journal entry helps to clarify the point he is making, saying that *'people walk past each other with smiles on their faces, there's that sense of "freedom". Although the older generation still think nothing has changed.'* He goes on to add, however, that: *'My generation will be well off, because by their time people will know about the past and do whatever it takes to prevent it from rehappening '* (journal entry, 18/08/08). What Patrick raises here for the first time is a generational difference that exists beyond the parent-child family dynamic that other students have referred to. The lack of change he asserted in his oral answer, we realise, is not attributed to all of society but to the perceptions of only the older generation; he concedes that things will be able to be different for the next (his) generation. The idea that differences in attitudes exist between the generations is a theme which emerges more strongly in the focus group data and is explored later.

4.3.2 Second layer of analysis: Working across the categories

The categories discussed above provide an outline of the positions students consciously take up on the TRC and its relevance while in the process constructing aspects of their senses of self and suggesting something of how they view themselves in the world. In this section, I look at two ideas that are evident in the categories, cutting across a number of them, namely: students' awareness of the ways in which they can be sutured into racialised historical narratives; and their concurrent attempts to strive for 'unfixed', post-apartheid identities. In each case, I begin by looking at how these ideas emerge in the categories discussed and then look at how they are extended, reinforced or challenged in other transcript data, drawing from both the spill-over discussions as well as the student focus group discussions.

Sutured into history?

Across all the categories discussed, the dominant construction of history is a negative one. This is the case even for those students who acknowledge the importance of history as well as for those who frame history positively by seeing it as having actively produced the freedom and privileges of the present. Drawing on their terminology, the past is an apartheid past and is a time when people were 'badly treated', and associated with a great deal of 'trouble', 'suffering and hardships', 'trauma' and 'pain'. It is an oppressive past, full of 'mistakes' to be learned from and is so unpleasant that it must never be repeated. Strongly coupled with this is a pervasive discourse on the desire to 'move on' and leave this conflicted past behind. Students across the five categories express this again and again in various ways, some of which are captured in Table 4.2 below.

Table 4.2: The 'moving on' discourse across the categories

- *'we move on – we don't want to go back all the time'* (category 1, Saskia S2)
- *'so that our future gets different and improved from the apartheid era'* (category 2, Lebohang, S1)
- *'we have to reconsole each other and you know move on with our others towards the future'* (category 3, Alice, S2).
- '...*and be able tomove forward as a united nation'* (category 4, Kabelo, S1)
- *'we've moved on from the past and aren't holding on to what happened'* (category 5, Sonia, S2).
- *'the country's moved on from the past'* (category 5, Jayesh S1, S1).

In some cases students appear to want to move on because they believe the past has been dealt with, in other cases they seem to want to move on in order not to deal with it. Either way it is not difficult to understand the impulse to distance themselves from a history that they construct as so overwhelmingly dark and threatening.

The idea that South African youth are not interested in history is not new. Research undertaken in the past decade repeatedly tells us this (see for example, McKinney 2004a, 2004b, 2007; McKinney and Van Pletzen, 2004). In 2010, the Apartheid Museum produced a series of viral videos for a campaign entitled 'A history forgotten is a future lost'. Young South Africans, who are informally interviewed going about their daily lives, are shown to be unable to answer even the most basic questions about South African history[5]. But as the idea of an apolitical youth rapidly approaches the status of a truism, less and less is asked about what this may really mean and why it is so, if it is indeed so. Certainly a more nuanced understanding is called for,

[5] These can be viewed on the Apartheid Museum website, www.apartheidmuseum.org/ .

particularly for those of us who teach young people and who believe it is important to find ways of engaging them meaningfully with the past. With this in mind, I would like to draw on further data from this project to engage both the 'if' and the 'why' questions. Firstly, is the notion that the youth are not interested in history valid in such broad terms? Secondly, is there something in particular about our troubled past that makes it so unappealing to young people?

Firstly, students' stances on history are not wholly unambiguous and consistent. The comments they made in focus group discussions do not suggest a wholesale rejection of history. A considerable number of students demonstratedlargely favourable attitudes to the TRC and the work done on it. Many students said they had not heard of the TRC before and had found it interesting, educational, even refreshing. A number of them mentioned that although they frequently dealt with apartheid, they had not known how it had been overcome. As one student put it: *'it was a good topic because every time we're talking about South African history the only thing that comes up to mind is apartheid and we don't know how like we got over it'* (Khuliswa, S1, FG1); and '*it taught us a lot about what they did try to do after apartheid and moving forward to democracy'* (Kathy, S2, FG1). Nevertheless, students were quick to point out that it had been *'just another school project'* (Kabelo, S1, FG1) and that *'we'll just talk about it and in the end we'll forget about it you know'* (Khuliswa, S1, FG1) or *'just like another subject at school and it's another project that we did and it had... as sad as it is to say like it had no real impact on the way I live and how I view everything'* (Kelsey, S2, FG1).

However, in relation to history, it is necessary to distinguish between the positions taken up in relation to the TRC and those taken up relation to South African history in general, and apartheid history specifically. The positions on the latter are often complex and fraught and it is here that resistance becomes evident. Some of the complaints foregrounded the way in which South African history is inserted into the curriculum. Across the board, students complained about what they saw as an over-emphasis on apartheid in their schooling, saying things like: *'We've done apartheid every single year! ...it's so overplayed in our minds we're sick of it!'* (Adele, S2, FG2). A number of students felt that while the skills involved in the research project were relevant to the English curriculum (i.e. interviewing, presenting, etc.), the subject matter belonged in the History class and, as one student said *'I was like oh not history again I ran away from it as a subject, now I have to do it in English, now what am I going to do?'* (Bontle, S2, FG1). One student compared the topic of apartheid to that

of photosynthesis in Biology– *'it just carries on and carries on...'* (Lesego, S2, FG3); while another spoke about visiting the Apartheid Museum and how the first visit was a shock but *'after the third or fourth time when they're telling you the same stuff and you're like ok like it doesn't make it any better like the more you hear about it but it does sort of um make it more normal... it doesn't affect you so much'* (Mei-Lin, S2, FG3). For one student, it all came down to the term 'apartheid': *'It's just that word "apartheid"... That word's been nailed. It's got a negative thing. To a point we've learned and we've understood but after that it's just…it's like irritable*' (Susan, S2, FG3).

These students seemed to be reacting to what they perceived as the overemphasis on the topic of apartheid but there were others whose comments seemed to centre on the nature of the actual content of apartheid history and the effects that engaging with this content produced. One student questions the need to 'bring it up', saying *'apartheid is dead and buried in this country honestly it's all gone, all these things that bring it up... it's just unnecessary'* (Thabiso, S1, FG1). Another student explains the ambivalence of his position towards engaging with the TRC:

> *I think the TRC was a good thing that we learnt about because first I didn't even know what the TRC was so it also gave me a chance to reflect on it and understand what it's all about. But at the same time I also didn't feel it was a good thing because they keep telling you 'forget about the past' you know, 'you mustn't act on the past' like what happened you know but we keep bringing it up and then people who weren't there in those times you know they grew up maybe in a non-racial place they didn't know what happened to their parents or anything but I didn't even know I was too young to understand. So when you come to school and you have to learn about it it just it brings rage into them just to have to think about what their parents and their family members went through you know. So it just it repeats a cycle it's like a vicious circle* (Luis, S1, FG2).

Luis is a student of Portuguese heritage and later explains that while he was born inSouth Africa, his parents had only recently emigrated from Portugal at the time and they *'weren't around in the apartheid time'*. But Luis's perspective slides between 'I' and 'them' and what he seems to be alluding to is the potential that learning about the past has to foment anger in black youth who are confronted with their parents' suffering.

The ability of history to position the young generation in uncomfortable ways is also evident in the Afrikaans girls' responses to dealing with the apartheid past. There are five girls who self-identify early on in the teaching intervention as Afrikaans: Adele, Antoinette, Calista, Saskia and Sonia. The data analysed thus far shows that multiple

positions exist among this group, from lack of interest towards the past and distress at having to repeatedly engage with it, to declarations about the importance of the TRC in having enabled the nation to move on. But a sensitivity to how the past is mediated is evident. In the spill-over discussion on the TRC, Sonia narrates an incident that happened in Grade 8, after a History lesson, saying:

> *I'm Afrikaans and I remember in my class, like we walked out of history, because we were doing apartheid, and the girls came up to us and they were like 'Look what you've done' and like things like that.*(S2, L9, 221).

This incident illustrates the multiple levels on which positioning can occur, namely race, ethnicity and language working together to produce a 'white Afrikaner' identity for Sonia which ties her to the apartheid government and subsequently holds her partially responsible for their deeds. Sonia therefore feels positioned by others' readings of the dominant historical narrative of South Africa, despite positioning herself significantly differently. For example, she goes on to say that *'it's like not our fault... our forefathers might have done it but you have to understand everything in its context'* (S2, L9, 221); and, in an earlier lesson, she argued passionately against the suggestion that she and her peers are not affected by the atrocities committed during the apartheid past, saying:

> *I think everybody is directly affected by this… it's people hurting other people. It's like your own race, your own people, hurting someone else. I don't think – I think it's directly linked to everybody in this country* (S2, L4, 89).

It is significant that in the focus group discussion – the group comprising the five Afrikaansstudents– the issues pertaining to a perceived anti-Afrikaans bias of the post-apartheid History curriculum were taken much further. Sonia herself spoke about the backlash to having Afrikaners consistently constructed as villains, saying that: *'drilling things into us just makes it worse because now we feel so patriotic towards being Afrikaans because we're just like sick of it, it's getting the opposite effect'* (S2, FG2). This bears out Jansen's critique of the counterproductive effects of the simplistic, racialised hero/villain apartheid narrative (2009a; Jansen and Weldon, 2009) which, in this case, traps young Afrikaans students into drawing on discourses of victimhood.

Overall, however, the suggestion is that these positionings are uncomfortable precisely because individuals are sutured (Hall, 1996) into the historical narrative in ways that are tied to fixed identity categories – among which race is dominant. This is alluded to in a comment made in one of the focus group discussions in Site 1. There

was a moment when students were grappling with whether there are conditions in which South African youth might willingly and meaningfully engage with the past. One of the students, Leila, answers in the following way:

> *You see the thing is I don't know if you can change this but I think everyone – the moment you say Africa people have a sort of black and white past and present sort of thing they don't think about anything in the middle or about concepts like culture or how we can sort of intersect. It's always it's set like black people were like this, white people were like that and that's it. So maybe if they could change their way of thinking maybe broaden the subject a bit we'd get further in* (S1, FG3).

This comment suggests a view of the past as a raced place – a place where subject positions were fixed according to race and people's thoughts, actions and attitudes mapped directly onto their racial identities – *'it's set'*. Leila reads this fixedness as a barrier that prevents meaningful exploration of the past – this *'black and white past'* is invoked *'the moment you say Africa'* and prevents one from recognising '*intersect[ions]'* or *'get[ting] further in'*.

Students' references to race in the present suggest a desire to move beyond race – usually by constructing either a race-less or a racially diverse, melting-pot type of present. But there are moments when it becomes clear that the raced past is not easy to shake off and that racialised discourses endure. Some of this comes through in students' negotiations of their relationships with their parents' attitudes to race, discussed in the following section.

Striving for 'unfixed' identities

Across the categories, there are a number of separate, sometimes seemingly unrelated occasions, when students refer to their parents, or people of that generation or older, in relation to history. The notion that as a young person one can have access to history via a parent or family member who may themselves have direct experience of the past emerges strongly in Category 1. What also emerges is the idea that parents and elders have been shaped by the past. In Category 4, Nina and Michelle, both from Site 2, take this position, saying that understanding the apartheid past provides insight into some of the current feelings and attitudes of their parents and elders. Nina refers to the *'hurt and hostility'* that so many people carry within them, while Michelle speaks elsewhere that her parents' realisation that they had lived through apartheid in privileged ignorance has made them *'exceptionally compassionate'*. Both comments allude to the impact of past experiences on current identities.

In Site 1, the idea that parents and their attitudes have been shaped by the past is also taken up by a number of students but has a somewhat different flavour. Parents and other elders are seen as having been negatively affected by the past and these effects are read as lingering on in their current attitudes to race which are, to a greater or lesser degree, subjected to critique by the students. In response to a focus group question which asked students to what extent they thought about race in the same way as their parents, students across all three focus groups take up positions which sought to foreground the differences between their own and their parents' attitudes.

The mildest form of this position is the comment that, *'Race in our parents' head I think it's still a big thing but in ours...* [Boipelo: */it's not that bad/*] – *it's not that bad because we find it easy to... find common ground'* (Enoko, S1, FG3). In another focus group, Thabiso makes a similar but stronger statement, saying *'Our parents' heads are messed up... because they don't reason. They reason with culture differently. If they talk to a white person they'd be like you know all defensive and stuff*' (S1, FG1). Students' critique is forthright but often this is coupled with a sense of compassion or understanding. For example, without disagreeing with Thabiso's statement, Kabelo follows it up with a comment that historicises the racial dynamics, saying, *'It's a different history that they have with white people whereas we were born and you know suddenly like black kids and white kids could go to the same school so you can come together'* (S1, FG1).

Students go on to provide examples of their parents and elders'attitudes: Motshedisi explains how her parents are *'scared of the whites... because they still thinking about apartheid and how the whites were treating them'* (S1, FG1); Sebolelo describes her father as often conveying his hatred for white people by *'coming out maybe with this racist stuff'* (S1, FG1); Lebohang talks about how uncomfortable her family is with her boyfriend who is *'not black'* (S1, FG2). Throughout these discussions, students position themselves at a critical distance, subtly conveying the difference between their attitudes and those of their elders.

However, across both sites there is also some indication that students have some awareness of the processes of intergenerational transfer (Hoffman, 2004, Jansen, 2009b). The possibility that knowledge, attitudes, feelings and values are both consciously and unconsciously transferred from parent to child is acknowledged by a number of students although not seen as inevitable. When Susan talks about *'how parents influence their children'* (see category 5), her point is that if it had not been for

the TRC, *'it would still be the same now'*, thus both highlighting the power of discourses of the home as well as acknowledging that these are not the only discourses that shape a young person. In a focus group discussion in Site 1, when Mahendra makes the comment that *'when parents that lived in apartheid [...] these days they don't like to mix with other races I think it passes on to the child'* (S1, FG2), his peers are quick to point out that these parental influences have limits. They refer to the fact that although one tends to listen to parents when one is younger, one begins to make one's own decisions as one grows up. Thabang says that once he leaves home, *'I will not at times follow like what they used to think was right, what they think is right, I'll do what* **I** *think'* (FG2); and Boikanyo says that you begin to *'make up your own values and your own rules, you'll see what's right and wrong, and you'll see who's telling you nonsense and who's actually telling you the truth'* (FG2). My focus here is not on the nature and extent of these parental influences *per se* but on students' perceptions of these influences and how their desire to be different from their parents in particular ways leads them to take up subject positions that foreground their own independence as thinking and choosing subjects.

In interesting ways, the past/present binary that was evoked in relation to history seems to be extended to incorporate an adult/youth binary where parents and others are associated with outdated, racialised identity positions and discourses while they take up the voice of young people who are able to adopt new positions, new values and thus leave the past behind and 'move on' on a number of different levels. This is alluded to in the following student comments:

> Boikanyo: *I think that we're all equal you know it doesn't matter what colour your skin is or you are or what you wear or where you're from we're all just equal. And clearly my gran doesn't think the same and my father doesn't think the same...*
>
> Patrick: *I think like with old people like a black person is black, a white person is white whereas you get the younger age groups where like a black person can be anything he wants to be, like take themselves wherever they want, doesn't matter what race you are because you have the freedom to express yourself* (S1, FG2).

These positions, particularly Patrick's, resonate strongly with Leila's comment, discussed above, on how unappealing apartheid history is for the youth because of its tendency to reduce everything to a '*black and white past'* (S1, FG3). And what both of these comments strongly suggest is that some of these young people are particularly invested in the 'unfixing' of old apartheid-style identities and are attuned to what Singh refers as 'the historic opportunity to fashion a new set of understandings about

who we are and what we consider to be of fundamental value to us' (1997, p. 120). The fixed, racialised identities of the past are thus rejected in favour of the seemingly 'fluid and open horizon for identity construction'(Singh, 1997, p. 120).

But these seemingly open-ended possibilities for deracialised identity construction are not uncontested storylines. Students, particularly in this site, often proffer anecdotes or describe in broad terms situations where they are given racialised labels by others for exhibiting behaviour that is not racially normative. Both Leila and Patrick talk of being labelled 'coconuts'. In the case of Leila, when she goes to Durban to visit family, her Jo'burg accent, which lacks the inflections of the Durban Indian accent, is criticised as an attempt to try *'to be a white girl'* (S1, L6, 101). She also talks of having had similar criticisms levelled against her by her peers when she arrived at her current school and did not immediately gravitate towards the *'Indian crew'* (S1, FG3). Patrick makes similar complaints about responses to his love for rock music, saying:

> *I'm black all right and if I like listen to rock music everyone else will put me in a certain category as a coconut or something... I don't think like people should like put you in a box because of the music you listen to or the sport you do ... or the way you dress. I think that's a certain like way people consider other people when it comes to races* (S1, FG2).

These stories point to the fact that while, for many of these young people, the unfixing of racial identities may be highly desirable, it is not necessarily something that can be smoothly accomplished. Labelling someone a coconut is a way of punishing them for transgressing the perceived boundaries of the discursive practices governing race and racialised subjectivities. It confers outsider status to an individual who is purportedly no longer an 'authentic' black or Indian person by virtue of their perceived attempts to take up behaviour associated with another racial category – in this case, to 'act white'. Davies (1989), working with gender, describes this kind of policing of boundaries as category maintenance work, done to dissuade individuals from transgressing the norms of behaviour associated with their group. In this case the same process is demonstrated in relation to race. Clearly the more stringently the borders of 'blackness', 'Indianness' or any other racial category are policed, the more difficult it becomes to undo fixed racial identities and to generate new or hybrid identities which work with race in more malleable ways.

Tensions are thus often evident between students' desires to escape the past as well as to escape, or at least redefine, race and their difficulties in doing so. Thabiso is a case in point. The various comments he makes about his father, whom he interviewed on the TRC, poignantly illustrate what it means both to attempt to resist

and yet to be unconsciously shaped by parental discourses. Thabiso's overt and fairly consistent position is to distance himself from his father's way of thinking. He begins by doing so when he reports back on his interview and makes a point of distinguishing between his father's position and his own. Later, during the course of the spill-over discussion he relates a personal anecdote about a racialised confrontation between his father and the white owner of the place they were holidaying in. His narration of this incident is analysed in detail in Chapter 6 but the dominant aspect of this narration is Thabiso's implied critique of his father's inability to shift out of old apartheid racial discourses in his interactions with white people. In the focus group discussion, he reinforces this position with the statement that *'our parents' heads are messed up'* and then follows this up with another anecdote where his father comes home one day and announces that he has white people in his employ. Thabiso relates the incident in the following way:

> *My dad told me once something and I was like 'why you telling me?' He once came home and said 'son I pay white people'.* [Laughter from peers]... *So it's like I mean hell wow, is that an achievement or what? What am I supposed to react like?* [Kelebogile: *for them it is*] *Yes* (S1, FG1).

Thabiso's impatience with his father's desire to 'turn the tables' on historicised and racialised power relations is palpable and he makes quite a show of suggesting that this is petty-minded and reactionary. Shortly after this the discussion moves on to the question of how students imagine their futures. In this particular focus group, all the students confidently evoke a highly idealised representation of 'the good life', replete with images of privilege and success such as, living on a golf estate, eating food with unpronounceable names and wearing monogrammed clothing. Thabiso, who has been contributing to this collective vision, then adds the following statement:

> *Having a white butler, ma'am, I'd love that, ma'am, I'd feel so high I mean high, ma'am, as in status – having a white butler...* [Ana: *So it seems you're agreeing with your dad after all...?*] *Ja well in a way, ma'am, it's like what did you do to make him work for you? That's the type of success I want to show people* (S1, FG1).

What is so striking about this example is that Thabiso is multiply positioned as a young South African of the 'born-free' generation who is dismissive of the lingering effects of the racialised past as well as as a son who is inevitably shaped by the discourses of his father. He does, after all, understand his father while simultaneously also objecting to his father's views. He illustrates how, although the moments when young people attempt to distance themselves from their parents' attitudes and to position themselves differently are real, they may not always be successful. The old

apartheid categories of ‘race’ may indeed be unfixed but the horizon is only as open as the existing available discourses allow.

4.4 Concluding thoughts

Despite various ambiguities and inconsistencies, these young people express reluctance to engage with the past. They do so verbally and explicitly, as captured by their classroom and focus group discussions, or through the passive resistance that seemed to be a feature of the interview-gathering process. This reluctance is evident even in those students who acknowledge the significance of the past, and the few who discern continuities between past and present.

This reluctance to engage with the past is in part due to the way in which history continues to be racialised. Students show signs of feeling sutured (Hall, 1996) into the national historical narrative in ways that are tied to fixed, racialised identities. The dominant TRC narrative – and the broader narrative of apartheid history – positions young people (Davies, 1989, 1993/2003, 1994) in uncomfortable racialised ways. This narrative is described byJansen as one with ‘characters in the divided setting… seen as essentially evil, as white racists, or as terminally disempowered, as black victims’ (2009a, p. 155). The TRC interviews gathered by students provide a strong indication that the discursive positions of the adults interviewed were still largely tied to the racialised discourses of apartheid, falling in predictable ways on the different sides of the black victim/white perpetrator binary. Additionally, the Afrikaans students in Site 2 maintain that they continue to be positioned as ‘villains’ in the apartheid narrative. It would seem that conscious discursive manoeuvring is thus required in order not to allow one’s racial and cultural identifications to predetermine the side of the historical racial conflict that one identifies with. Given the difficulty involved in this, it seems easier to opt out, disavow history and any effect it could be seen to have on present realities. The past therefore is seen as a raced place, best avoided.

There are, however, a number of additional points of interest. There is evidence that the students themselves were not inevitably positioned by the discourses they accessed and did not simply repeat racialised patterns. Some students in Site 2 distanced themselves from their interviewees’ views or openly challenged them even when these were family members. There is also evidence that during the spill-over discussion some students made moves to either deracialise perspectives on the TRC

or attempted to disrupt the racialised binary by expressing interest in both perspectives.

Also students, particularly those in Site 1, attempt to distance themselves from their parents' ways of thinking about 'race' and carve out different identities and relationships for themselves. They are sometimes able to see how history has shaped their parents' generation but there are no signs that they see how it has contributed to their own historically constructed discursive positions. So while they want race to be irrelevant they are not always able to escape the racialised discourses of the past. What students gain by turning their back on the past is a rejection of the fixed racial identities that held sway in South Africa for so long; but what they lose by doing so is the ability to discern the ways in which they continue to be shaped by past discourses and thus to take considered action against them.

5

PLACING THE YOUTH POSTERS

> *It is not that words are imperfect, or that, when confronted by the visible, they prove insuperably inadequate. Neither can be reduced to the other's terms: it is in vain that we say what we see: what we see never resides in what we say*(Foucault, *The Order of Things*, 1970, p. 10)

5.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter, the focus was on the positions that students take up in relation to the past, with two tasks on the TRC serving as starting points for the analysis. In this chapter the focus shifts to the latter part of the teaching intervention where students are invited to re-engage with the present. Central to this chapter is the final task of the intervention where students were asked to produce a poster which captures in word and/or image what it is like being a young person in South Africa today. I thus continue to explore the range of subject positions that students take upand their relationship to pedagogy.The research sub-questionsbeingaddressed in this chapter foreground the role of multimodal representational resources in realising these positions:

- What subject positions do students take up in the poster and the poster talk?
- To what extent are these positions inflected by students' spatiotemporal locations?
- How does the pedagogic structure of the poster task shape the discourses of the classroom space?

For the purposes of this analysis, the posters are seen as multimodal artefacts functioning as snapshots of students' subject positions, concrete instantiations of

what Hall would refer to as ‘points of suture’ (1996). Students’ fluid identities are discernible as points of temporary attachment to the multimodal discourses they draw on in the construction of their texts. Whereas in the previous chapter the discursive analysis of subjectivity attended exclusively to students’ use of the linguistic mode, in this chapter the analysis is underpinned by an understanding that discourses occur in multiple semiotic modes (Kress and Van Leeuwen, 2001). The multimodal forms of representation through which students’ subject positions are realised centre predominantly on the visual mode and draw on image, spatial design and colour, as well as use of written language. In addition, because they are asked to present their texts to their teacher and peers, students have the opportunity to foreground their own meanings verbally through their ‘talk around the text’ (Lillis,2001, 2008). By doing so they add an additional layer of interpretation which is itself open to re-interpretation.

The analysis which follows is structured into two sections, each working with the student artefacts in different ways. In the first section, I begin by presenting the full set of youth posters across the two sites. Using a form of content analysis which is predominantly visual, I explain how I have coded the posters by ‘counting what I think I see’, to coin a phrase from Rose (2001, p.54). This is complemented by the coding of the verbal images and writing that is present on the posters. In the second section, I deal with the posters from each site separately and provide a deeper analytical perspective by bringing together the poster and the poster talk. The analysis thus emerges from the dialogic interaction between the visual and the verbal mode and the discourses that are mobilised by each, focusing on the ways students have positioned themselves in relation to place and nation. As a pedagogically structured intervention, the poster task is thus understood to shape the discourses that students draw on to articulate their subject positions. Therefore the analysis of the relationship between subjectivity and pedagogy is taken further through its attention to the kinds of subject positions that it is possible to articulate within the discursive structure of the poster task.

Overall the analysis thus moves from surface detail to discursive depth. While the initial content analysis has a quantitative aspect to it, I argue that it is inevitably interpretative from the start and, additionally, its primary function is to facilitate the qualitative discursive analysis which ensues. A point that I wish to emphasise is that while the multimodal student artefacts remain the focus of the analysis throughout this chapter, the student talk which I draw on in the second part plays an important role in

layering the analysis. A criticism often levelled against visual content analysis is that it ignores 'the site of its production' (Rose, 2001, p. 67). By using the mediating talk of students' classroom presentations, students' own meanings as producers of the artefact are being acknowledged. However, these meanings are not treated as authentic and transparent and are themselves subjected to discursive analysis. In this way, the dangers of reifying student identities as they are realised in 'one moment in time' (Lillis, 2008, p. 361) are obviated through the use of multiple data sources. Furthermore the use and combination of multiple modes usefully provides different 'takes' (Kress, 1997, cited in Stein, 2008) on the subject positions of their makers and enables a more nuanced analysis.

5.2 Pedagogic framing of the poster task

While the first part of the teaching intervention has the past as its focus, the remainder of the teaching intervention focuses on the present and young people's current realities. The question on the TRC's relevance to today's youth functions as a bridge between past and present, as it requires that the past be found meaningful, or not, from the vantage point of subject positions located in the present. This shift to the present was facilitated through the use of a handout that collected a variety of contemporary representations of South African teens. This handout is discussed in section 3.3 and presented in Appendix A4. Teachers used this handout in an open-ended way, allowing themselves to be guided by student response to different aspects of the handout.

This discussion is followed by a briefing on the poster task. Students were asked to work in pairs to produce an A3 poster that captured in word and image their sense of what it is like to be a young person in South Africa today, i.e. 2008. See briefing sheet in Appendix A5. Both sets of students were given class time to work in pairs to conceptualise and design their posters and a date was set for the poster presentations. In each site, students presented their completed posters to their teacher and peers in the final two lessons of the teaching intervention. This entailed the poster-makers taking the floor at the front of the classroom, with their poster, and talking through their design, and included, in some cases, interaction with teacher and peers.

The main aim of this analysis is to explore how students use word and image to construct accounts of their social worlds and what they choose to include in and

exclude from these worlds. The task is a (self)representational one, inviting engagement on three levels. Students were asked to represent what it is like to be a young person in South Africa today. One level of engagement was a generational one requiring a focus on the lived experience of young people. A second level of engagement was related to place, with 'South Africa' referring both to a particular, shared geographic location as well as suggesting a potential investment in nationhood. The third level of engagement located this exploration in time, the contemporary moment, i.e. these young people's lives in 2008. Given the 'post-apartheid-ness' of the moment, particularly in light of their recent engagement with the work of the TRC, this also offered the possibility of connecting to history.

While the task was intentionally open-ended in order to allow for a broad range of positions to be taken up, it deliberately invited students to see their identities as placed and historicised – to consider who they were in relation to the particular historical moment and to particular sociopolitical conditions. The ensuing analysis of these multimodal artefacts and their surrounding talk thus focuses on the ways in which students represent their generational, spatial and temporal locations. The task was designed as pair work to preclude a narrow, introspective focus on the inner world of the self and to encourage instead some sense of looking outwards. Once again, this becomes an exploration of the relationship between the self and society but this time derived primarily via a multimodal artefact and shifting the focus to one which encompasses the interplay between the visual and the linguistic mode.

5.3 TAKE 1: Identities on display

5.3.1 Introducing the posters: The 'look' and the 'feel'

The data for this analysis is drawn from the total set of 25 posters: 12 from Site 1 (where one group had 3 students, and 3 other students produced individual posters); and 13 from Site 2 (where two students produced individual posters). A full set of colour posters is provided in the appendices: **Appendix C** contains the posters from Site 1; **Appendix D** contains the posters from Site 2[6]. The sequence of the posters is derived from the order in which they were presented in class. All posters are A3 size and students use a range of materials and material resources that result in various different visual and sensory effects. Interestingly all 25 posters make use of collage

[6] Photographs of students and of their friends and family that are included in some posters have been pixellated to preserve confidentiality.

although there are some variations in the way this technique is used. Although this is essentially a two-dimensional artefact in that students work with a flat design on a single plane, many of the collages are textured through the layering of different cut-out texts and, in some cases, the inclusion of objects that are glued onto the flat surface.

Within the collage mode, the majority of posters (15 out of 25) assemble a multiplicity of pictures and words, filling the space of the page in a random way. Some of these posters are so tightly packed with cut-out images and words that little background is visible; images and words overlap in higgledy piggledy ways; in some cases pictures are only partially stuck down so as to be able to flap up and reveal others below, creating a busy, chaotic effect. Others have fewer words and pictures, allowing some background to be visible, often positioning words and pictures square on the page, creating an altogether neater, more controlled effect. Most posters consist of pictures and words cut from magazines and glued onto the page, some include photographs of the students themselves, others include found objects that have been stuck down to form part of the collage, such as compact discs, condoms, and miniature bottles of alcohol. Some posters, however, have been designed on computer and printed in full colour creating a seamless and untextured collage effect.

A smaller though significant portion of the posters (10 posters) have used collage effects but have subordinated them to a particular design structure which dominates the page. This can be as simple as dividing the page into two and structuring it around a binary (e.g. S1P2 ‘cool’/’uncool’; S2P4 ‘good things’/’bad things’); or dividing the page into three columns and filling each column with words and images representing a particular theme (e.g. S2P8 uses 3 separate columns to represent fashion, school and personal life, and politics). Others have chosen symbolically meaningful designs to structure their pages, such as the South African flag or the outline of the African continent, and have then used collage techniques to various effects in and around their selected shapes.

5.3.2 Coding collages

The widespread use of the collage mode means that although 25 multimodal texts are being subjected to analysis, each one is made up of a multiplicity of images and fragments each of which needs to be noted and rendered meaningful. While breaking these posters down into codes and numbers is inevitably a reductive exercise, it is

useful to begin by establishing the types and frequency of images and words selected across the full set of data. This serves to minimise the bias of the researcher's gaze (Rose, 2001), as I am compelled to look beyond what it is that I am looking for – and find it present or absent – and look instead at what is actually displayed. This surfaces patterns that may otherwise have passed undetected if the posters were only analysed compositely, one by one, and is useful as a first step in a process of analysis that is multilayered and overarchingly qualitative.

The posters have been comprehensively coded using content analysis that takes into account both the visual images (of people, places and things) and the linguistic images (cut-out words of various styles and sizes as well as hand-written words or phrases). The first step of this process required detailed analysis of all that was visible on the posters. Every image in each poster was inspected and identified, as was every word, phrase and quotation. Based on this, 40 descriptive labels or codes were derived across the full set of data.

The process of deriving categories is a painstaking one and, given the open-ended meaning potential of images, is seldom merely about 'counting'. Coding categories which are based on material objects rely on identifying iconic images of those objects, e.g. the codes for 'Alcohol', 'Cell phones', 'Cars', 'Condoms' tend to refer unproblematically to visual depictions of alcohol, cell phones and condoms. But the code for 'Music', for example, is derived from a broader range of images, such as pictures of musicians, the covers of music albums, ipods, mp3 players, actual compact discs attached to posters as well as wording which either names a musician or music group or the word 'music' itself. There are categories, however, which work almost exclusively with the indexical value of an image. For example, the category 'Education' is derived not only from cut-out words like 'education' or 'academics', but includes images of children posing in school uniform, piles of serious-looking books, a document labelled 'school report' and a hand-written comment saying, 'School NB'.

Deriving these coding labels is thus an interpretative act which is shaped as much by the available cultural meanings and associations of the images on display as by my gaze as researcher – which itself is shaped both by my theoretical orientation as well as by the line of inquiry mapped out by my research questions. Given the interpretative nature of this process, I agree with Rose that it is essential to make my own 'way of seeing' as researcher as explicit as possible (2001, p. 56). For example, one of the posters (S1, P3) contains a representation of the cover of the Steve Biko book, *I Write What I Like*. Such an image could have been coded as 'books' or

perhaps even ‘education’, but working within the interpretative parameters of this research project, I have elected to code it under ‘History’ which is both consonant with Biko as a political figure associated with the apartheid past and tied to one of the central concerns of this research. These 40 categories are described in the table in **Appendix E1**.

The majority of the categories in this table comprise both visual and verbal references; however, because the genre of the poster operates predominantly in the visual mode, there are far more visual than verbal images. Many verbal images fall neatly into categories already delineated by visuals. For example, ‘beauty’ and ‘glamour’ connote Fashion; and ‘rainbow nation’ joins visually depicted rainbows and South African flags in representing Nation. Some more extended writing also fits easily into existing categories. A phrase such as ‘What’s on DSTV?’ is comfortably accommodated in the category for Other Multimedia Entertainment; and one such as ‘uncertainty about the future leadership of the country’ falls into SA Politics. However, once all the visuals had been coded and all the verbal references that could be accommodated by existing categories had been accounted for, there remained a considerable number of words, phrases and more extended pieces of writing that still needed to be coded. These have been captured in the table in**Appendix E2**. As is evident from the lengthier category labels (e.g. Teen Attitudes; Susceptibility to Pressure; Individuality & Personal Growth, Discrimination), this data tends to be dealing with more complex ideas that are less easily visually captured.

5.3.3 Presentation of data

The coding of the posters is captured in a series of tables in Appendix E1-5. In addition to E1 and E2, which outline the parameters of the categories and detail their contents, E3 and E4 show a poster-by-poster breakdown of categories for each of the two sites, and E5 provides a comparative summary of this data. These tables attest to the detail and rigour of the coding process. For the purposes of identifying the dominant trends, however, it is Table 5.1 below which is most significant. It summarises the occurrences of the categories across both sites, ranked from highest to lowest frequency.

Table 5.1: Ranked totals of poster categories across the full set of data

Item	CATEGORY	GRAND TOTAL [25]	Site 1 total [13]	Site 2 total [12]
1.	Fashion	**23**	13	10
2.	Music	**18**	11	7
3.	Relationships (romantic/sexual)	**17**	7	10
4.	Partying	**16**	8	8
5.	Alcohol	**15**	11	4
6.	Nation, symbols of	**13**	6	7
7.	Cars	**12**	9	3
8.	Cell phones	**12**	8	4
9.	Education	**11**	3	8
10.	Friendship	**11**	5	6
11.	SA public figures	**11**	6	5
12.	Drugs	**10**	6	4
13.	International public figures	**10**	8	2
14.	Body image	**9**	2	7
15.	Condoms	**9**	6	3
16.	Future	**9**	4	5
17.	Place: international	**9**	3	6
18.	Sport	**9**	6	3
19.	Teen attitudes	**9**	7	2
20.	Crime	**8**	4	4
21.	History	**8**	4	4
22.	Individuality & personal growth	**8**	5	3
23.	Money	**8**	7	1
24.	Self	**8**	0	8
25.	Other multimedia entertainment	**7**	5	2
26.	Smoking	**7**	5	2
27.	Social media	**7**	1	6
28.	Other activities, interests	**6**	3	3
29.	Pregnancy	**6**	4	2
30.	Other technological equipment	**6**	2	4
31.	Desirable female forms	**5**	2	3
32.	Family	**5**	2	3
33.	Food	**5**	2	3
34.	HIV/AIDS	**5**	2	3
35.	Place: local	**5**	3	2
36.	Racial harmony	**5**	0	5
37.	SA politics	**5**	1	4
38.	Susceptibility to pressure	**5**	3	2
39.	Traditional dress	**5**	4	1
40.	Ambition	**4**	1	3
41.	Discrimination	**4**	1	3
42.	Gossip	**4**	4	0
43.	Privilege & materialism	**4**	1	3
44.	Twenty-first century lifestyle	**4**	2	2
45.	Environmental issues	**3**	0	3
46.	Media	**3**	0	3
47.	Poverty	**2**	0	2
48.	Religion	**2**	1	1
49.	Teen affirmation	**2**	2	0

In order for the 49 narrowly specific categories identified in the above table to be rendered meaningful or ‘enlightening’ (Rose, 2001, p. 60), relationships between the categories need to be explored. In the discussion which follows I do this by mapping

these categories, in broad terms, onto the three areas which the poster task sought to engage, namely, age, place and time. This is followed by a discussion of the differences which seem to be emerging between Site 1 and Site 2.

Age, Place and Time: The dominant trends

Taken together, the posters demonstrate that these young people have drawn on a wide range of ideas to represent their social worlds. Issues ranging from fashion to food, cell phones to discrimination, poverty to gossip, environment to crime traverse varied social terrain and gesture towards identities that are multifaceted and fashioned across multiple domains. However, issues conventionally associated with teenagehood are strikingly prominent. These issues occur with high frequency,in addition to which almost half of the categories could, broadly speaking, be classified as teen preoccupations.

Firstly, categories such as Music, Partying, Alcohol, Relationships – all falling within the top five most frequently referenced categories – foreground the role of fun, enjoyment and self-gratification in these young people's lives. The strong presence of social interaction with peers is evident in the multiple references to sport spectatorship or participation (Sport) as well as to casual chatting, whether face-to-face or via social networks such as Facebook or Mxit (Gossip, Social Media). In addition, closer relationships of both the romantic/sexual variety as well as friendships are rated highly, with family also having a presence although a lesser one.

Secondly, there are a number of categories that point towards young people's preoccupation with self representation, particularly in ways that are tied to the body, most noticeable in Fashion and Body Image. Fashion is the most ubiquitous of all the categories, being referenced in every single poster in Site 1 and all but two posters in Site 2. As a category, it includes all references to men and women's clothing and fashion accessories as well as references to well-known fashion brands, and is deeply implicated in the construction of identity. Bearing in mind the argument that has been made by Nuttall (2004)for interpreting – in the context of urban, consumerist youth culture – material possessions such as cell phones, cars, and other high-tech devices as forms of 'accessorisation of the self', categories such as Cell Phones and Cars can be read as operating alongside Fashion and Body Image as ways of representing the self.

Thirdly, also present in significant numbers are categories which tend to paint a somewhat negative picture of young people, alluding to teens as reckless, rebellious

and deviant. Categories such as Alcohol, Drugs, Smoking as well as categories that allude to teens being sexually active (Pregnancy, Condoms) are a case in point, as is the category Teen Attitudes which includes quotations such as: 'fearless', 'rebellion', 'know no bounds' and 'we don't have much respect'. However, alongside this exist categories that construct a somewhat more benign image of teens, Individuality & Personal Growth, Susceptibility to Pressure, and Teen Affirmation. Teens are represented as 'stressed' and battling to 'fit in' and are vulnerable to peer pressure; but quotations such as 'The most important thing you wear is your personality' and the lengthy poem explaining why 'Teenagers are amazing…' point to the hopefulness and potential also attached to this period. So while the theoretical perspective that this research project adopts is one which rejects constructions of teens as naturally deviant (Finders, 1998/1999) or adolescence as a time of becoming (Nielsen, 1998), these are discourses that circulate in the public domain and students have drawn on them in locating themselves generationally.

Students' generational locations have been represented in strong if predictable ways; however, their spatial and temporal locations are, on the whole, considerably less evident.

With regard to place, there are a number of categories that engage explicitly with South Africa but these are both considerably fewer than the categories engaging with teen issues and they occur less frequently. Posters that show signs of being 'placed' in South Africa do so either in terms of geographic location or in relation to nation – South Africa as 'imagined community' (Anderson,2006) or 'national culture' (Hall 1996). At first glance, only a handful of posters show any traces of place or nation – notably, the South African flag or visual references to the Rainbow Nation. A second look reveals that a considerable number of the cut-out magazine and newspaper images of people are of South African public figures, mostly musicians and various minor celebrities such as soap opera stars and DJs, although the occasional politician and sports star is also evident. Beyond this, the only other visual traces of place are images of landscapes and wildlife that appear to index South Africa, or at least Southern Africa; a few traces of place or nation also occur in written form, e.g. 'Life is in South Africa' (S1P5).

There are an additional five categories that can be seen as referencing South Africa. These are Racial Harmony, Discrimination, Crime, HIV/AIDS and Poverty – social issues which while not peculiar to South Africa are widely understood to be particular concerns for this country. Racial Harmony includes images of multiracial children

holding hands (S2P10), and image of two young women, one black and one white, anchored by the words ‘best mates’ (S2P4); while Discrimination, a category that is wholly represented in the verbal mode, captures sexism, xenophobia and then various references to racism, including an extract from Nelson Mandela’s well known speech from the dock in 1964 where he speaks against racial domination of any kind (S1P9).

Place is not only limited to South Africa, however. Several posters contain images of the globe of the earth or references to the African continent, as well as images of international locations, often related to travel. The world beyond South Africa is also indexed through images of international public figures although these are overwhelmingly drawn from the music industry.

An additional set of somewhat disparate categories exists: Education, Sport, Money, Other Activities/Interests, Other Technological Equipment, Desirable Female Forms, Family, Ambition, Privilege & Materialism, Twenty-first Century Lifestyle, Environment, Media, Religion. These categories are not age-specific and their presence in the posters indicates that these young people are thinking about these things. And while they are also not place-specific, they suggest one’s location within the social fabric of society. Because these categories allude to social context, where relevant they are discussed in relation to place in Take 2 of the analysis.

With regard to Time, there are two categories that capture students’ explicit engagement with their temporal locations: History and the Future. The former, while not occurring frequently, is almost wholly made up of references to South African history, usually in the form of quotations such as ‘acknowledging our past’ (S1P7), ‘healing a young nation’ (S1P8) or ‘learning from past mistakes’ (S2P5); but there are also visual references such as the cover of Steve Biko’s book, *I Write What I Like* (S1P3) or an anti-apartheid poster (S2P6). There are also two posters where students take a longer view of history and include rock art (S2P6) and a skull that looks like an early hominid fossil (S1P9), possibly alluding to the paleontological theory of Africa as the cradle of humankind. The future, on the other hand, is either seen in broad, aspirational terms, signalled by verbal fragments such as ‘future dreams’ and ‘careers’ (S1P1) or ‘Tomorrow is ours…’ (S1P12); or in terms of tertiary education, to which several posters in Site 2 refer. There are also two references to 2009 as the year of their matriculation (S2P3), as well as two posters referring to the 2010 Soccer World Cup (S1P9, S1P13), two years away at the time. In the context of the analysis which follows, references to South African history are read as indexing place.

Emerging differences

While these key trends work across the two sets of posters, there are some categories that show marked differences in frequency in each site, as well as categories that are realised in interestingly different ways in each site. Without, at this point, attempting to draw any conclusions as to their possible significance, I would like to briefly outline some of the more noticeable differences.

1. *Aspirations and lifestyle:* In Site 1 there are considerably more references to a consumerist lifestyle and a greater focus on material possessions (e.g. Cell Phones, Cars, Money), as well as the high degree of brand-consciousness in the Fashion category. In Site 2, there is greater emphasis on privilege and luxury, education (especially tertiary education), global travel and social media.

2. *Representations of the global:* In Site 1 this is largely achieved through images of international public figures, most of whom are drawn from the American music and film industry; as well as through the many references to global fashion brands. Site 1 also includes the only two references to the African continent as place. In Site 2 the global is more evident though markers of place, such as flags of other countries and images of international tourist locations, some of which are photographs of the students themselves in well-known tourist spotsacross the globe.

3. *Music:* In Site 1, music tastes are tied to specific artists and genres, referring predominantly to rap, hip hop, R&B and house. The single exception is Poster 5, which refers to multiple bands, including heavy metal and various rock bands. (One of the students that made this poster is the single white student in this site.) In Site 2, music is represented more generally, mostly through images of ipods or sound systems; there are two references to rock ’n roll.

4. *Teenage pursuits:* Site 1 scores consistently higher in categories that are conventionally associated with rebellious teenage behaviour, namely: Alcohol, Drugs, Smoking and Teen Attitudes, although some of these references are explicitly negative depictions.

5. *Broad sociopolitical issues:* Although both sites refer in comparable amounts to HIV/AIDS and crime, only Site 2 contains references to poverty, environmental concerns, racial harmony, and media as a social influence, and also has more references to discrimination, including not only racism but also sexism and xenophobia.

6. *Depictions of the self:* In Site 2, the majority of posters use personal photographs to depict the self, either individually or with friends or family. No visual depictions of the self are displayed on any of the posters in Site 1.

5.3.4 Discussion of data

Fundamentally the predominantly quantitative content analysis of the posters informs us of only one thing: the frequency of the visual and verbal references which are displayed. While the interpretative commentary is held over until the qualitatitive analysis has been presented, there are a number of things that it is possilbe to say at this point.

Students appear to be far more deeply invested in their generational locations than in their spatial or temporal locations. The content of the posters speaks overwhelmingly to teen preoccupations which are of the kind typically associated with teens in general, throughout the developed world.

While many posters do locate young people broadly in a social fabric of some kind – one that shows awareness of, *inter alia*, technology, crime, education, media, sport – these societal features are not peculiar to the South African landscape and there is little indication that the interests of the youth or the lifestyles they depict are inflected in any way by the place in which they live. Furthermore there are only vestigial senses of either a national South African identity or a sense of belonging to or participating in a national South African culture, however these might be defined.

In addition to the scarcity of references to the particular sociopolitical conditions of this country, there is almost no evidence that students are aware that they inhabit a particular historical moment, despite their earlier engagement with the apartheid past. While there are a number of references to future identities,the posters are dominated by a sense of an eternal present. However, despite these rather deterritorialised, timeless representations of South African youth, there are a number of emerging differences between the two sites which suggest that at a deeper discursive level, students' representations are being shaped by their own classed and raced locations in South African society.

The ensuing qualitatitve analysis, among other things, attempts to address some of the limitations of the content analysis. Firstly, in the content analysis the posters are not treated as compositional wholes but are atomised through having their multiple images treated as discrete entities and categorised individually, thus disregarding the

meanings that are generated through the ways in which these images interact in the overall design of the poster. So, for example, in the context of this quantitative content analysis, the tiny South African flag in the centre of Poster 13 of Site 1 (S1P13) has the equivalent value of the flag on Poster 2 of Site 2 (S2P2) which spans the full page and structures the design of the whole poster. Clearly this quantitative content analysis needs to be supplemented by the kind of multimodal analysis (Kress, 2000) that would attend to the different social semiotic, design and discursive meanings that each of these flags generates. Secondly, due to the collage mode being one that works largely with the accumulation of multiple iconic images of objects and people, it is often not possible to arrive at clear and unamibiguous interpretations of the meanings or stances that the poster makers are adopting towards the images being displayed. For example, the inclusion of a condom on a poster does not automatically indicate how the poster-makers are positioning themselves in relation to condoms and whether they are constructing the young people who use them as sexually responsible or sexually promiscuous. Overall, this analysis tells us the kinds of things students are thinking about but not how they are thinking about them.

5.4 TAKE 2: (Un)placed identities

In this second layer of analysis, the data comprises not only the poster itself but the talk of the students' poster presentations. It is the ways in which the two modalities – the linguistic mode of the poster talk and the predominantly visual mode of the artefact – are harnessed for the purposes of identity work that is a central aspect of the analysis.

In contrast to the largely quantitative content analysis above, here the analysis is qualitative and multilayered. The posters are treated as expressive wholes (Rose, 2001) so that the relationships between images, and the use of placement and layout can be attended to where relevant (Kress and Van Leeuwen, 1996). As explained in section 3.5.3, I use Lillis's notion of 'talk around the text' (2001, 2008) to analyse the different levels on which the poster talk functions. I deal with the two sites separately in order to retain the boundaries of each classroom space and enable the discursive characteristics of each to be more carefully considered. This also enables site-specific trends in the content of the posters to be tracked.

This section of analysis investigates the extent to which students see their identities as placed. Despite the fact that the task specifically invited students to see their identities as spatially and temporally located, not all posters do so. In order to

facilitate the analysis, each set of posters has been plotted along a continuum which moves from least placed to most placed. In order to determine degree of placed-ness, both markers of place on the poster itself as well as references to place in the poster talk were taken into account. To a considerable degree, the markers of place in the poster talk map onto the markers identified in the content analysis of the posters, particularly when students' presentations remain at a purely descriptive level. There are instances, however, where there is a difference in emphasis between the poster and the poster talk with regard to place. These differences are taken into account when placing posters along the continuum and are more fully discussed in the ensuing analysis.

Taking all this into account, a continuum of place was created that consists of six categories capturing different levels of placedness, asshown in Figure 5.1 below.




Figure 5.1: The structure of the continuum of place

When the posters are plotted along the continuum, we are able to see at a glance the extent to which place is a feature of the students' posters and poster talk. This does not, however, tell us anything about how place is represented – positively or negatively, for example – or what kind of relationship is constructed between self and place. In the ensuing analysis, the discussion moves from least placed to most placed, beginning by considering the unplaced meanings that students foreground and the subject positions that they construct before attending to the ways in which South Africa as a place or nation is represented in the posters and talk that show a higher degree of placedness.

5.4.1 Representations of place in Site 1

Place or nation is not a strong feature of the ways in which the students in Site 1 have represented youth identities. There are not many markers of place in the posters themselves and some of the references that do exist are not acknowledged in the poster talk. Figure 5.2 captures the continuum of placed-ness in Site 1.

Figure 5.2: The continuum of place in Site 1

Placeless ⟷ **Locally placed**

1 Placeless:	2 Traces of place:	3 Mentioning place:	4 Commenting on place:	5 Clearly placed:	6 Highly placed:
1	5	3	6	10	8
2	11	4			9
	12	7			
	13				

The posters in category 1 are devoid of all markers to place and are thus entirely deterritorialised, with the use of global brands, products and celebrity figures suggesting a globalised placelessness. In category 2, markers of place are evident upon close inspection: images of African wildlife, a tiny South African flag and a reference to 'South Africa 2010' (P13); images of local television celebrities and musicians (P11); images of two Zimbabwean politicians (P12); and a verbal reference to South Africa and an image of a South African band (P5). However, not only do these images not stand out in their respective posters, dominated as they are by a multitude of other images denoting teen preoccupations, but they are also not significant enough in the poster-makers' minds to be mentioned in the poster talk.

The posters in category 3 allude only briefly to place in the poster talk. There is a mention of the genres of music that are popular among South African teens (P3); a brief reference to South African languages (P4); and a verbal reference to the need to 'acknowledge the past' (P7). Poster 6, in category 4, is slightly different because in her talk the student refers to Mandela and South African history in such a way that, albeit brief, she takes a stance on an issue which indexes place.

Only three posters, those in categories 5 and 6, engage with place in a more significant way. Posters 10 and 9 use the South African flag and the shape of the African continent, respectively, as the dominant design of the poster, while Poster 8

shifts the visual-verbal balance, using the poster talk to contextualise youth identities in South Africa in far more significant ways than are evident on the poster. All these posters are analysed individually later. What is interesting though is to consider why it is that the majority of these posters have attempted to escape place when it was so clearly an aspect of the task. In attempting to answer this question, it is important to look at what meanings the students have foregrounded in the unplaced posters. The analysis therefore begins with the identification of the dominant discourses of the unplaced posters, seeking to understand what subject positions students tend to take up in these posters, before turning to the three placed posters and exploring how the students, who do engage with place construct their spatial locations.

The teen code

The most salient feature of the poster presentations is their collective construction of a 'teen code'. This is a tacit set of rules and expectations that is perceived to be operating among teens, governing what they should look like, how they should behave and who they should be. It is a complex classification system which is inextricably linked to self-representation, assigning meaning to different styles of clothing, various kinds of accessories, genres of music as well as different types of activities and behaviour, many of which intersect on the body to produce a desirable, 'cool' teen identity – or a less desirable, 'uncool' one, if the crafting process is not successful. However, I argue that while there may be a remarkable degree of consensus among the students about what this code is and how it operates, they do not all position themselves in the same way in relation to this code. Thus the degree of similarity which is evident in the visual content analysis of the posters is partially disrupted by the discursive patterns of the linguistic mode of the presentations.



S1 P2: Thabiso, Sithandi& Tumelo

The second poster to be presented offers the clearest and most favourable application of this code. **Poster 2** (S1P2) is made and presented by Tumelo, Sithandi and Thabiso. In their poster talk they erect the binary between desirable and undesirable teen identities which is visually represented on the poster by a vertical

fold dividing the landscape-orientated page into two equal halves, one labelled 'cool' and the other 'uncool', and each populated by various words and images cut out from magazines. The students offer unambiguous explanations, stating that: *'without money you're nothing'*; *'if you're wearing clothes from PEP I mean you're looked down at but if you're wearing clothes like Versace and stuff like that people can just see that you're wealthy'*; *'if you're an intellectual, you aren't cool*'; *'if you drive a standard car and have the biggest phone, you aren't cool'* (S1P2, L9, 119). Tumelo refers to the hand-drawn t-shirt on the 'cool' side which reads 'I'm too drunk to walk I better drive' as a *'fashion statement'*; this is reinforced by cut-out images of bottles of alcohol on the cool side of the binary, and contrasted with a bureaucratic-looking, neat outfit comprising shirt, tie and suspenders on the 'uncool' side. The presentation is short and unelaborated and despite the fact that not all of the images speak straightforwardly from their 'cool' or 'uncool' sections, the binary is clear: being cool is associated with various accessories and material possessions that serve as markers of wealth and status, and strongly associated with a rebellious, anti-establishment stance, signalled through references to smoking, drunk driving and guns; conversely, being uncool is associated with middle-of-the-road conformity, outdated technology, studiousness and a lack of style.

While no other students present the code as simplistically and unproblematically as this group do, other presenters do continue to fill out the terms of the binary, with the focus being largely on the kinds of teen identities that this group has defined as 'cool'. Drawing on the transcript data from the poster presentations as a whole, the binary takes the form outlined in Table 5.2 below.


Table 5.2: The 'cool' / 'uncool' binary

'cool' desirable	'uncool' undesirable
Doing & Being:	
partying/clubbing	studying maths on Saturday afternoon
drinking	being intellectual
smoking (cigarettes, drugs)	trying to gain knowledge
listening to music: hip hop or house	listening to R&B music
playing games: playstation & other pc games	
having sex	being a virgin
speaking a cool language	speaking Shangaan
backchatting& being rebellious	
swopping gossip or scandal	
Owning/having:	

small, sophisticated cell phones	standard cell phones
fancy cars	standard cars
money	
Wearing:	
branded jeans & labels	baggy clothes
expensive fashion	clothes from PEP (a discount store chain)
jewellery & bling	
tattoos	

Variations exist in students' interpretations of the code and the degree to which they buy into it or take up its dominant discourses. Some students present this code as a given. In **Poster 4**, for example,Kekeletso and Ntombi have divided the space into four sections which they identify as *'culture, labels, peer pressure and music'*. During their presentation, Kekeletso moves beyond fashion and appearance and applies the code to language and culture, saying with a sense of inevitability: *'If you speak a certain language you are considered to be cool. If you speak Shangaan in other words people like making fun of you which I don't know why'* (S1P4, L9, 123). Her partner's comments also bear out how peer pressure functions as a powerful engine in the workings of this code, alluding to issues of self-esteem and acceptance, saying:

> *Peer pressure like drinking, smoking you know doing stuff that your friends want you to do and ja the latest trends and you know if you don't have these you feel very small and you'll end up doing things that are wrong to get these things* (Ntombi, S1P4, L9, 133).




S1 P4: Kekeletso & Ntombi



S1 P3: Thabang & Nkosana

There are posters, however, that begin to demonstrate an awareness of the aspirational nature of the teen code.**Poster 3** is replete with images of cars, fashion, alcohol, and brands, as well as sport and popular culture thus constructing a highly consumerist vision of youth identity. When talking about these items, the students draw explicitly on what Nuttall refers to as 'the future-orientated language of aspiration' (2004, 439): Thabang talks about the types of cars *'we'd like to own'* while

his partner Nkosana refers to how owning a fancy car would *'show your status… if you're fortunate enough to have one'* (S1P3, L9, 121).



S1 P1: Lebohang&Leila



S1 P5: Luis&Kelebogile

Poster 1, presented by Leila and Lebohang, is also littered with randomly-placed images of alcohol, music, various celebrities, brands and general bling. Near the top right-hand corner, a strip of negative film from a camera has been glued down. In her talk, Leila says:

> *one of the things that identifies a person most is the way they spend their time. Whether you're out partying and drinking, or if you study maths on your Saturday afternoons, you're classified in totally different places. I have film over here because I think the way that a person – the way other people see themselves like in a photo or the way other people capture them is very important to people* (S1P1, L9, 117).

She thus demonstrates an awareness of the classification system at play using an object symbolically to convey an abstract idea. The film strip indexes issues of representation and self-representation which loom large in young people's imaginaries.

While the first few posters to be presented all reinscribe the teen code in various ways, there are moments of critique which become evident as the presentations proceed. **Poster 5**, by Luis and Kelebogile, is another unstructured collage, displaying images of cars, cell phones, alcohol, fashion items and accessories, as well as wording referring to music groups, dating, sex and love. Luis begins the presentation by saying, *'We took the latest trends, obviously what teenagers are into now and what you <u>have</u> to wear and what you <u>have</u> to own to be accepted'* (S1P5, L9, 123), highlighting by his choice of phrasing and vocal emphasis the almost coercive

workings of the code. However, he takes a strong personal stance against an aspect of the code, saying:

> *A lot of teenagers nowadays think it's cool to have sex and not wait until you're married which – I'm a strong believer that sex before marriage is wrong, it's just within my religion and my culture. I follow by it and it's always been with me*(S1P5, L9, 125).

It is significant that a reading of the poster alone provides no indication of the no-sex-before-marriage stance that is verbalised during the presentation. It is in the linguistic mode that Luis, who has a Portuguese heritage and has had a Catholic upbringing, draws on these alternative discourses to position himself as a non-sexually active teen. Similarly his partner, Kelebogile, unsettles the high aspirational quality of the images, saying that it is about *'the way you want to see yourself… everyone wants to look good. Because getting the latest cell phone, if you really can't get it it's not a big deal'* (S1, L9, 125).


So students may be using discourses of aspiration – both visually and linguistically – but they are not always doing so unreflectively. Motshedisi, for example, when presenting **Poster 6**, says the following:

> *Here I've got a picture of Madiba because actually some of us teens do care what he did and like, ja. And here's a girl who's… and not all of us are so high class and want to follow the life of teens and high prices. By knowing where you come from and your family, when you come to school you won't compare yourself with other teens because you don't know what their parents can afford* (S1P6, L9, 125-7).

This is a particularly interesting comment in light of the visual impact of the poster. It too is replete with images of fashion items, brand logos, beautiful people, much bling and various high-tech consumer goods. It conveys the glamour and desirability of what it is displaying, and carries no trace of the critique offered by Motshedisi in her presentation. The only thing that gestures beyond the teen code is the picture of Mandela, and it is also the only trace of place, largely because it is anchored by the words 'Viva Madiba', a South African term for celebrating Mandela. Yet Motshedisi shows an awareness – and an acceptance – of her personal material and economic constraints. She makes it clear that for her identity is not tied to wealth and status, instead aligning herself with the values associated with Mandela's involvement in the struggle for freedom as well as her own family values. Thus while the poster display itself appears to reinscribe the teen code, Motshedisi makes it clear that she herself does not buy into it.




S1 P6: Enoko&Motshedisi




S1 P7: Kholiswa

Therefore what also becomes evident is that students are keenly aware of what is desirable but some students are able to – at particular moments – step back and not be fully positioned by the obligations of the code that is largely governed by middle-class consumer culture. Nuttall talks of how the highly aspirational nature of black urban teen identities is about 'utopian possibilities' (2004, p. 450) which, she acknowledges, can be read 'as a certain "refusal" of the agony of the social' (2004, p. 451). As part of the emerging middle class, the students in this site are working with images and ideas that index luxury, privilege and elitism, and there is a distinct absence of any reference to social issues such as poverty and HIV/AIDS. Nevertheless there are some who are able to discern , at least at their own personal level, 'the gap… between an aspirational culture and real social conditions' (p. 451).

The remaining poster presentations adopt positions of critique towards the teen code. In **Poster 7**, Kholiswa, the single poster-maker, includes a text box where she briefly outlines her own personal manifesto of identity in hand-written form. She points out how the youth are compelled to adopt society's *'crucifying perseption of true identity'*, which she derides as materialistic and status-conscious, contrasting this with her own view of identity which is about *'acknowledging the past, accepting the present and embracing my true mind, body and spirit'* (S1P7, L9, 127). She reads this out as her presentation and her poster talk also makes reference to how 'the church for spirit' is also tied up with what counts for her as 'true identity'.



S1 P11: Puseletso



S1 P13: Mahendra

In the presentations of Posters 10, 11 and 13, students take up positions of unambiguous critique towards the code although once again the posters themselves carry little indication of this critique. Poster 10 (shown on page 140) displays a variety of consumerist products, brands, logos, and alcohol under the banner 'teen' 'status'. On **Poster 11** the heading is 'Teens Identity' and pictures of local celebrities and ordinary people socialising are complemented by words such as 'out & about', 'scandal', 'glamorous' and 'backchat'. **Poster 13** has the usual cars, alcohol, cell phones, brands and logos, and some high-tech gadgets, but also has pictures of what look like holiday getaways, in the bush or the beach, including some African nature and wildlife, surrounded by words like 'discovery', 'gold' and 'explore'. In none of these posters are there any indications that teens are being constructed negatively and it is only in the poster talk that criticism of the teen code emerges. The critique is achieved through taking behaviour and attitudes that have already been identified as arbiters of 'cool' and re-framing these negatively so that what was previously constructed as desirable is now seen as immoral and deviant. This is conveyed using highly judgemental discourses, as captured in the quotations in Table 5.3 below:

Table 5.3: Discourses of teen vice

- **Poster 10:***'they confuse true love with infatuation… infatuated with labels… it's all about what you wear on the outside, your appearance… intelligence [is] something that today's youth lacks… our youth is addicted to alcohol'* (Boipelo & Boikanyo)
- **Poster 11:***'they are obsessed about fashion and looking good while they can't afford it at times… want to compare themselves to adults in terms of fashion… they backchat'* (Puseletso)
- **Poster 13:***'teenagers are very greedy and they love money, can't do without money… teenagers are like wild animals… most teenagers are obese…'* (Mahendra)

It is particularly interesting that in Poster 10 the word 'intelligence' is displayed on the poster yet Boikanyo explains it as something that teenagers lack therefore its presence on the poster points to an absence. Similarly, in his talk of Poster 13, Mahendra explains that the word 'gold' and the image of a leopard in a tree are used to index teenagers' greed and wildness, respectively, meanings that would not have been likely to be read off the poster alone. These examples speak to the need to take seriously some of the arguments that have been made (e.g. Rose, 2001) about the dangers of analysing multimodal/visual artefacts without any consideration of the meanings of their makers. However, it is more complex than this. As I will show, closer analysis of the pedagogic context suggests that meanings are continually shifting and that it is not possible to identify singular and true meanings in any mode.





S1 P12: Kabelo&Sebolelo (front & back)

Poster 12, by Kabelo and Sebolelo, is the final of the unplaced posters. These students too take a critical stance towards the teen code but they do so in complex and multilayered ways which give some indication of the multiple discourses and subject positions that they are negotiating. Kabelo and Sebolelo draw strongly on parental discourses to critique the teen code. Near the top edge of the poster in the centre there is a cut-out photographic image of a woman's eyes staring directly at the viewer and below them, stuck down at an angle, is the cut-out phrase 'parenting pains'. Sebelelo explains this, saying: *'… and why we have the eyes here is that this whole thing is about the views of parents and how they see teenagers and we call it 'parenting pains'* (S1P12, L10, 137). The front of the poster displays, as other posters do, images of alcohol, cell phones, fashion items, condoms, music, money, and so on, against a black background. The presentation opens and closes with the reading of two poems (only the second of which appears on the poster, on the back). The opening poem is entitled 'Children of Today'; it is written by Sebolelo and is a heartfelt lament written from the narrative perspective of today's young people. It simultaneously bemoans the way adults label teens and criticises the behaviour of teens but ends on a positive, hopeful note with the children of today being reborn as 'children of tomorrow'. However, by the time the students have talked their way through the display, they have wholly participated in the labelling process that their poems speak out against, adopting the very kinds of discourses that they attempt to challenge, saying things like: *'most teenagers are drug addicts… they smoke cocaine, they do drugs, smoke cigarettes because that's the cool thing to do'* (137). At times they even take up the subject positions these discourses offer, saying things such as *'we like money and we're concentrating on getting money'* (139). The closing poem is displayed on the back of the poster where they have written in large hand-writing against a bright orange background, 'Tomorrow is ours'. This poem (attributed to

Jamie Haskins) functions almost as an extension of the first poem's positive ending, highlighting the potential of teens while speaking back to the critical gaze of parents.

This presentation is more complex and layered than most. It attempts to challenge parental discourses that are perceived as overly critical of teens and teen practices, yet it is complicit with these discourses at various points; it refutes the construction of teens as indulging in irresponsible behaviour but it cannot entirely escape the 'teen code' and its binaries. There is the sense that these students are multiply positioned as vocal critics and inevitable followers of the code.

The elusive self

In the presentations, the positions from which students speak structure the discourses they draw on in relation to the youth, and vice versa. As was already noted in the content analysis of the posters, a significant difference between the sites is that none of the posters in Site 1 have a visual 'self' on display. Students do not attempt to draw or represent themselves – either iconically (through drawn or photographed human figures) or symbolically (through visual metaphor or design that could allude to individualised identities). In the poster talk this depersonalisation is evident in that by and large students talk *about* the youth rather than *as* the youth.

This trend is noticeable in the use of nouns and pronouns across almost all the presentations: *'teenagers… they… teenagers today… most teenagers…. the youth of today…'*. Only occasionally do students use first-person pronouns either to refer to themselves as individuals (using the singular 'I' or 'me') or the inclusive plural form ('we' or 'us'). However, often the 'we' tends to refer to the poster-makers and the process of constructing the posters and is used alongside talk of the youth in the third person, e.g. *'<u>we</u> put specifically a Durex condom because <u>they</u> prefer to use money um buying things like these whereas <u>they</u> could just abstain'* (Boikanyo, S1P10, L9, 133). There is slightly more frequent use of 'you', a pronoun usage that seems to stand mid-way between 'they' and 'we', appealing to a generalised experience which is broadly understood, if not necessarily shared, by the speaker and audience and functions perhaps as a less risky version of the inclusive 'we'. However, while noun and pronoun use is often an indicator of the position that a student takes in relation to the youth, this usage slides around during the presentation talk suggesting that students' shifting positions may be related to the particularities of the subject matter under discussion.

Poster 10 is a particularly striking example of this. In their mediating talk, the students construct an overwhelmingly negative representation of the youth, describing them as infatuated, prejudiced, label-mad, money-focused, and interested in gossip, external appearances, sex, games and alcohol. In the process of constructing such a negative vision of the youth, these students – unsurprisingly – make linguistic choices that distance themselves from such youth, largely referring to them in the third person: *'today's youth... a lot of schoolkids are... every teenager loves... with teenagers it's all about... they prefer... they could just... today's youth... they like...'*. In addition to the distancing effect of these choices, there are moments when they take up positions of direct critique of the youth, criticising them for spending money on condoms when *'they could just abstain'* and identifying intelligence as *'something that today's youth lacks'*.

In relation to the negative construction of teens and the focus on teen vices a number of issues come to the fore. Firstly students seem to be reproducing dominant discourses on the youth which circulate in the media where the youth is frequently depicted as deviant, difficult and only interested in instant gratification. Students fall back on stereotypes which are easily available in magazines – from which most of these resources are drawn. In a focus group discussion one of the students made a comment about how easy it had been to find visuals depicting teen vices, saying *'I think we found every single topic, the drugs, the alcohol, whatever, in a magazine. You didn't even have to go and look for it'* (Leila, FG3, 10); while in a different focus group, Lebohang said that when designing their poster, they had tried to look for positives but *'it was quite impossible'* (FG2, 5). Secondly, students seem to be strongly positioned by an extract from an article included in the youth handout. (See the article entitled 'Educate for Justice' on the first page of the handout, Appendix A4.) The article constructs today's teens as apolitical and party-mad teens by contrast to the politically active teens of the 70s. Various comments by students suggest that they felt positioned by what they saw as the article's depiction of the youth as *'drug addicts and alcoholics'* (Beverley, FG2, 5). It is interesting to note, however, that while the article does mention drunkenness at Youth Day 'bashes'[7], its focus is on political indifference and it does not mention drugs at all. Yet students did not feel positioned as apolitical and uninterested in history, but as drug addicts and alcoholics, escaping the political and historical once more.

[7] Parties held on Youth Day, a political public holiday on 16 June commemorating the Soweto Uprising that occurred in 1976 when protesting school students were gunned down by police.

Placing the youth

Thus the majority of posters in Site 1 appear to have escaped place in ways not that different from those used to resist historicising their identities, as discussed in Chapter 4. The remaining three posters do engage with place, thus giving us some insights into how these particular young people construct the relationship between themselves and the world they live in. I subject these posters to close analysis to determine how this placing works, what discourses are being drawn on and what positions these students are taking up in relation to nation.



S1 P10: Boipelo&Boikanyo

Poster 10 is interesting because the visual design of the poster creates the expectation that this is a highly placed representation of youth, yet a discursive analysis of the poster and poster talk does not fully support this expectation. In their poster, Boipelo and Boikanyo have used the South African flag design as the dominant design structure, although the flag itself does not quite take possession of the A3 space fully and is not necessarily immediately obvious. It is a pencil-drawn rendition of the flag using an unpolished style without clean lines. The original colours and panels of the flag have been retained and these are filled with words, images and objects which, according to the poster-makers depict 'teenagers' status aspects'. The poster seems to have three headings placed along the top margin: 'South Africa teen' and 'teen', both cut out from magazines, and the word 'status', which has been hand-written in large black writing. Colour is the guiding organisational principle. Although items have been chosen to represent particular teen interests and dispositions, they are selected for inclusion on the basis of their colour: black, green, blue and red words and images are inserted into appropriate panel of the flag. Items that are not a suitable colour are placed around the flag.

The flag may be the dominant design of the poster, but it is barely put to use as a symbol of national identity. The meanings usually encoded in a national flag – citizenship, national unity, democracy – are subverted by the strongly consumerist discourse of the images and words. Furthermore, despite the ostensible South

African-ness of the flag, none of its content is distinctively South African or distinctively related to the South African experience. Although a couple of brands may be considered to be South African (e.g. ABSA bank, Simonsig wine), neither banks nor wine are peculiar to South Africa. The selection of items foregrounds the importance of self-gratification and middle-class consumer culture in the lives of these South African teens, and suggest strong connections to globalised consumerist identities.

However, as I have discussed earlier, the presenters themselves adopt an unambiguously critical stance towards these teen dispositions, consistently distancing themselves from this behaviour and referring to teens in the third person throughout. They take up positions of critique against that which they have displayed and, in the process, they put the South African flag to use as a receptacle of what they have defined as negative. There is, however, one occasion where students use the inclusive 'we' pronoun to invoke a national identity, saying:

> We put 'rainbow' in there as well to show that basically we're still realise that we are a rainbow nation even if we still do realise that there is a bit of racism that does exist and as we can see in school a lot of kids are quite prejudiced against some but, ok... basically (S1P10, L10, 133).

Students thus make use of the popular but much critiqued metaphor of the South Africa as a Rainbow Nation but they undercut the idealism of the discourse of rainbowism (Gqola, 2001) by pointing out that racism exists alongside it. Boikanyo and Boipelo therefore work with identities that are not entirely unplaced. But the discourses of nationhood that are harnessed through the use of the South African flag and the metaphor of the rainbow nation are offset by countervailing discourses of 'race trouble' (Durrheim et al, 2011) and globalised consumerism.



S1 P9: Jayesh&Patrick

Both of the two remaining postersare underpinned by the students' orientations to place even though the discourses they draw on and positions they take up are considerably different.**Poster 9**, presented by Patrick and Jayesh, uses the shape of the African continent as its structuring design and fills it with cut-out words and images. The students explain that the poster represents the negative and positive influences on the youth, which occupy the top half and the bottom half of the African continent, respectively. The negatives are predominantly the teen vices that have been identified by others (e.g. experimenting with sex, being status conscious, focusing on appearance, pressurising peers to smoke and drink, teenage pregnancy, even nightclubbing). Included among the negatives is also the effect that the lack of appropriate adult role models is having on the youth, with reference being made to corruption among figures of authority, such as politicians and the police, and to high levels of crime. Also associated with the negatives, is a bar graph, placed more or less where the Arabian Peninsula would be, which identifies and compares people's negative perceptions of life in South Africa (e.g. high crime rate, and uncertainty about the future leadership of the country).

The way in which this poster engages with place is thus interesting. Despite the salience of the African continent, there seem to be no visuals that work with recognisably continental African identities. All the images placed in the shape of Africa refer to the influences on South African teens, with the continent functioning ostensibly as a container for both the negative and the positive in South Africa rather than representing itself. However, the negative images – of drug-taking, bling jewellery, drinking and smoking, for example – appear largely placeless. On the other hand, there is strong visual evidence of a South African identity in the southern or 'positive' half of the continent. There are numerous sportsmen and -women who represent South Africa in the international sporting arena, namely Jacques Kallis (cricket), Nathalie du Toit (swimming) and Victor Matfield (rugby). In addition, soccer is foregrounded in relation to the 2010 World Cup and in relation to local soccer rival teams Kaiser Chiefs and Orlando Pirates, represented by their respective badges. It is in the poster talk that some of the thinking behind the use of the African continent becomes evident.

> *And we have the history here of idols, Nelson Mandela, Mahatma Ghandi, and what they've done in the past for us like the past achievements of getting us where we are today. And then we have Strekfontein, you know the Sterkfontein Caves where heritage of humankind started, that's dating back to our history, like most teengaers today tend to forget where they come from, they just want to be where the whole world is which is America, so if America sneezes then Africa will catch the cold. So if everyone now just wants to follow*

> *the whole world but not following their own heritage and culture so ja that's why we put a picture of a Zulu man here to represent that – to say you must love you culture and love where you come from and not follow everyone else's belief* (Patrick, S1P9, L9, 131-133).

It would seem therefore that the use of the African continent signals two things. Firstly, it is referencing an evolutionary history that pre-dates any notion of national identity and establishes Africa as the origins of humankind. Secondly, given Patrick's criticism of American cultural and political dominance, the poster can be read as a full shot of Africa that has been cropped from a map of the world: Africa is the centre and America has been rendered so peripheral as to be beyond the margins of the page. Both of these things draw on Africanist discourses that speak to Africa's position in the global arena. Patrick also comments on the positive impact of the Soccer World Cup, in particular the fact that *'it's going to expose the country to other countries in the world'* (131), placing South Africa on a global stage. In addition, this is one of the only two posters in this site which place is historicised. The image of the Zulu man in traditional clothing is a localised example of heritage and culture; political history is also represented as significant not only in the use of images of Mandela and Ghandi but in the inclusion of a lengthy extract from the speech delivered by Mandela from the dock at the Rivonia trial in 1964 which has been cut out of a magazine and positioned off the west cost of Southern Africa.



S1 P8: Dipuo &Moipone

Poster 8 engages with place far more significantly than the poster itself suggests. It contains some of the same kinds of images that are displayed on other posters (e.g. cars, make-up, laptop, cellphone, young people taking drugs, music, etc.), and it also displays images that contain traces of place (e.g. women wearing traditional African clothing) and, significantly, it contains a number of cut-out quotations from magazines, some of which speak to issues such as place, history, gender and self, as captured in the table 5.4 below.

Table 5.4: The verbal images in Poster 8

• Healing a young nation • Care for your image, set your standard on gold • I am an African child who has grown up in the cities of the world. Certain things have influenced how I look, dress… It celebrates all the different lives. • I'm no fake / Madonna • I don't limit myself on anything. I also don't believe I need a man to be told I'm pretty or that I'm loved. • So what if I'm big?

Already the visual display of the poster hints at many more issues than have been touched on by the other posters. The opening comment by Dipuo reinforces this, introducing the poster in the following way:

> [reading from her notes] *Since we are the post-apartheid generation there's a lot of pressure on us to use the opportunities we now have. Others have high expectations of us but we have failed to meet their standards. They expect an ambitious, focused generation to emerge from this age [?]. … We get labelled as the rebellious generation, the materialistic generation and the generation with no future goals. After all we are born to be free, we are not afraid to express ourselves in different ways, but we all bear in mind that you can only reap what you sow, so whatever we sow we must make sure that we produce good food* (S1P8, L9, 129).

This is the first and only time in this site where poster-makers contextualise the youth historically or refer to themselves as *'the post-apartheid generation'*. They understand their historicised, generational positions to be tied to particular expectations, to failure to meet those expectations and to the consequent stigma. Both Dipuo and Moipone take up positions as post-apartheid youth, speaking throughout as 'we', which at some points becomes gender-specific, as in *'most girls, we…'* (S1P8, L9, 129). The 'others' – the 'they' – are, by implication, the adults that are harbouring the expectations and doing the labelling. When Moipone takes the floor, she describes the situation among teens as one where drugs are often considered by 'a lot of kids these days' as more important than education, where parties and alcohol are popular and where designer labels and the latest trends are what life is all about. Speaking as a 'girl' – and to the other young women in the room – she takes collective responsibility for thinking, albeit erroneously, that 'hot guys are the guys that will give us the happiness' and then links this to the quotation on the poster which disavows the need for approval from men. She critiques what she sees as young women's tendency to rely on external affirmation for their self-image which is based largely on external features such as size, beauty, a certain physique, particular possessions, and speaks emphatically about the need to change from an external to an internal

locus of control. This functions as a challenge to the normative stance on 'peer pressure' expressed by other students, reinforcing this with the following closing statement:

> *We should have the attitude of 'So what I'm big?', 'So what I'm ugly?', 'So what I don't have all the latest trends?' – as long as I'm happy, I don't care what you guys think. As long as I am happy inside, then I am good. I don't need the latest trends to make me happy because all those things just fade away, but your inner happiness will not*(S1P8, L9, 129-131).

The presentation is thus introduced in a spatiotemporally contextualised way which foregrounds the ways in which historically produced conditions have shaped this generation and others' expectations of it. The discourses these students draw on are not the judgemental discourses of the earlier critiques, neither do they construct youth simply as victims of adult labelling. Instead they speak back to the code using a psychologised discourse of Oprah-like self-empowerment which would also resonate for those students who draw inspiration from motivational speakers, self-help books or even particular forms of religious worship. Given that these students take up positions ofexplicit critique of the teen code that underpins most of their peers' posters, it is somewhat ironic that they sit down to thunderous applause from the class, a point that I return to in the following section.

5.4.2 Performing subjectivity in the pedagogic space (Site 1)

At this point I would like to turn to the performative and relational dimension of the talk around the text (Lillis,2001, 2008) and the ways in which the pedagogic space shapes – and is shaped by – the discourses and subject positions taken up during the poster presentations. As a pedagogic activity, there are inevitably discursive constraints operating (Foucault, 1970)that are particular to the classroom context.Moreover, this poster task makes unusual demands of these students in that they are being asked to present, in a formal classroom environment, a self that is not normally invited into a domain known to privilege various forms of book knowledge. As such, the process of constructing and presenting a youth poster can be simultaneously perceived as legitimising and exposing of out-of-school identities (Hull and Schultz, 2003; Pahl & Rowsell, 2006). Perhaps the students feel they have no choice but to take up positions of critique towards their constructions of the youth. Certainly the move to distance themselves from these negative representations can be considered quite strategic under the circumstances – about self-protection and avoidance of unwanted exposure. This compels attention to be paid to the specifics of the immediate situation

– in this case, the presentation of the posters to teacher and peers – and to subtle shifts in power relations among the participants who are multiply positioned as student/teacher, youth/adult, female/male, to mention but a few of the most salient available subject positions in this discursive space (Walkerdine, 1990; Baxter, 2003). The negotiation of these shifting positions is discernible at key moments in the presentations and highlights the extent to which subjectivityis performed (Butler, 1992).

Poster 2 is a case in point. Tumelo begins by talking about 'teenagers these days…' and referring to them in the third person, but as he gains momentum, he shifts into 'you':

> *… and the fancy clothes that they like. I mean if you're wearing clothes from PEP, I mean you're looked down at but if you're wearing clothes like Versace and stuff like that people can just see that you're wealthy* (S1P2, L9, 119).

The pronoun shift seems to signal a growing alignment of the teen views that he is reporting on and his own position, particularly in light of the emphatic and personalised nature of the interjection 'I mean', used twice in quick succession. Thabiso, his partner, modalises his statements, saying, *'..and basically teenagers think alcohol has the status of being cool'*. In this way, he introduces the possibility that others may not hold the same opinion of the status-value of alcohol and leaves his own stance ambiguous. Elsewhere he says: *'Basically if you're an intellectual you aren't cool'*, and – after the briefest pause – adds, *'…according to teenagers'*. Here the modalising comes across as an afterthought and lacks conviction. What seems to be happening is that both Tumelo and Thabiso are struggling to negotiate two seemingly incompatible subject positions: those of students in the classroom performing academically for the teacher in authority and needing to present themselves as thoughtful individuals; and those of young people, young men, performing for their peers, other young people, and needing to avoid, at all costs, the impression that they might be 'uncool'. The distancing strategies are thus for the benefit of the teacher and peers who might judge their involvement in teen practices that could be perceived as dubious, while their inability to do this convincingly suggests that they are themselves invested in being cool and are unable to disinvest in the discourses that govern 'cool'. In a discussion of teen fashion trends in an earlier lesson, Thabiso made the comment that *'it's not what you wear, it's how good you look in it'* that counts (S1, L6), taking up a rather different position from the one he and his partners take up in their poster talk, even while interacting with the same teacher and peers. Thus it is not sufficient to say that the pedagogic space has its

own set of desirable/undesirable discourses; the pedagogic space is not static. Students are multiply positioned in this space and they negotiate their positions based on how they evaluate the degree of risk, exposure and affirmation, and these shift across different interactional situations.

Over and above this, however, there is also a discursive pattern that suggests itself in relation to the sequence in which the posters are presented and the order in which students take the floor. Poster 2, discussed above, is an early presentation and it unequivocally puts forward the definition of teen cool and, despite the presenters' relatively transparent attempts to distance themselves from some of the more contentious aspects of 'cool', the presentation naturalises and glorifies these practices. Almost all the posters thereafter engage with the teen code that has now been set up. It is as if this poster has defined the terms of the debate and the remaining presentations can only agree or disagree. The first few presentations after this adopt the terms of the debate and largely reinscribe the teen code; however, they also subtly begin the process of re-framing the 'cool' stuff as teen vice. They begin to construct peer pressure as a negative influence and begin to make small but meaningful challenges to some aspects of the code or the behaviour of teens who feel compelled to follow it (e.g. Luis taking a stance against sex before marriage (P5); Motshedisi positioning herself against the 'high class' life and embracing her roots (P6). Posters 7, 8 and 9 shift the terrain of the debate by launching significant critiques on the code. The last four posters (P10-13) were presented at the next lesson the following day, and all of these posters fell into line behind what had now become the dominant discourse of the class, a wholesale critique of the code.

In light of this trajectory, I suggest that some students, consciously or unconsciously, adjusted their poster talk in order to suit the prevailing classroom discourse. It is important to point out, though, that all the posters were physically completed before the presentations began, that students were called up by the teacher in random order, and that – with the exception of three students (Motshedisi, P6; Dipuo, P8; and Kabelo, P12) –students did not have notes with them and appeared to be speaking off the cuff. My argument therefore is that the relative open-endedness of the visual design of the poster enabled the students who had not actively prepared their presentations and who did not have strong opinions of their own – or lacked confidence in their ability to express opinions that had not already been introduced – to 'go with the flow'. For example, the presentation for Poster 12, by Kabelo and Sebolelo, was carefully structured, more detailed and lengthier than most and raised

entirely new ideas, approaching the critique of the teen code from a different angle, thus suggesting careful preparation, independent thought and minimal influence from the previous presentations. However, Posters 10 and 11 displayed no indication of the wholly critical stance they adopted towards the teen code. And Poster 13, which looked as if it represented the interests of a teenager who, among other things, enjoyed the African bush, nature and wildlife, had highly unexpected explanations for these images, suggesting that he succumbed to the imperative not to stand out and adopted the discourses of his peers.

What could be some of the possible explanations for these patterns, if they are indeed strong enough to be called patterns? Firstly, the move from 'cool' to 'vice' is one which enables students to position themselves at a critical distance from teen behaviour which could be seen as running counter to a discourse of 'teacher approval' (Baxter, 2002a) in a classroom space which is subject to particular relations of power. Secondly, students seem to be unduly swayed by classmates with strong and confident voices. Moipone, who was one of the presenters of Poster 8, is considered by her teacher and peers an intelligent and articulate student and thus has a high degree of academic credibility; her ability to speak persuasively is alluded to more than once by her peers and teacher and she seems often able to sway opinions. Thirdly, there seems to be a tendency amongst the students in this site to aim for consensus or display convergent thinking. At one point during the course of a class discussion the teacher points out to students that they are 'echoing' one another and reminds them that they are allowed to have their own opinions as long as they can justify them. In the focus group interviews there are students who comment on their impression that everyone in the class has the same opinion because it is easier and less risky to simply rehash other people's remarks. Thus even though in this site there is no dialogue which develops around the posters and each poster presentation has the appearance of functioning as a discrete performance, students' seeming awareness of what has been said before them suggests that at a deeper discursive level the presentations collectively function as a 'chain of communication' (Bakhtin 1986, 93) where students are responding to others' positions as well as to their positioning by others. This orientation to classroom talk and positioning is the central focus of the following chapter of data analysis.

5.4.3 Representions of place in Site 2

In Site 2, there is considerably more engagement with South Africa as nation or place. While the number of markers of place on the posters themselves is comparable across both sites, it is in the poster talk that this more extensive engagement become evident. It is worth noting, however, that the presentations in this site are considerably longer. The average length of the presentations in Site 1 is 352 words, while in Site 2 the shortest presentation is 368 words, and the average length of the presentations is 610 words. These figures for Site 2 do not include the interaction with teacher and peers after each presentation which in itself pushes the length of class time used for the class presentations considerably higher.
The continuum of placed-ness in the posters of Site 2 is represented in Figure 5.3 below.

Placeless ⟷ **Locally placed**

1 Placeless:	2 Traces of place:	3 Mentioning place:	4 Commenting on place:	5 Clearly placed:	6 Highly placed:
7	-	-	8	(1)	3
10			12	2	4
				5	6
				9	
				11	

Figure 5.3: The continuum of place for Site 2

Because of this increased engagement with place, there is greater opportunity to scrutinise the ways in which the relationship between self and place is constructed. Before doing so, however, I would like to outline some of the discursive patterns at play in the construction of the self more broadly. This prepares the groundwork for an analysis that considers how the self is located in social and spatial terms.

Broadly speaking, in the posters and poster talk students tend to address the things that influence them or affect their lives as teens. The contexts in which these influences are seen to operate vary across the posters, ranging from the narrowly personal (such as family and friends) to the broadly social (such as media, politics, etc). The self is thus always contextualised in, at the very least, an implied social fabric of some kind, and particular influences are sometimes classified as negative or positive. As I will show, students' decisions about what to include and exclude from

their worlds and their conscious juggling of the perceived negative and positive aspects of these worlds are a strong feature of some of the poster talk. It is the extent to which the features of their worlds distinctively index South Africa that underpins the analysis of the relationship between place and identity.

Despite the range of interests and preoccupations in this set of posters, it is possible to provide a general sense of the flavour of the presentations and the meanings they foreground. In the poster talk, students frequently refer to the importance of friends, relationships and socialising. They present themselves as being fashion-conscious and talk about the need to look good, sometimes linking this to particular practices such as dieting and going to gym. There is, however, an almost comparable amount of focus on schooling and academic achievement, and various students comment on the importance of their own particular school in their lives. When aspirations for the future are mentioned these are normally tied to tertiary education, careers and success in general, sometimes also to global travel. Although peer pressure and *'the battle to "fit in"'* are mentioned, the notion of pressure is not constructed as wholly negative and nor attributed solely to peers but is more generally spoken of in relation to expectations to perform well or achieve something, e.g. *'it's quite pressurising what we have to strive for today'* (Jenny, S2P1, L10, 247); *'pressure from the media'* to look perfect (Antoinette, S2P4, L10, 265); *'we're hardworking lately because of the pressure obviously'* (Bontle, S2P8, L11, 285). And finally there is also considerable focus on what I have referred to as a twenty-first century lifestyle, more so than was evident in the posters themselves. Students frequently refer to themselves as being part of the information generation, seeing the fast-paced, instantaneous and globally connected lifestyle they lead as a significant aspect of why their lives today are so different from those of their parents' generation.

A point I wish to emphasise is that all students include themselves in the worlds that they construct through their posters. It has already been noted that in this site, the majority of posters (8 of the 12) represent the self visually through means of photographs or, in the case of Poster 8, a stick figure. This inclusion of the self is also evident in the poster talk. Students take up their generational locations strongly, using the first person plural to denote their insider status, as in *'as teenagers today we always want to be…'* (Jenny, S2P1), or *'in this age we're actually going through…'* (Bontle, S2P8). There are occasional moments in one or two presentations when students wish to signal that the behaviour that they are discussing may be characteristic of their age group but does not apply to them. These are the only times

when teenagers are referred to in the third person, as in *'A lot of teenagers are so depressed nowadays'* (Antoinette, S2P4), and *'quite a lot of people our age [are sexually active]'* (Lesego, S2P7). It is also worth noting that although reference is occasionally made to cigarettes, alcohol and drugs, these never form the focus of the discussion, neither are they explicitly constructed as vices or referred to in judgemental tones. It stands to reason that if students are so strongly taking up subject positions as teenagers, they are less likely to construct negative representations of teens.


However, while students predominantly use the inclusive pronoun 'we' in their poster talk, the referent is not always the same. The 'we' is always speaker-inclusive, but whether it refers exclusively to the poster-makers and their lives, or functions as a generational 'we' used to refer to themselves and other teens broadly – or whether in fact it signals the speaker's adoption of other available group identities – depends on the presentation and the subject positions students take up. Who is included in a 'we' and who is, by implication, excluded from it suggests where the parameters of these students' social worlds lie. These shifting referents are often present within individual presentations and function as evidence of students' attempts to negotiate the multiple positions that are inhabited simultaneously.

This analysis follows the sequence in which posters have been located on the continuum, moving from least placed to most placed. The early part of the discussion focuses on general trends relevant to each category but in the categories where place is strongly evident, a number of posters and their poster talk are analysed in depth, either individually or comparatively.

Placelessness



S2 P7: Lesego



S2 P10: Nguvi & Nadia

The students who present **Poster 7** and **Poster 10** (Category 1) take up strong subject positions as teenagers, making use of the 'we' pronoun to speak as insiders.

Neither of these posters, however, bear any traces of place nor do the students make any references to place in their talk. The sense of living in a globally connected, technologically sophisticated world is captured through images of Facebook logos, laptops and hi-tech music devices as well as through references in the poster talk to the importance of digital communication. Apart from the fact that Poster 10, produced by Nguvi and Nadia, includes a variety of quirky quotations about life, there is very little that individualises these posters – these posters could represent the lives of any privileged teen living anywhere in the western world.

Peripherally placed



S2 P8: Bontle



S2 P12: Michelle & Alice

Poster 8 and Poster 12 are not alike in content or appearance but they do share some intersting similarities. In particular, while their focus is elsewhere, they both make telling comments on place that provide some insight into the ways these students understand their relationship to place.

For Bontle, the single poster-maker of **Poster 8**, her domain is the inner world of the teen psyche which she depicts as one filled with much pressure, turmoil, potential and personal growth. She opens her presentation by foregrounding the fact that this is her own personal perspective of what teens go through, saying that *'it is a minority view because I'm seeing it with my perspective and my conditioning'* (S2P8, L10, 285). What she goes on to discuss is not personal in the sense that she presents her own life but, adopting a strong voice frequently punctuated by *'I think that… I feel that…'*, she outlines her carefully thought-out views on teenagehood as a phase. She indicates that the stick figure and map of South Africa with a dot on it, both hand-drawn on her poster, are intended to represent her and her geographical location in Johannesburg. She then delves at length into the teenage psyche, speaking as a teenager, shifting occasionally between 'we' and 'I'. It is only at the end of the presentation that she returns to place, explaining that the hand-writing all over her poster is in green koki because green represents new life and *'we're experiencing the*

birth of our country'. Her point is that because apartheid is over, *'we're actually living the dream, that Martin Luther King had, that all individuals are actually interacting equally'* (S2P8, L10, 289). Thus while the dominant subject position which she constructs for herself is one of a young person caught up 'in a time of becoming' (Nielsen, 1998) which is predominantly inward-looking, she also takes up her national identity as a South African, living in a post-liberation South Africa.

In **Poster 12**, presented by Michelle on a day when her partner Alice was absent, a more critical stance on South Africa is presented. This poster is made up largely of words representing the kinds of things the two poster-makers talk about, *'things that affect us because they're part of society and they make who we are'* (S2P12, L12, 306), e.g. love, food, drugs, philosophy, social conditioning, fashion, racism, elitism, theatre, etc. These students therefore construct for themselves identities as individuals who debate issues relating to human nature, culture and society. They envisage a broad social fabric, the type of liberal humanist social context that is largely timeless and placeless, and underpinned by the notion of the autonomous, critical thinking individual. While this is the dominant orientation taken to context in the poster/talk, there are a couple of moments when place is alluded to in more distinctive ways. The notion of 'cosmopolitanism' is used to critique the idea of the 'Rainbow Nation', terms which both appear on the poster, the latter, according to Michelle, in inverted commas because it *'doesn't actually exist'* (S2P12, L11, 305). Without going into detail she points out that cosmopolitanism is the ideal form of the rainbow nation since it is *'where people like they're completely integrated and it's not just cultures living together but actually living in the company of each other'.* The presence of the word 'racism' on the poster suggests that this may be one of the reasons why the 'rainbow nation', with all its overtones of equality and diversity, is not achievable.

The only other reference to place is a colour photograph of Jacob Zuma in a strange dancing posture, looking rather buffoonish. At the time, Zuma was the president of the ANC, controversially involved in a high profile corruption case and widely expected to be the next president of South Africa. Michelle indicates that her partner chose the picture but that it is there because *'politics is a joke. I think we both feel that way, especially in South Africa, it's really a joke'* (L12, L12, 307). This is one of several negative representations of South African politics and the off-hand manner in which Michelle dismisses it says something about her desire not to engage with this political world but to confine herself to the world of ideas.

Negotiating place


The posters in category 5 are all clearly placed in South Africa but they each set up quite different relationships between self and place.

Kate and Lily, presenting **Poster 5,** begin by invoking the Rainbow Nation metaphor but their focus quickly shifts to their specific interests and aspirations: their hobbies, their intended university degrees, their prospective careers, their interest in global travel; amidst references to the importance of friends, family and school life. Here place is more global than local, with the global being invoked through ties to extended family living overseas as well as through global travel. As Kate says, in relation to a photograph of a Vietnamese man, *'I travel often and I like to experience different cultures first hand'* (S2P5, L10, 273).

The local is indexed initially through their desire to complete their tertiary education at a local university but predominantly through references to South Africa's past. After reading out the verbal references to South African history on the poster, Kate provides the following explanation of one of the photographs:

> *Basically we put a blurred image of an empty street because the memories of the past for us basically apartheid is basically formed from memories but it's blurred because a lot of people were kind of influenced in different ways by apartheid. And basically for us it's an empty street because we weren't there, we didn't witness it ourselves* (S2P5, L10, 273).

This photo thus functions as a powerful metaphor capturing some of the discourses of history that emerged in the TRC section of the teaching intervention. Unlike the majority of posters in this site, this poster does not overlook or deliberately exclude history; however, the meanings ascribed to the blurred quality of the image and the emptiness of the street serve to keep history in its place, as it were. While there is an acknowledgement that apartheid history has shaped undefined people in undefined ways, the subject position that Julie takes up for herself and her partner is one of non-involvement in the apartheid past.



S2 P5: Kate &Lily



S2 P9: Adele & Saskia

The notion of affluence is a strong feature of the posters in this site, and becomes increasingly evident in later posters. Sometimes it is present in unstated ways linked to lifestyles where luxury and privilege are naturalised, at other times students engage with it explicitly. In this vein, **Poster 9** provides possibly the clearest example of the construction of white privilege. The poster is divided into three panels arranged in a triptych-like manner. The first two panels deal with fashion and beauty, and school and friends. Centred along the bottom edge, there is a circular panel that can be flapped open to reveal a photograph of the two students. Both the images and words, particularly in the first panel, create the overwhelming impression of luxury and a life of ease, effectively captured by a hand-written comment which states: *'Life is handed to us on a silver platter'* (S2P9). It is in the third panel, which the students refer to as 'the political side of our poster', that the context is evident. The panel refers to 'politics' and the name 'Nelson Mandela' has been cut out and stuck on, presumably because he is a key political figure in our country. Ironically however it is clear from the small, square, gold logo that is embedded in the cut-out Mandela name that it was originally functioning as a reference to Nelson Mandela Square, arguably one of the most affluent shopping precincts in Johannesburg which happens to be named after the political figure. A number of environmental issues are also introduced (e.g. global warming, energy, recycling, eco-awareness) but these are placed in the South African context, with reference being made, for example, to there being an 'energy issue in our country', reinforced by the term 'load shedding'[8] that has been hand-written onto the poster.

After outlining some of the environmental issues, Adele says the following:

> *But then also we've got other problems in our country like racial inequality in college applications, and black empowerment* (S2P9, L11, 291).

She is referring here to two issues which routinely unsettle white privilege in South Africa. The race quotas which local universities apply when admitting students to university is a problem which looms large to these students, poised as they are on the brink of pursuing their own tertiary education, and it is something white students at this site repeatedly mention as an issue of concern. Black Economic Empowerment (BEE), a far more complex notion, is often perceived as threatening the job opportunities of white South Africans which is likely to be the way it is being drawn on here. The word 'economic' has been omitted (also missing on the poster), suggesting a less defined, far broader racialised threat. Controversial though both of these issues


[8] Due to difficulties in meeting rising demands for electrical power in the greater Johannesburg area, scheduled power outages were a frequent occurrence in 2008-2009.

may be in the sociopolitical domain, particularly in the finer details of their application, they are underpinned by ideals of social transformation and the need for racial redress. Adele's comments here function as 'white talk' in that by constructing herself as a white person who is bearing the brunt of these policies, she is reconstructing whiteness as a 'victimized positionality' (Steyn, 2005, p. 131). It is worth mentioning that in the Afrikaans students' focus group discussion, when asked about the idea that life is handed to her and her peers on a silver platter, Adele says: *'I can't remember who made that comment but life is not offered to me on a silver platter, like I have to work for everything I want. Everything I want'* (S2 FG2, 32). This occurs during a discussion where these students are positioning themselves as young Afrikaners whose Afrikaner identities are under threat. Adele's shifting position thus indexes an underlying tension between privilege and victimhood. Class privilege enables an affluent lifestyle, a superior education, and a protected upbringing. Yet in the sociopolitical domain this privilege is unsettled and whiteness, specifically Afrikaner whiteness, is threatened by black majority rule and by initiatives intended to redress historically constructed inequalities.

In Poster 9, the poster design and the poster talk together allude to the sense that the personal world of the self is a comfortable and protected one while the social domain is predominantly associated with problems, whether they be environmental or political. As I will show, in the next two posters this distinction between the positive/personal and the negative/social takes its clearest form.



S2 P2: Susan & Jody



S2 P11: Julie & Kylie

Poster 2 and **Poster 11** both use the South African flag and their own personal photographs as the basic components of their design, but the different compositions encode different meanings and construct different relationships between self and place. In Poster 2 the authentic design and colours of the flag are maintained and a seamless, computer-generated composition is created. Each of the panels is filled with photographs from the students' personal photograph collections. These are

cropped, distorted to fit and suitably coloured so that the flag design retains its clean lines and original colours. In Poster 11 the flag design is not immediately obvious, despite the fact that it too is the full size of the poster. This is because although the flag has been painted onto newsprint in the appropriate bold watercolours, multiple photos of the self, with friends and family, have been glued onto this background, creating the impression of a randomly organised photo collage.

In Poster 2, the students identify the personal photographs which occupy three of the four panels as representing *'friends and going out', 'our school days'* and *'the things that sort of influence us'*. They depict scenes of fun and socialising with friends, many of these including the two girls whose poster this is; there are also many photos of school events, scenes during school-time and of global travel, all of which seem to be related to school tours.

The fourth and smallest panel depicts 'politics'. The photographs used here are derived from the public domain, most likely the internet. Most salient is a picture of a prancing Jacob Zuma who is represented as buffoonish and looming. (The same picture has been used in Poster 12 above.) Also visible is the logo of the ANC flag, a photograph of Kgalema Motlanthe, then the interim South African president, and to the right a headshot of Jacob Zuma, backgrounded to the point of looking like a watermark. This is the black panel of the flag and the visuals are monochromatic, shades of black, grey and white, with black, both as colour and mood, predominating. The words 'corruption' and 'Jacob Zuma' are lined up against the top and bottom of the panel.

In their mediating talk, the students explain their use of the flag, saying:

> Jody: *… we used a flag to represent obviously us being South African children and we're proudly South African. As much as there is bad stuff going on we chose to look on the brighter side and show the good part of our youth* […].
>
> Susan: *Ja, I think we're bombarded every day with such negative publicity about our country so we thought we actually really proud so we thought we'd represent it with the flag* (S2P2, L10, 249).

They go on to explain that they deliberately chose to use the brightly coloured panels to represent their youth – 'in order to highlight the positive aspects of it' – and placed the politics of the country in the black panel because it is a 'dark' and 'touchy' subject.

Thus while the South African flag provides the overarching structure of the poster and its design features, with regard to line and colour, are respected, its dominant

meaning as a symbol of national identity is subverted not only by the negative portrayal of 'politics' but by filling 80% of the space with images of the self and the self's pursuits. The flag functions as a container which displays the self, providing information about where the self is 'placed' – in South Africa. The self is constructed as positive, structured as inhabiting a happy world of interpersonal friendships, fun-filled school life and world travel; while the sociopolitical context is constructed as negative and is cordoned off from their lives – confined behind thick yellow lines in the smallest, darkest panel, populated by black people who are entirely absent from the other panels. However, reading the vectors of the design, this small panel seems to function almost like an arrow, penetrating the idyllic world of the self, perhaps presenting, at an unconscious level, a threat to the idyllic life of these young people. In their mediating talk, the students are emphatic about their decision to *choose* to look on the bright side or highlight the positives of their youth, a point I return to in the next chapter.

In Poster 11 the subversion of the conventional meanings of the flag is greater as is the construction of the negative/social. Julie explains this, saying:

> *…we did the South African flag because we are South African teenagers and then we put newspaper clippings at the back and every newspaper clipping has a negative heading – like 'disease kills three people', 'bail not paid', and all those negative things. And we put photos of our friends and family over it to try and show – it's not that we're not aware of it or we ignore it, it's just that there are so many things in our lives so much that's better in our life than what's going on [out there]* (S2P11, L11, 301).

Here the self appears to be obliterating the national identity that is invoked by the flag design. Photos of the self experiencing positive moments with significant others are deliberately placed over this negative media construction of the social. Here the students are simultaneously signalling both their awareness of and their rejection of the social, which they construct as negative.

In one of the gaps in the photographs, looking somewhat graffiti-like against the red section of the newsprint, has been hand-written 'Bad life?' in black pen. Kylie states that this is intended to raise the question of whether your own personal life is *'really that bad'*, going on to say that such things are based on choice: *'If you choose the negative things you'll have a negative life but if you choose the positive things you'll have a positive life'* (S2P11, L11, 301). The discourse of choice used in this way only further reinforces the position of privilege from which they are speaking, constructing the self as autonomous and agentic and fully in control of the circumstances which

govern its existence, and showing no awareness of the structural conditions which enable their own privileged existence or deny others access to the basics.

In both posters the focus is so strongly on 'our youth' that it excludes 'the youth' as a broader social category, i.e. any sense that they are capturing any young person's experience beyond their own. Poster 2 is slightly less exclusionary only in the sense that the strong focus on school identity – as pertaining to this particular school – suggests that other students at this school are included in 'our youth'. Both pairs of students are taking up positions as South African citizens, simply by identifying themselves as South Africans and by making use of the flag. But they position themselves negatively towards the social while presenting the self and the narrow world of the self positively.



S2 P1: Mei-Lin & Jenny

Poster 1 functions as an interesting contrast to these two posters. It is anomolous in that the poster itself displays no markers of South Africa. Visually it comes across as being a globally placeless depiction of twenty-first century lifestyle. Environmental issues and global connectedness are foregrounded, and references to fashion, beauty, and education are displayed. Yet the poster talk reveals that while students focus strongly on globalisation, they engage with it from a distinctly South African vantage point, taking up positions as teens and continually shifting between the global and the local. They refer to themselves as *'upcoming South Africans'* (S2P1, Jenny, L10, 247) and mention in particular the pressures upon them as South African teens to help South Africa to compete on a global stage and to strive to achieve equal footing with developed countries. Mei-Lin refers to the need *'to be as good as say the person who went to school in America'* (247), and Jenny speaks of the expectations of *'teenagers in South Africa to be the new – you want to develop more you want to globalise, you want to get – to develop our country as a whole so that we can all be educated'* (247). The dominant subject position from which they speak is thus that of a globally placed South African citizen who is invested in the development of the country. This is an interesting contrast to Poster 2, for example, which appears at first


glance to be rooted in nation; yet it is Poster 1 that is demonstrates, through its poster talk, a far greater investment in a national identity

Place dominating

In the final category, posters are highly placed because the notion of place either underpins the structure of the poster and/or the presentation or it permeates the poster talk throughout. I point out some of the more interesting features of Posters 4 and 6 before undertaking a detailed analysis of Poster 3.



S2 P4: Antoinette & Nina



S2 P6: Kathy & Kelsey

In **Poster 4**, the two students set themselves up as South African teens who are *'directly impacted by the things going on around us'*, classifying these influences as either negative or positive. This is visually depicted on the poster by having one half of the poster containing words and images of negatives and the other half of positives. Nina explains that because they often feel as if *'there's almost like a devil on our shoulder and an angel on the other, almost like a cartoon'* (S2P4, L10, 265), they took photographs of themselves dressed up as a devil and angel and organised the negative and positive images respectively around themselves. This is a way of including themselves in their poster despite the fact that their approach is broadly social, speaking about teens in general, and not personalised. With regard to the negative, Antoinette constructs an image of teens as victims of the negative influence of the media, as well as victims of their own and others' (self)abusive behaviour; while on the positive side Nina focuses largely on the advantages of having easy access to a variety of African nature and wildlife, referring also to the possibility of having friendships across the colour-line as a way of turning apartheid history into a positive. There is thus a conscious attempt to incorporate both the positive and the negative because, as Nina says, *'it's quite sad that the youth of today focuses so much more on the bad side of South Africa than on the good side'* (267), particularly because, as Antoinette states, some of the negatives, such as xenophobia and homelessness,

have become so everyday that they no longer have any impact on them: *'You get used to it it doesn't get to you. You feel sorry for them but ja'* (267).

Poster 6 is similarly located in the social fabric of South Africa. The poster collage is a tightly packed one because, as Kathy says, *'there's a lot happening in our lives and in our country as well'* (277). Visually it carries multiple markers of place as well as multiple references to the lives and interests of the two poster makers. Some of the more salient images are the national coat of arms, images of African women some of whom seem to be speaking at formal events, others dressed in traditional clothing, an anti-apartheid poster and various images of African landscapes and wildlife, even a braai[9] scene. There is also an image of two shaking hands, one black and one white, as well as rendition of a face made up of fragments from multiple faces of different skin tones, symbolising reconciliation and racial harmony; poverty and crime also feature because, as Kelsey points out, she and her family have themselves been victims of crime, and she and Kathy have deliberately included the negatives in order not to construct an idealised image of the country. Interspersed among these are images of fashion, music, education, the school badge, as well as pictures of hockey and rowing, sports at which these two students excel. They also acknowlege that they live in *'a community that's very materialistic and we're very like technologically advanced'* (Kathy, 277). This poster thus seems to achieve a balance between the personal and the social with the students taking up subject positions as 'proudly South African' without excluding the self or the negative social.



S2 P3: Sonia & Calista

Poster 3 is another A3 flag design painted onto newsprint. The newsprint consists of a number of articles, some in English, some in Afrikaans. The flag is painted over this in muted watercolours. Against this background, cut-out pictures, photographs, words, quotations and two poems are stuck down; some hand-written words and

[9] A South African term for barbeque.

hand-drawn images are also present. Centrally placed are two black and white headshots of the poster-makers. Here the self is also present but is surrounded by a variety of issues, among them: body image/weight, sexual relationships, fashion, and world religions; alongside these are pictures of public figures, international flags, a rainbow, and a hand-drawn fence.The studentsovertly take up subject positions as Afrikaners through their use of Afrikaans news articles and poetry. The poem they have selected is by renowned Afrikaans poet Ingrid Jonker, known for her commitment to human rights and democracy. The poster displays both Afrikaans and English versions of the poem 'Die kind', a poem which evokes sympathy for the victims of the struggle against apartheid – and which was read by Nelson Mandela at the opening of parliament in 1994 (although the students make no mention of this particular fact). The choice of language, the identity of the poet, and the subject matter of the poem work together to mobilise a politicised, Afrikaner discourse that stands against racial oppression while simultaneously challenging stereotyped depictions of Afrikaners as racist, culturally insular and politically conservative. In their mediating talk the students briefly explain that they chose the poem because it represents them as children in the two languages which they speak, since they both have Afrikaans home backgrounds. Somewhat less straightforwardly they say that the poem represents them because *'as Afrikaans people we kind of got the raw end of apartheid'* (S2, L10, 12). This signals once again some of the tensions present in these students' identities as young Afrikaners – where they seem to shift between clearly opposing apartheid oppression on on hand *and* feeling victimised as Afrikaners for their cultural affiliation to the Afrikaans nationalist apartheid regime on the other.

Alongside this Afrikaner identity is also an internationalised South African identity(Van der Westerhuizen, 2007; Steyn, 2005). Flags of various countries are scattered over the poster – Canada and Scotland are places where the students themselves have been on exchange trips organised through the school, while Holland and Germany represent their heritage as their ancestors come from these countries. And yet these different national identities are subsumed into one – *'we're all one like in South Africa'* (L10, p12). The image of the rainbow alongside suggests that South Africa can unite as a 'Rainbow Nation'.

Hand-drawn along the left margin of the poster is a rather indistinct outline of a picket fence. The students explained that it is a representation of their protected lives and the security behind which they live. They explain that *'you can't see it that well, it's*

just there, because we know it's there but no one really talks about it so it's there. That's just where we live. / It's part of our lifestyle' (L10, p 13). This is a reference to crime, clearly understood by all in the room, and capturing some of the normalisation of living privileged sheltered lives behind high walls.

Near the left side of the page are two cut-out head-and-shoulders shots separated by the handwritten word 'Vs', images of Paris Hilton and Nelson Mandela, respectively. The visual semiotics seem open-ended since it is possible to read a number of contrasting relationships off this juxtaposition: young/old, female/male, white/black, vacuousness/significance, popular culture/politics. The students refer to Hilton and Mandela as *'two like totally like different role models'* (L10, p 12), saying that they exemplify the kind of confusion they as young people are experiencing because: *'like who do we follow? Because one's popular and the other is good... we're not sure.'* (L10, p12).

It is also interesting to note that the flag and newsprint design in the background of this poster works differently from the backgrounds of the two previous posters. The background is not obliterated by a mass of words and images, instead it seems to provide a context for them. This is borne out by the students' comment that they chose the South African flag for the background *'because that is a lot of our influence, where all our influences come from'* (L10, p10). Later saying *'it's the news... ok the newspaper behind, it's like the background / the foundation / and that if we were in Italy or somewhere I don't know if we would actually put that as the background for say crime or whatever...'*. So here we have the social as influence or foundation – and given the scope of the poster, this includes both the positive and the negative.

Unlike the previous two posters where the students' representations seemed narrowly devoted to the immediate interpersonal world of the self, here we have two students who are engaging with a variety of issues and thus articulating more complex and varied subjectivities. This impression is reinforced through an analysis of some of the linguistic elements of their mediating talk, in particular the shifting meanings of the first-person pronoun, 'we'.

> '**we** have English at school but Afrikaans families...' – the two of us
> '**we** are more open-minded these days...' – the two of us? youth? Afrikaans youth?
> '**we** are the rainbow nation...' – South Africans
> 'as Afrikaans people **we** kind of got...' – Afrikaners
> 'the kind of confusion **we**'re in...' – the youth
> 'magazines give **us** say "love lessons"...' – the female youth
> '**we** all matriculate...' – the Grade 11 students at the school

Using this linguistic lens we are able to discern the range of subject positions these two students take up, their shifting identifications across a variety of group identities, and get a sense of the moves they make in negotiating and inhabiting these multiple subject positions.

Of the three flag posters, this is the only one which includes the self and moves beyond the students' immediate personal lives of school, family and friends. The presenters of Posters 2 and 11 spoke confidently about their circumscribed lives, finding ways of blocking out or minimising the impact of the broader social environment. Their negotiations seem to be centred on how they could, to a greater or lesser extent, reject the social in order to retain their neatly defined identities. However, in Poster 3, in choosing to represent aspects of the broader social world, these students put themselves in the position of having to negotiate and shift between various subject positions, not all of which are necessarily easily compatible. In addition to this, as students who have an Afrikaans home background and find themselves in a school where the normative position is that of the English-speaking, white South African of Anglo-Saxon descent, these students are outside their communities. Occupying this outsider status, however subtly – particularly in the case of white Afrikaans girls who are likely to look and sound the same as their English-speaking counterparts – these students are used to negotiating their positions. Although they haven't consciously sought to show this negotiation in their posters, it emerges through the discourses they use since it forms the way they think about and construct their own work.

5.4.4 Manoeuvering in the pedagogic space (Site 2)

As with Site 1, there are indications that the discourses that these students draw on in their presentations are both shaped by and shaping of the broader classroom discourses. The most significant one is triggered by the debate which ensues after the presentation of Poster 2.

After Julie and Susan have presented Poster 2, two of their classmates challenge their positions. Kelsey takes issue with the fact that they have chosen to tightly contain the negative/political and focus on the positive/personal; and Alice makes an argument for the difference between *'being positive and being blind'*. This leads to a heated debate around privilege, protectedness and representation which I analyse in more detail in the next chapter (see 6.3.5). Here I wish only to point out that there are a number of presentations subsequent to this interchange where students take up

positions that appear to speak back to this debate in some way. When Kelsey and her partner present their poster (Poster 6), she is explicit about their decision to include the negatives, hence clear references to poverty, suffering and crime. Bontle's insistence, at the start of her presentation, that *'there's no debate about me representing just one person, it's a minority view'* (S2P8, L11, 285) is her way of protecting her presentation from similar criticism. Similarly, when presenting Poster 11, which focuses entirely on the positive/personal, Julie says that *'it's not that we're not aware of it, or we ignore it, it's just that…'* – another preemptive defence. This suggests that students are at least partially aware of how their own positions are informed by and are able to speak back to discourses which circulate in the pedagogic space.

It is also noticeable that the presentations and the interactions around them become shorter as they proceed, with the teacher asking fewer and less probing questions, and the students becoming seemingly less interested in engaging their peers in debate around their posters. By the time Julie and Kylie present their poster, an element of presentation fatigue has set in and the chances of any of their peers taking issue with it are slim despite the fact that its focus on the positive/self is even more pronounced than that of Poster 2.

5.5 Concluding thoughts

In light of the data presented and analysed in this chapter, what is it possible to say about the kinds of subject positions that students take up? And is it possible to detect ways in which the pedagogic space enables certain subject positions and not others? What seems clear is that the ways in which students have sought to either escape place (Site 1), or control and define place (Site 2) are strongly shaped by how these different groups are situated in the sociopolitical and economic landscape of South Africa.

In Site 1, a de(re)segregated (McKinney, 2011), former Model C school catering to the emerging black middle class, students' imaginations with regard to available youth identities are strongly influenced by middle class consumer culture. Their aspirations and counter-aspirations are, to a considerable degree, emblematic of those of urban black youth in post-liberation South Africa for they are strongly tied to the kinds of material wealth and trappings of success that were denied to black people during the racialised political and economic oppression of the past centuries. Many students show signs of being simultaneously critical of and seduced by discourses of

‘conspicuous consumption’ (Farber 2002), particularly in relation self-stylization and accessorisation (Nuttall, 2004). Classed distinctions (Bourdieu, 1984) are evident in the aesthetics of taste in clothing, music, etc. Therefore while the majority of students do not engage with their spatial and temporal locations as post-apartheid youth in their posters/talk, these locations can be read in the discourses they draw on.

In Site 2, students engage more readily with place and nation; however, the ways in which they do so betray their positions of privilege and entitlement. Their established middle class to upper-middle class socioeconomic status coupled with their private school education shapes the elite subjectivities that constitute transnational citizens that make up the global elite. The connections between a superior education, global mobility and more ‘worldly concerns’ are a strong feature of their posters/talk. Most of the posters that are placed in South Africa and construct national identities for their makers tend to do so in ways that block out the sociopolitical context, turning the gaze inward on the self and the self’s narrowly circumscribed world, although often simultaneously reaching out to a global world, thus being ‘globally connected and locally disconnected’ (Castells, 2000, p. 436). It is these schools that are producing the ‘privileged identities’ of which Soudien (2007b) speaks which, as he later points out, contain relatively low numbers of black students (2012).

It needs to be emphasised that in the South African context both of these schools are on the privileged end of the schooling spectrum but it is also clear that their levels of privilege differ and that there are ways in which these positions are racialised. In the posters of Site 2, whiteness is the unmarked norm. When black people are present they are either South African politicians or anonymous black people representing poverty or homelessness, or else interacting with white people as evidence of racial harmony or racism. In Site 1 black people are more frequently represented but often they are well known public figures or celebrities. Most musicians represented are black, in keeping with the racialised tastes around music genres and popular culture (Dolby,2000, 2001b). So students’ ways of engaging with the global are both classed and raced.

Finally, there are some indications that in these two classrooms different concepts of identity are at play. It is not insignificant that in Site 1 fewer students took up positions from which they spoke with confidence as individuals; generally there was greater evidence of convergent thinking. Conversely, in Site 2 notions of middle class agency (Soudien,2012) and possessive individualism (Skeggs, 2008) are evident in the ways

in which students speak with ownership of ‘our country’ and make conscious choices about what to allow into their worlds and what to filter out.

6

CLASSROOM TALK

A person needs to analyse their conversation as an oak leaf needs to analyse its photosynthesis. Speakers do what they do, making their actions intelligible to each other, but we have the luxury and time to play and replay a record of it and see how *they do it (Charles Antaki)*[10].

6.1 Introduction

In the previous two chapters, the data analysis was structured around specific tasks which formed part of the teaching intervention. In this chapter the focus is on the open-ended classroom talk that happens during the course of the teaching intervention, in the spaces between the tasks, as it were. Discussion topics are teacher-initiated, according to the guidelines of the teaching intervention, and therefore the talk continues, in various ways, to deal with how these young people think of their lives, or understand their place, in South Africa. However, the deliberate open-endedness enables students and teacher to be the prime arbiters of the direction of the classroom talk. An analysis of this talk thus provides the opportunity to answer the final research question, namely:

- How does the classroom discourse work to position students and how, in turn, do the subject positions that students take up shape the classroom discourse?

[10] From the dialogue presented in: O'Brien, A. and Antaki, C. (2001). 'Two Lines of approach to the question "What does the interviewer have in mind?"', in A. McHoul and M. Rapley (Eds.). *How to Analyse Talk in Institutional Settings*. London: Continuum.

The lens of poststructuralist theory on discourse and subjectivity is thus applied to stretches of classroom talk in order to investigate the relationship between subjectivity and pedagogy. I seek to address a number of analytical considerations, namely: the kinds of discourses that are mobilised in the pedagogic space of each classroom, and the types of subject positions made available in relation to these discourses (Foucault, 1978, 1980, 1982); the ways in which participants continually (re)position themselves and one another within this space (Davies, 1994; Davies and Harré, 1999); and the shifting nature of the power relations (Baxter, 2003).

It bears reminding that within the framework of this research the classroom has been conceptualised as a discursive pedagogic space which is co-constructed by the interactions of its participants. It is therefore the transcripts of classroom talk that constitute the data which is subjected to analysis. As explained in Chapter 3 (Section 3.5.4), the analysis has a three-fold focus which brings together attention to interaction patterns, consideration of (sub)topics of discussion, and exploration of the emerging discourses. I draw on considerably longer extracts of lesson transcripts than is conventional in analyses of classroom talk in order to track the ebb and flow of multiple discourses in the classroom space, sometimes tracking topics and discourses over a number of lessons. I thus engage Bakhtin's notion of language as a 'chain of communication' (1981, 1986), approaching each student's utterance as being 'a link in the chain of speech communication [that] cannot be broken off from preceding links that determine it' nor indeed from the responses which it anticipates (1986, p. 94). This approach has been applied to children's informal classroom talk by Maybin (1994, p. 132) who refers to it as 'a complex chaining relationship between utterances and responses both within and across conversations'.

For this reason it is essential that each site be dealt with separately in order for the classroom talk to be understood in relation to the distinctive characteristics of each pedagogic space. In keeping with this reasoning, the rationale for the selection of extracts for analysis differs for each site. This enables each site to 'speak' on its own terms, as far as it is possible to do so with the parametres of the research project, and enables the focus to be on the kinds of interactions which each site makes (im)possible – what can be said, and heard, in each of the classroom spaces.

The chapter is thus structured into two sections, the first analysing extracts of classroom talk from Site 1 and the second from Site 2. With each extract, I provide a descriptive overview of some of the key elements of conversational analysis before providing the extract in full and proceeding with the interpretative discursive analysis.

The chapter concludes with a discussion that considers what insights the analyses of classroom talk from both sites can provide about the relationship between subjectivity and pedagogy.

6.2 Classroom talk in Site 1: Place, race, transformation and agency

6.2.1 General norms of classroom discourse

Many of the lessons pertaining to the teaching intervention centre on discussion. During the course of my observations I therefore had the opportunity to begin to discern the general characteristics of the classroom discourse that held sway with this group of students and their teacher. As indicated in Figure 6.1 below, the students' desks are arranged in two horse-shoe shapes that fit into each other and opened towards the front of the room. The patterns of gaze enable students to see most of their peers – with the exception of those sitting either directly in front of or behind them. During discussions, the teacher either perches on the extra desk in the front of the room or walks around.




Figure 6.1: The seating plan for Site 1

With few exceptions, whole-class discussion is always teacher-fronted and turn-taking is tightly controlled by the teacher. The dominant pattern of conversational interaction tends to be a form of the common IRE or IRF (Initiate, Respond, Evaluate or Feedback) (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975) – i.e. the teacher initiates the discussion by asking a question and students respond, one at a time. The teacher often holds over her evaluative comment until she has gathered a number of answers, or covered a

'topically related set' (Mehan, 1979). Once she feels she has exhausted a particular question, she summarises or paraphrases students' input, asking them to verify that she has understood them correctly. She then directs the conversation on to the next (sub)topic, perhaps through the use of a follow-up question, or by asking a question that takes the issue further or re-frames it in a new way. In general the discussion moves quickly across a number of issues with multiple students, usually teacher-nominated, giving input in a relatively short time. Despite the seating arrangements, students almost never address their peers directly and the majority of the time is spent responding to the teacher's questions or comments.

6.2.2 Rationale for selection of extracts

Two extracts have been selected for analysis because they represent two extremes of teacher control of the classroom discourse. Extract 1 is taken from a discussion in Lesson 1 where the teacher retains clear control of the interactional and discursive order of the classroom. Extract 2, taken from Lesson 5, shows the students taking control of the classroom talk. Within the parameters of the teaching intervention, Extract 1 is typical of the discursive order of this classroom and Extract 2 is atypical; however, I make no claim that this would hold true for this classroom as a rule. For the purposes of an analysis of the relationship between subjectivity and pedagogy, it is however particularly interesting to explore how the same participants can generate quite different pedagogic spaces and to consider the ways in which these each give rise to different possibilities for subject formation.

6.2.3 Extract 1

The interaction captured in Extract 1 occurs in the first lesson of the teaching intervention and follows on from an introductory discussion on identity. The teacher began the lesson by introducing the concept of identity and generating some discussion on the notion itself as well as how students think of identity in relation to themselves. Extract 1 begins when the teacher re-frames identity within a national context, asking students how they would conceive of their identities within the contemporary moment and the national space.

Before presenting the transcript, I provide a brief overview of the forms which the participation and turn-taking take. See **Appendix F1** for a tabular summary of this overview. The teacher and the students collectively have an almost equal number of speaking turns. While this indicates a considerably high degree of student

participation, the way in which the teacher uses her speaking turns impacts on how the students themselves make use of theirs. Of the eleven times that the teacher gives a particular student the floor, she herself selects and nominates students eight times. She does this as a matter of course. Students appear unruffled and, apart from one student who opts out of giving an answer (T10), they all respond readily to being called on to speak. This practice does, however, produce a number of effects. Few students come forward of their own accord, waiting instead to be called upon to speak, their compliance manifested in their wait-and-respond-to-teacher mode. A related effect is that no peer-to-peer interaction takes place. Although all students appear attentive, there is no indication that they should think about and respond to their peers' comments.

The teacher's initiation move is, typically, in the form of questions. These are general questions, directed to the class as a whole – although sometimes followed by the nomination of a particular student to respond. Apart from the questions in the first turn (which are drawn directly from the teaching materials), of the nine turns that function as questions to the class, seven of them contain closed questions. These questions encourage one-word answers and tend to be followed by a chorus of usually uniform answers (e.g. T14, T16, T22, T24).

The extract under analysis comprises 55 turns in total. I present it in three shorter sections, each followed by an interpretative analysis that looks at the interactional patterns in relation to the content of the conversation and the emerging discourses.

Extract 1a:

1	*T:*	*... Let's move on to the idea of being **in** South Africa. What does it mean to be a South African teenager? For example, if you were growing up in Sydney, would you be a different sort of a teenager? How does being here, in Johannesburg, 2008, South Africa, how does that affect your identity? Sithandi.*
2	*Sithandi:*	*Ma'am,I said* [consulting journal]*we face a lot of challenges in our life and lots of changes too.*
3	*T:*	*So it's challenging? Is that agreed upon?*
4	Murmurs of assent	
5:	*T:*	*Kabelo.*
6	*Kabelo:*	*Ma'am, on the challenges?*
7	*T:*	*The South African one, ja.*
8	*Kabelo:*	*I said* [reading from journal] *as a teenager living in South Africa I face lots of challenges on a day to day basis. Challenges such as the recent xenophobic attacks, high crime rate, teenage pregnancy, HIV/AIDS epidemic and poverty in the country. But I didn't only focus on the negative I also looked at the positive, such as the 2010 world cup that will be able to create more job opportunities and therefore decrease*

poverty.
9 T: *Sebolelo.*
10 Sebolelo: *Ma'am, I didn't get anything.*
11 T: *Ok. And Luis.*
12 Luis: *You're more aware of your surroundings, now in 2008, because it hasn't been the best year that the country's gone through. And you're just more aware of people that you hang out with and you see people in a different view because it's a challenging year for us, especially with the inflation rate going up so you tend to not spend so much money as well so you have a lot of, like, you're trapped. There's certain things that you can't really do that you used to do in the past.*
13 T: *So, do you think that your lives as teenagers are affected by things like the petrol price going up?*
14 A chorus of yeses
15 T: *Does it create pressure on you?*
16 A chorus of yeses followed by multiple overlapping comments
17 T: *Yes?* [to Leila who has her hand up]
18 Leila: *Um, ma'am, I think in comparison to other countries, we have – people want to know our opinion more because of our past, apartheid and stuff like that. I think other countries and old people would like to know our opinion. Even though legally we're not allowed to vote yet, I think we have a good idea of what's going on in our country and people have strong opinions about it.*
19 T: *Moipone?*
20 Moipone: *I think my mother is affected because some people are not able to do – things like finances, you are not able to explore that really because the parents, like their father doesn't take them to [inaudible] so they have a step down in what their future holds.*
21 T: *And aside from your future, would that affect your day-to-day lives?*
22 Murmurs of assent.
23 T: *Would your parents go, 'Okay no more airtime'?*
24 Chorus of yeses followed by laughter.

(from Lesson 1, 11/08/2008)

What emerges in this conversation is an overwhelmingly negative construction of (teenage) life in South Africa. This contrasts with the overwhelmingly positive attitudes voiced in relation to students' own more circumscribed personal identities in the earlier part of the lesson as well as their journal entries written prior to this lesson, which balanced the positive and the negative. Sithandi, the first student whom the teacher nominates to speak, mentions both challenges and changes (T2) but in her feedback move, it is the notion of challenge that the teacher revoices and seeks consensus on (T3). This search for consensus seems somewhat premature not only because this is only one of many possible answers to this question but also because as a statement it remains entirely unelaborated by the speaker; however, the students collectively murmur their assent to the teacher's closed-ended question thus colluding upfront with a construction of the teenage South African experience that gives limited room to the positive.

This sets up the preferred discourse in the classroom as one which foregrounds problems and renders a more positive stance as the alternative discourse. Kabelo (T6), who speaks next, reading directly from her journal, is explicit about attempting to provide a balanced perspective, listing both negatives and positives of South African life as she perceives it, saying *'but I didn't only focus on the negative'*. However, she seems only able to provide one positive aspect of life in South Africa at the time, namely the fact that the 2010 Soccer World Cup would be taking place the country in the near future. Kabelo draws on the positive media discourses on the World Cup, constructing it as an opportunity for job creation and poverty alleviation.

The only positive stance which is voiced in this extract is that of Leila who is the only student who raises her hand and bids to speak (T18). In a context where a particular discourse comes to dominate, it requires less discursive energy to maintain the preferred discourse – either by contributing to it or by remaining silent and enabling others to continue perpetuating it – than it does to deliberately introduce an alternative discourse which would inevitably require some shifting of the frame of reference. By bidding for the floor, Leila actively creates space for herself in the conversation. And although her contribution does not negate the challenges her peers are speaking about, she does offer a quite different construction of the South African teen. Instead of someone who is beset by challenges or even a victim of circumstance, Leila historicises the youth, constructing them as a post-apartheid generation whose opinions are sought after and who are politically informed and engaged. What is noticeable is her use of linguistic markers (such as the first-person plural pronoun 'we' and the possessive 'our') to create a collective youth identity in which she includes herself, speaking confidently both as a young person and on behalf of young people in general. This confident and positive inhabiting of a collective youth identity is all the more noticeable for its almost complete absence in the rest of the data, something that I have already shown in the previous chapter in relation to the youth posters from this site. It also has to be said, however, that Leila's comment can be seen as her taking on the construction of the youth which is implied by this research project and which she would have been exposed to in the ethics permission letter that she had recently read and signed as well as my brief explanatory talk with the students before the teaching intervention. Read in this light, her comment can come across as an attempt to position herself as a clever, insightful student who is responding to what she shrewdly (and accurately) perceives to be the subtext of the research project: the extent to which today's youth is aware of their past and interested in politics. This thus functions as an illustration of how the

subtextual agenda of the research can 'leak' into the discursive structure of the classroom talk (Baxter, 2003, p. 98). But for all its confidence, Leila's is an isolated voice and the classroom discussion closes around her comment and returns to the topic of financial challenges; no other voice takes up any aspect of this discourse until her colleagues Moipone and Dipuo provide a similar construction of the youth in their poster (section 5.4.1).

In this short extract, although only six students make individual contributions to the discussion, the teacher's use of general questions aimed at the class as a whole contrives to involve more than these individual speakers in the discussion. However, because the questions she uses are closed, the students need to do no more than offer a 'yes' or 'no' response, which they usually chorus in unison (T14, T16, T22, T24). Such questions appear particularly unsuited to this type of discussion. Although she begins by opening up the space for students to come forward with their own ideas (T1) and she allows space for individual students to take the floor, her dominant questioning style is one which closes down, or considerably narrows, this space. These questions are not followed up with 'how' or 'why' questions that would require individual and particularised answers, therefore students are not required to elaborate or to mount an argument to support their positions. Instead the teacher herself often provides a possible answer, structuring it as a second, closed-ended question. Thus as it stands, this portion of the conversation reads like a monologue, with the teacher taking the part both of the questioner and of the respondent, appropriating what she imagines to be a likely student response. Although this demonstrates extreme control of a topic that is intended to be student-centred, ironically, the students' response (T24) to her 'mono-dialogue' implies that her comment (T23) does indeed capture their experience. This suggests either that the teacher has a firm grasp of their realities or that the students are highly compliant and responsive to the teacher, or perhaps both.

Extract 1b:

25 T: Do you think your life would be very very different if you were growing up in a different country?
26 Multiple overlapping responses, mostly yes, some no.
27 T: Tell us uh Jayesh.
28 Jayesh: It depends on what culture you're brought up in, you're brought up in different ways [inaudible]
29 T: Give us specific – would it be better? Or worse? Give us some examples.
30 Jayesh: It depends on how you're brought up and how it affects you.
31 T: What other place do you think would change how it is that you are

		living?
32	*Thabiso:*	*Ma'am, can I say something?*
33	*T:*	*Yes, do.*
34	*Thabiso:*	*Ma'am, if I was born in Houghton for example I'd be a different youth from if I was born in Alex –*
35	*S:*	*You'd be a snob.*
36	*Thabiso:*	*Besides that* [laughter]
37	*T:*	*A bit like Gatsby, you'd* [...inaudible]*?*
38	*Thabiso:*	*Yes well I think your surroundings make you who you are.*

(from Lesson 1, 11/08/2008)

At this point, the teacher re-directs students' attention to place, repeating a version of one of the questions she asked earlier (T1). This is the first of the closed-ended questions she asks which does not have a uniform chorused response since there are students that do not take the position that is encouraged by the question, indicating that they do not think their lives would be very different if they were living in a different country. This suggests a lack of attention to the historical particularities of a context such as South Africa, and foreshadows the placeless quality of the majority of the posters in this site. Jayesh, the first student the teacher nominates to speak, draws a connection between identity, place and culture but although the teacher tries to probe the comment, he does not elaborate.

At this point another student who has raised his hand calls out, bidding for permission to speak and strongly signalling his insertion into the conversation. He engages directly with the teacher's question on place, making an explicit statement about how place shapes identity, but shifts the contrast from the international to the national arena. By saying that he would be a different person if he were born in Houghton instead of Alex (T34), he locates difference within South African borders, suggesting that the interplay between place and identity is more nuanced than simply that of a national identity. He invokes a suburb/township binary, suggesting that these places constitute such different environments that they serve to construct different subjectivities. However, Thabiso choses a suburb – Houghton – that indexes not only wealth and affluence but is specifically associated with 'old money'. Its established status, civility and secure privilege remains unrivalled by the new wealth and rapid rise of many of the newly prestigious areas of northern Johannesburg. A gibe from a peer (T35) – in the form of an audible aside – and Thabiso's smooth response (T36) and the accompanying laughter confirm that the symbolic value of the suburb of Houghton is understood by all. The teacher's reference to *The Great Gatsby* (a recently studied literary set work), the quintessential representation of the affluence

that is associated with the American Dream, shows that she too picks up the reference to class and privilege.

Earlier in the lesson, Thabiso had already signalled his sensitivity to the interplay between place and identity by describing himself as a *'South African Tswana-speaking student at Willowvale High, born and grew up in Alex'*(S1, L1, 5). By referring to South Africa, the school he attends, Alexandra township and language, Thabiso does not only locate himself geographically, but also indexes broader social discourses of origin, social mobility and ethnicity. A complex and ambivalent relationship with the township emerges. His choice of phrasing – *'born and grew up in Alex'* – suggests that Alex is not just a place of residence but is linked to his beginnings and has shaped his childhood and youth. But he qualifies this by adding: *'I dream to move on... I want to move up the social ladder'*. The township is thus associated with origins and current influences but the future is not in the township. Moving out of the township is equated with a successful, middle class trajectory, and in this schooling plays an important role. Thabiso includes the school – a suburban, former Model C school – as one of his identity markers, following this with the township to which his origins are tied and from which he wants to escape. It is as if the school in the suburbs functions – both geographically and metaphorically – as a 'half-way house' out of the township and into a future middle class existence. Almost half of the students in this class live in a township and thus belong to what Mda calls 'the new migrants' (Mda 2006, quoted in Soudien, 2007b, p. 77), forming part of the flow of black students who still live in the townships but commute daily to and from historically white schools in the suburbs. Soudien sees these youth as coming from homes which are undergoing the socioeconomic transition from working class to middle class, illustrating how schooling is implicated in the project of producing middle class identities. However, there is a danger of allowing class to oversimplify the distinction between the township and suburbs. It is possible to be middle class ***and*** to live in the township (Mbembe and Nuttall, 2008) – Thabiso himself refers elsewhere to being away overseas, being on holiday in South Africa and other middle class pursuits. The move out of the township into the suburbs is overlain with all kinds of symbolic social meanings of which socioeconomic status is only one. And it is likely that it is these meanings that are at the forefront of Thabiso's aspirations to move out and are implicated in a 'New South African Dream' that has overtones of *Gatsby*.

Extract 1c:

39 T: *Boipelo.*
40 Boipelo: *Ma'am, on which part?*
41 T: *We're just talking about how being South African is unique.*
42 Boipelo: *Ma'am... I think that okay it is unique ma'am in terms of if you look at how we live in South Africa now as teenagers, I think we're quite competent* [meaning: competitive] *about many things, and ma'am, if you look at other provinces, many kids don't really have competition in terms of clothing, money, schoolwork and such.*
43 T: *So do you think this is quite a tough place to grow up?*
44 Boipelo: *Yes, ma'am, I do.*
45 T: *Quite racy? Ntombi?*
46 Ntombi: *I think it's hard because you have to keep up with the latest trends because if you don't you feel very small*[very soft, hard to hear]
47 T: *What makes you feel small?*
48 Ntombi: *Like if you don't have the latest cellphone.*
49 T: *So if you bring out a brick* [much laughter], *you're not worthy. Do you think that that's a teen thing? To be judged on nice things?*
50 Luis: *I think it's also a way as other countries see us. They also think of us like we go to school riding elephants* [laughter] *it affects people. I mean because Americans and all those other countries think they're more important than us and they just leave us in the dust. They think that Africans, South Africans are just, ja... They don't really care about us even though they say they do but...*
51 T: *Kabelo?*
52 Kabelo: *Ma'am, about if it makes a difference living in a different country...um as South Africans we're faced with different challenges where we have to worry about different things from other teenagers have to worry about. Like if we're living in Iraq, we'd have to worry about the war and maybe getting married at a young age. While we have to worry about maybe teenage pregnancy and crime so that the challenges that you face are different and I think that makes up part of your identity as well.*
53 T: *Do you think that as SA teenagers you are more aware of status symbols than other teenagers? Or do you think that being a teen means you care about the logo on your jeans, the brand on your – Do you think that's international, or do you think that's a unique Jo'burg thing?*
54 Murmurs from students
55 T: *Let's just raise your hands. Those who think that it's internationally teens are status-orientated* [majority of hands raised]. *And then those who think not really* [fewer hands]

(Lesson 1, 11/08/2008)

In the final portion of Extract 1, two students speak to the competitiveness of consumerist teen identities. Boipelo, whom the teacher nominates to speak, refers to South African teenagers being competitive (*'in terms of clothing, money, schoolwork'*) in comparison to *'other provinces'*. She seems to be alluding to the urban/rural divide, signalling that Gauteng or Johannesburg is a place of urban consumerism which generates competitiveness at the level of quality and quantity of material

possessions. Ntombi, who takes up this discourse, makes a clear statement about the impact of material possessions on her self-esteem going so far as to say that she feels small if she has a large cellphone, indexing the symbolic value of particular types of cellphones among trend-conscious youth. This foreshadows some of the themes of 'conspicuous consumption' (Farber, 2002) and accesorization of the self (Nuttall, 2004) that have already been discussed in in relation to the posters.

Luis, the student who speaks next, picks up on the idea of feeling judged and applies it to the way in which he is made to feel in response to what he believes to be outsiders' or non-South Africans' perceptions of South Africa. Broadly, he expresses his frustration at the ignorance and stereotypes applied to (South) Africa in the global arena. In defending South Africa against the gaze of outsiders, he draws defensively on an 'us versus them' discourse, forging a unified (yet undefined) South African identity of which he is part. His personal investment in this is evident in the tone and inflection of the statement, '*they don't really care about us even though they* ***say*** *they do...'*. The issue of representation and its interplay between notions of self and other is not straightforward, however, and Luis falls into the trap of himself being guilty of the type of national stereotype thinking that he accuses outsiders of ('*Like Americans and all those other countries think they're more important than us'* – i.e. all Americans are arrogant, cultural imperialists).

In response to the teacher's encouragement for students to define themselves as South Africans in relation to other countries, Kabelo demonstrates an awareness of the contextual factors associated with place and how these shape identity. She maintains that challenges are context-dependent and that teen challenges vary from country to country. This provides an interesting disruption of the reading that was done of her poster (S1P12) in the previous chapter as it suggests that although neither the poster itself nor the poster talk engaged explicitly with the South African context, the choice of content was underpinned by an unspoken sense of context.

The teacher-class interaction that occurs between T53 and T55 is a further example of the ways in which the teacher controls the participation structure of the discussion. She returns to the issue of teens' trend-conscious consumerist attitudes, and asks a number of closed-ended questions designed to find out whether students think that being trend-conscious is a characteristic peculiar to only South African teens (T53). When the teacher is unable to interpret students' mumbled responses – since her utterance consists of multiple questions in quick succession and a neat 'yes' or 'no' response is not possible – she adopts a different strategy to determine the sway of

the opinion: she asks each question separately and asks for a show of hands for each. This demonstrates two different techniques which the teacher uses to access students' positions. The first combines economy of speed with inclusivity. By asking students to raise their hands, she manages, in a matter of moments, to get an impression of what the majority position is on the issue and, by giving all students' opinions equal weight, does so in a democratic fashion. The corollary to this is that she imposes a binary by offering students only two distinct positions on the issue and thus precluding more complex positions from surfacing. The two positions she offers are based on the taken-for-granted assumption that all South African teens are indeed brand-obsessed. The two questions are phrased in such a way that, by answering, the students automatically accept this underlying assumption – there is no room for those who may want to disagree with the presupposition, which in itself is a generalisation. The teacher seems satisfied with finding out how many students support which position and does not probe their reasoning. In this way, the teacher is assigning value to the students' opinions by recruiting them but because students are not asked to defend their positions, to justify their thinking or to provide substantiation for their views, she misses the opportunity to promote a classroom discourse which engages more meaningfully with the exploration of ideas and positions. Used in this way, the teacher's questioning becomes a mechanism for controlling the classroom discourse rather than a tool for thought and classroom discussion remains trapped at the level of accumulation of untested opinions.

6.2.4 Extract 2

Extract 2 comes from one of the lessons where the TRC is being discussed (Lesson 5). The lesson begins with the teacher eliciting the students' responses regarding the relevance of the TRC which formed the focus of the analysis in Chapter 4. The talk captured in this extract is part of the spill-over discussion. In other words, this is the direction in which students take the discussion when it is no longer strictly confined to the particular task/question but remains engaged, in less obvious ways, with some of the discourses that have emerged with regard to the TRC.

This extract captures the discussion in the final portion of the lesson – the bell marking the end of the lesson is heard in the middle of turn 58. The extract begins immediately after one of the students, Thabiso, has asked the teacher what her opinion is about whether or not history is important or relevant to the present. She speaks eloquently of how she does indeed believe that it is important to know about

and critically examine one's past but is careful to emphasise that this is purely her personal opinion and that it has no bearing on the way in which she would evaluate theirs and that they are free to disagree with her. Extract 2 begins with Thabiso's response which sparks the most engaged discussion that takes place in this site. Again, before turning to a discursive analysis of the talk, I provide a brief overview of the forms which participation and turn-taking take. See **Appendix F2** for a tabular summary of this overview.

The teacher's participation in this extract is significantly different from the previous one. Whereas last time she held the floor for approximately as long as the students' collectively did, here she has substantially fewer turns and they are very brief, with the students utterances accounting for 90% of the words spoken. Eight students participate in the discussion and what is particularly striking is that, uncharacteristically, the teacher does not nominate students to speak, they all come forward to take the floor of their own volition, either raising their hands and making a bid to speak or else inserting themselves into the conversation by calling out in response to a peer's comment. Also significant is that here the students engage with one another's comments, responding to their peers either via the teacher or else addressing their peers directly. Furthermore, with one exception (Patrick), they all enter the conversation twice, returning, after having listened to their peers, to challenge their comments and/or defend their own earlier positions.

The majority of the teacher's turns thus function to direct the verbal traffic (Cazden, 2001) often assigning numbered speaking turns to multiple students who are all bidding to speak at the same time (e.g. T6, T16, T35, T57). She organises the order in which students speak and enforces the one-at-a-time rule; and she does not initiate topic change or direct questions to the class, she asks only follow-up questions directed at individual speakers, most often a request for clarification (e.g. T4, T18, T33, T39, T41, T43). These features mean that this particular portion of classroom talk contrasts strongly with Extract 1. Here it is not the learners who are reacting to the teacher but the teacher who is reacting to the learners – to their raised hands, to their comments. The extract is provided below in full, despite its length, in order to retain the momentum of the conversation.

Extract 2: transformation, youth and agency

1 Thabiso: Ah well, ma'am, well, history is the only way of going forward, basically.

2 Kholiswa: But even though it might be the only way forward, how can it be the

		only way forward when things are still the way – kinda – the way they are?
3	*Thabiso:*	[aside] *Because people out there are uneducated, that's why.*
4	*T:*	*What do you mean by things?*
5	*Kholiswa:*	*I mean, we still have racist people, we still have people who murder other people, we still have people who attack people for no reason – there are a lot of things that are still the same, at school, at home, wherever you are. People still look at you in a way – there's some people who still like 'and you're black therefore you eat there – and I'm white, this is my place' you know, and even though some people pretend, like you know 'because you're black I should treat you like this', or they'll be all smiling to you but you can still see that this person is like – 'why you in my school?' why.. you know?*
6	*T:*	*I'm just going to give you numbers because then your hands can have a rest* [to students whose hands are up to speak] – *one, there was a hand, two, three, okay? Yes?*
7	*Lebohang:*	*Ma'am, I think the people of this country, ma'am, they know our history but I don't think they understand it, they hear it but they don't understand it, ma'am. And then some people just don't want to change their opinions, they don't want to ... Just because they hear a person say such a thing, they're also going to say it because like they've heard someone else say it, they think that it makes sense but the..*
8	*T:*	*They don't fully grasp it.*
9	*Lebohang:*	*Yes, so if a person says something, I'm just going to say okay, I think you're speaking sense so I also think that's the truth.*
10	*T:*	*Moipone?*
11	*Moipone:*	*Ma'am, what Kholiswa was saying, that some things are still the same. I think we need to look at our history, we need to analyse our history to see where we went wrong. Because some things are still the same because some solutions were not effective enough so we need to look in the past and see where we went wrong. So maybe if – because the future is in our hands as teens so we need to look in the history and see what our leaders did wrong so that when we are leaders we can do something more about it.*
12	*T:*	*Yes.*
13	*Thabiso:*	*I just want to analyse what she* [Kholiswa] *said, ma'am. The only reason that's true is because people don't want to change, people can't – people are still trying to adapt to this new democracy we're living in. That's why that's possible, ma'am. That's why Boksburg will always be Boksburg* [laughter].
14	*T:*	*Puseletso?*
15	*Puseletso:*	*Ma'am, I'd like to ask, ma'am, like Moipone's saying that the future is in our hands. I really do not believe – okay, at a certain point I do believe that but in some way I don't because I mean how many years will it take for me to be a president of the country? And I mean things that are happening, like let's look at the xenophobia attacks. Our leaders are the ones that should show us the way and lead positively but if they are negative and they are negative and they're not setting a good example obviously there's nothing that's going to change instead they are emphasising the point of these xenophobia attacks, not helping the country anyway while they in the yesteryears went to their countries for safety and everything. So, how many years is it going to take me to get there?*
16	*T:*	*Let's just see, Patrick and then – one – is your hand up? You're*

number one. Another one? Two.

17 *Patrick:* *Ma'am, I think racism is part of the system now* [laughter].

18 *T:* *Explain.*

19 *Patrick:* *It's one of those things that are just meant to be there, you can't erase it anymore. The future can't change. You can't tell someone that love this person because he's black. Somewhere in that person's heart they will have that hatred for you because you're black, you can't change that person into a white guy or he won't [?]. No matter how far in the future we go, people still remember the apartheid days and things, things will always be the same. Things will never change – unless you leave the country, of course.*

20 *T:* *Okay.*

21 *Enoko:* *To what Puseletso said. ..people think that you have to be the president to change the world – you don't have to be the president to change the world.*

22 *Puseletso:* *But how? What are you going to do now?*

23 *S:* *Be a cleaner?* [laughter]

24 *Enoko:* *No, no, obviously there's a certain extent to like authority in the country but I mean like –*

25 *S:* *To which extent do you have to be in order to win? There's no extent –*

26 *Enoko:* *It doesn't matter as long as you can make a difference then like –*

27 *Puseletso:* *How long is it going to take to notice the difference?*

28 Multiple inaudible voices

29 *T:* *One at a time. ... Then you can rebutt. Thabiso? And Moipone, I'm sorry I didn't forget about you.*

30 *Thabiso:* *I've got this case study, ma'am. We were in Mpumalanga, ma'am, and we were in a place owned by like whites, so obviously we were black* [mild laughter] *and we were just having fun so –*

31 *T:* *On holiday...?*

32 *Thabiso:* *Yes, on holiday. So I was with my dad and he was like one of these party political people in the past – so we were having fun and stuff and like there was no rules there and so like the people who owned the place came to us and told us to go to sleep. So clicked that my dad's still got this thing of 'hey, you're white, you're not going to tell me what I'm going to do' and stuff, so it all started in a fight. So I say it's just the attitude, ma'am, the attitude's all wrong, like –*

33 *T:* *So you're saying those racist attitudes are still –*

34 *Thabiso:* *Ja, and they'll never go, ma'am. Because he's still got those flashbacks of them treating him bad and stuff so I don't think that's ever gonna go in like this country – it's always going to be there.*

35 *T:* *Okay,... go you, you and you.*

36 *Boikanyo:* *Yes, ma'am, also the black people, ma'am, they – they're still scared of whites. Well, not like all black people but like –*

37 *T:* *Well, not Thabiso's dad!* [laughter]

38 *Boikanyo:* *But ma'am like – in complexes and shops and Pick 'n Pay and Spar and all of those, if you're black they treat you in a certain way and if you're white they're all jumpy, and if you say 'Jump!', they'll say 'How high?' but if you're black they'll give you attitude and all of that. Because black people still have that mentality that white people are better.*

39 *T:* *Who's 'they'?*

40 *Thabiso:* */The workers/*

41 *T:* *Black staff or white staff?*

42 *SS:* [in chorus] *Black staff.*

43 T: *So are you saying, black staff are racist to other blacks?*
44 Boikanyo: *Yes, they feel that whites are more important.*
45 Thabiso: */Superior/*
46 T: *Moipone? Let's keep to our sequence, and raise your hand if you've got something to add.*
47 Moipone: *Ma'am, I was going to* agori[11] [laughter] *that, that no, we think* gore *we don't have we don't have an influence to make a difference in our country, so we have that attitude of keeping quiet and not speaking out because we think okay, I'm just a normal person so what makes me think* gore *that the leaders are going to listen to me. So I think that's the problem that we are too quiet and we're not putting our ideas forward.*
48 T: *Kholiswa?*
49 Kholiswa: *It's not that we're quiet and it's not that we're.../*
50 Enoko: */We're not heard/*
51 Kholiswa: */...not strong, we are limited.*
52 Enoko: *Yes, we're not heard.*
53 Kholiswa: *Yes, they tell us that the future is in our hands, but how can our future be – how can the future be in our hands if we are limited to do stuff and talk and act?*
54 Multiple voices, general chatter, inaudible
55 T: *Lebohang had something profound to say. Let's hear. She said you...?*
56 Lebohang: *You limit yourself. Just because I'm black doesn't mean I can't do this and what not. It's within you, ma'am, if you say I'm going to achieve such a thing, then you're going to do it. Just because you're black doesn't mean ... or they're not going to take me seriously because I'm black, or back then – no, it's within you, ma'am, you can change it, you know.*
57 T: *Okay, one, two, three, four* [pointing to the students' whose hands are up to speak]
58 Puseletso: *I think Lebohang is talking about like these simple, like easy things – like not these complicated things. I mean, ma'am, Kholiswa's right, we are limited. If you've got a problem, ma'am, about the country* [bell rings, marking the end of the lesson], *are you going to write a letter to Thabo Mbeki and tell him? And how long will he take to read your letter? And, I mean really ma'am, how is he going to respond to it?*
59 T: *Listen, listen. Hey, don't pack up.*
60 Boikanyo: *I agree with Puseletso and Kholiswa, ma'am. It's not that we're limiting ourselves but who are you going to tell when you want to change something in the country? You can't run to Thabo Mbeki because, I mean, he has securities and all of that. So it's not about limiting yourself, we are being limited.*
61 T: *Three.*
62 Enoko: *Ma'am, Lebo said you can do anything you wanted. It's like if you got here before BEE was introduced, most people that were hired were whites so that the BEE was introduced to help blacks to perform but then if the BEE wasn't introduced then the black people wouldn't have anything in order to...*
63 S: *Thank you!*

(from Lesson 5,20/08/2008)

[11] *gore* means 'that' in the Sotho languages; used here as a semantic filler.

In this spill-over discussion, the discourses around the value (or lack thereof) of history that were mobilised in relation to the TRC develop into two parallel but intertwined strands: one which engages issues around racism and lack of transformation and the other which interrogates the extent to which the youth have agency to bring about change. It is clear from the dynamics of the conversation that students feel strongly about these issues.

The issue of transformation, or lack thereof, surfaces upfront with Kholiswa's somewhat oblique response to Thabiso's assertion that *'history is the only way of going forward'* (T1). Judging by her response (and in the context of the teacher's remarks on history which immediately precede this extract), it would seem that Kholiswa has interpreted Thabiso's comment to mean that our past needs to be understood in order to be overcome. The contrasting connector 'but' at the beginning of her utterance signals immediate disagreement with this view because, as she asserts, things are still the same. She elaborates on this in response to the teacher's probe and it becomes clear that she means that racist behaviours and attitudes persist. She illustrates this by mimicking two types of white people's talk, an overtly racist discourse ('*you're black therefore you eat here – I'm white this is my place'*), and a discourse of political correctness associated with racialised forms of politeness which function as a social veneer for the underlying racism *('some people pretend… because you black I should treat you like this… they'll be all smiling… why you in my school'*).

Because of her appropriation of the white voice, she herself is the 'you' that is the target of the racism she parodies but this construction of herself as victim is undercut by her strong, critical voice. The strength of her sentiments is also reflected rhetorically in the use of repetition to foreground the lack of transformation. She repeats elements of the syntactical structure, namely *'we <u>still</u> have...'* is used successively three times and she goes on to use the word 'still' a further four times in her utterance.

Kholiswa's statement prompts a marked increase in the level of engagement of the class and their chained responses drive the discussion for the remainder of the lesson. No challenge levelled at her central assertion that racism persists, students simply position themselves differently in relation to the reasons they provide for the persistence of racism and in relation to whether or not they believe change is possible.

Of all the subsequent speakers, it is Moipone who constructs the most agentive position for the youth (T11). She interweaves two common discourses, that of the youth being the leaders of the future and that of history being important because we learn from our mistakes. Using the pronoun 'we' to construct a collective youth identity in which she includes herself, she envisions change being possible if the youth use history to learn from past mistakes and correct them when they themselves are leaders. Her use of language is persuasive and future-orientated – she uses *'we need...'* four times, all in relation to the imperative to analyse the past for mistakes to be corrected. Her confidence in the youth's future leadership is reflected in her use of the word 'when' in 'when we are leaders' and her statement that the youth can do 'something more' than was done before. Overall she positions herself as a young person, capable of critically analysing history, who has the potential to become a future leader able to improve on past ineffective solutions. It is interesting to note that Moipone's subject positions seem to remain remarkably consistent over a range of data. The comments she makes here echo her position on history, discussed in Chapter 4, and foreshadow the discourses of agency that are evident in her poster talk (S1P8).

Puseletso (T15) is the first of a number of students to challenge the idealism of this position and she does so by directly questioning Moipone's statement that the future is in the hands of the youth. Although she does speak of the youth collectively and inclusively – 'our hands', 'our leaders' – she also refers to herself in the singular form – 'for me to be...', 'take me to get...'. But more salient is the fact that neither of these participants occupies the grammatical subject position which is instead left to the leaders – 'our leaders', 'they' – to occupy. This reinforces, grammatically, the main thrust of the point she is making: that the youth have no significant agency, certainly not in the short term. She endows political leaders with agency but their actions are all represented in negative terms, as is their lack of moral leadership. Altogether Puseletso constructs a bleak picture of the situation as she sees it: the youth effectively have no power to act and are therefore constructed as helpless; those that do have agency are adults in positions of political power and they are exercising their power negatively, or ineffectually. This seems to indicate little hope of change.

A number of turns later, Enoko comes forward to challenge Puseletso's notion that agency is limited to whoever holds the position of president. This move has the effect of triggering the only instance of spontaneous, direct student-student interaction that occurs in this site. Puseletso's position is clearly an entrenched one and she is not

open to hearing Enoko's attempts to construct ordinary people as agentive. Over a number of turns (T21-T27), she and an unidentified student resist Enoko's challenge, firing questions at him and repeatedly interrupting his answers thereby placing him in a defensive position. The unidentified student mockingly enquires as to whether Enoko might be suggesting that a cleaner would be able to bring about change. The cleaner here is obviously intended to signal an uneducated, poorly paid, lowly employee representing the polar opposite of the characteristics a president is understood to embody, and tied to notions of class, suggesting that power and agency lies with the elite and not with the working class. This reduces the argument to one based on two extremes and Enoko is not given the space to present the more nuanced position he seems to be alluding to. The end of this interchange is marked by multiple students speaking simultaneously and, unfortunately, not being audible enough for transcribing.

The debate about youth agency is interwoven with a parallel, and ultimately related, conversation about racism. Thabiso, in T13, agrees with Kholiswa's assertion that racism persists, maintaining that at the level of the individual, change is difficult. His contentions that *'people don't want to change'* and *'people are still trying to adapt'* seem contradictory. By asserting that 'people' find change difficult, he distances himself from this attitude. This is further borne out by the aside (T3) he utters immediately after Kholiswa's first comment. It is the *'people out there'* who are the problem, or the obstacle to change. His final statement foregrounds the inflexibility of the status quo: *'That's why Boksburg will always be Boksburg'*. Boksburg is a suburb on the eastern outskirts of Johannesburg which was stereotypically associated with middle class to lower middle class, politically conservative Afrikaans values. I learned later in a focus group discussion that Thabiso was basing his judgement on his experiences of visiting his mother who lives in Boksburg and feeling unwelcome and uncomfortable in that suburb. By creating a distance from those he critically describes, Thabiso positions himself, by implication, as one of an educated, thinking minority that is open to change.

The conversational thread of racism is picked up a few turns later by Patrick who begins by asserting that *'racism is part of the system now'* (T17). At the teacher's prodding, he describes an implacable social structure which reproduces hatred of white for black – *'in that person's heart they will have that hatred for you because you're black'* (T19). His construction of white racism as intractable points to Patrick's belief in the impossibility of change, a stance which is captured vividly in the repeated

phrases he uses: *'... just meant to be there... can't erase... can't change... can't change... things will always be the same. Things will never change'*. For Patrick, white feelings of racial hatred are so immutable that one might as well try to change a black person into a white person – neither can be achieved. Disturbingly, the future is fixed for even *'the future can't change... no matter how far in the future we go...'.* Patrick's addendum that *'things will never change – unless you leave the country of course'* reinforces the notion that change is not possible but also makes it clear that it is South African society that constitutes *'the system'*. The fact that Patrick is from the Congo and came to South Africa at the age of about 12 may explain why he can envisage emigration from South Africa as a possibility, and also suggests that his sensitivity to the racialised social structure he alludes to comes from having spent his childhood in a country where society was differently structured. Patrick's utterance does not only engage with the uneradicability of racism but in doing so also constitutes the individual as having no agency. As a black youth in South Africa you have no power to change the system, all you can do is leave.

In turns 30 to 34, Thabiso comes forward to offer a personal narrative which supports his earlier contention about the difficulty of change. The story he relates involves his father's response to being told what to do by a white man and illustrates his father's racial sensitivities and the difficulty of changing people's mindsets. Like Kholiswa (T5), he appropriates another's voice. And although he too distances himself from it, he does so in a way that conveys a growing awareness of his father's dynamic *('I clicked that my dad's still got this thing...'*, T32) and a level of understanding and compassion (*'he's still got those flashbacks of them treating him bad and stuff*', T32). What is significant is that while Thabiso is able to differentiate between his father's attitudes and his own implied one and thus position himself differently from his father, he does not seem able to use this to envision change, something I have already touched on in relation to this anecdote in Chapter 4 (see section 4.3.2).

Previous students have spoken in generalised ways of the ongoing racist behaviour of white people towards black people. Thabiso provides the first example of racialised attitudes inherent in black people, and Boikanyo provides the next one. She begins by making a generalised statement about *'the black people'* being afraid of white people but then, realising this is too broad – and perhaps also becoming aware that the previous speaker's example refutes this – she self-corrects, adding *'not like all black people'* (T36), with the teacher's rejoinder (T37) showing that she too picks up this contradiction. Boikanyo then narrows her frame of reference to black employees who

attend to the public in places such as shopping malls and, by describing how their behaviour differs according to whether the customer is black or white, she provides an example of internalised racism evident in everyday social interaction (Fanon, 1952). This example is overlain with traces of classed behaviour and attitudes, and has echoes of the aside uttered by Thabiso in turn 3, but once again it is an instance of young people being critically aware of adults' racialised behaviour practices.

It is also interesting to look more closely at the interaction spanning turns 38 to 45. Boikanyo introduces her example and the teacher, her voice overlapping with others', asks three consecutive clarificatory follow-up questions. These are answered by Thabiso, the class in chorus and Boikanyo. A strong sense is created of the students constructing, for the teacher's edification, something that is part of their shared, collective experience and that is outside the teacher's frame of reference. Her third question (T43) suggests that this is so far beyond her own reality that a final verification is necessary to ensure that she has indeed understood correctly.

Although the issue of racism seems to disappear at this point and give way once again to the discussion around agency, it resurfaces in the form of race and agency before the discussion is over. Moipone, whose view of agency was earlier challenged by Puseletso, returns now to defend her position (T47), addressing the points that have been made on agency in the meantime. She continues to use the inclusive 'we' in the grammatical subject position. Speaking from her position as a young person in South Africa, she argues that the youth are silenced by their own perception that they are unimportant and that they cannot make a difference. This is particularly interesting in light of the absence of the self from the youth posters of this site (see section 5.4.1). Her utterance contains clear echoes of the various utterances that have argued against ordinary people being able to effect change (Puseletso T15, 22, 27 and the unidentified student in T23, 25). Moipone incorporates the voice of someone who feels there is no point in attempting to effect change (*'I'm just a normal person so what makes me think gore the leaders are going to listen to me'*, T47) and reaccentuates and reinterprets this attitude as the root of 'the problem'. Her overall utterance therefore has, in the first instance, the effect of making the youth responsible for their own lack of action but the corollary of this is that it also places the possibility of agency squarely back in the youth's domain – one can only be held responsible for a particular action if a different action were possible. Here the youth are not constructed as powerless before an unchangeable 'system' but as rendered powerless by their own defeatist attitudes.

This belief in agency is met with scepticism. Kholiswa and Enoko, responding with overlapping utterances (T49-53), place the locus of control externally once again. Both of them use grammatically passive constructions to explain why the youth do not effect change: *'we're not heard...'* (T50, 52); *'we are limited...'* (T51, 53). Grammatically, the agentless passive not only constructs the subject of the verb as the 'done-to' rather than the 'do-er' but by omitting the agent or actor (Not heard by whom? Limited by whom?), the possibility of action by the passive subject is rendered more remote.

This brief interchange is punctuated by a wave of general chatter as students respond to what they have heard in overlapping ways that cannot be captured in the transcription. The teacher is able to make out at least one of the comments and, indicating approval, gives the relevant student the floor so that she can repeat it to the whole class. Lebohang (T56) relocates the locus of control – and thus responsibility and agency – within the individual, generating obvious echoes of Moipone's previous utterances. But a subtle shift takes place and it becomes clear that the focus of her utterance is on race and agency. She seems to be only partially arguing against those who maintain that the youth have no chance of being listened to by those in power; in fact her utterance reads more like a rejoinder to Patrick's statements that things will never change because racism is an irrevocable part of the system. Adopting a conception of the individual as fully autonomous, self-determining and capable of impacting on her/his surroundings, she maintains that one's ability to achieve or not comes from 'within', saying *'just because I'm black doesn't mean I can't do this'.* In doing so, there is the sense that she is also positioning herself against public discourses of 'black victimhood', drawing on liberal discourses of 'racelessness' by eliding the structural inequalities of race.

The two immediate responses (T58 and T60) are students taking issue with the free reign over agency with which Lebohang endows the individual and suggesting that the ability to effect change in minor ways is not the same as addressing a problem 'about the country'. The final comment of the lesson is made by Enoko who brings 'BEE' into the discussion. In what appears to be a shift from his earlier position of 'ordinary people can make a difference', he seems to use the existence of BEE as evidence that black people do not possess agency of their own. His logic seems to be that without the assistance provided by BEE black people would not be able to succeed and therefore it is not personal motivation from 'within', as Lebohang maintained, that ensures success, but external assistance in the form of BEE.

6.2.5 Discussion

A number of insights about classroom discourse can be derived from juxtaposing these two extracts of classroom talk. In Extract 1 the teacher's question-and-answer mode and rapid rotation of the turn-taking keeps the classroom discussion moving and enables new speakers to keep getting the floor. This works to elicit opinions from a maximum number of students and prevents any student from dominating. It also, however, works against depth of discussion since the frequency with which topic change occurs precludes meaningful exploration of ideas. Furthermore, despite the fact that the topic is student-centred, teacher authority is entrenched through control of the speaking turns. There thus appears to be a mismatch between the teacher's explicit avowal of openness to different positions and her use of discussion strategies. Her frequent use of closed-ended questions and either/or options directed at the class as a collective, with the expectation that there will be a uniform response across all the students, and her moves towards consensus in the early stages of a discussion work to prevent more complex positions from surfacing and, if used regularly, can encourage convergent thinking.

However, it could be argued that it was the students who were not forthcoming and the teacher was attempting to adapt to their reticence. This was the first lesson of the teaching intervention and the students had not yet warmed to the conversation – or indeed to the presence of the camera and researcher in the classroom. My impression as observer was that the teacher found it difficult to draw students into discussion and the techniques she employed may well have been intended to facilitate discussion without requiring deep engagement from students. Certainly as a teacher I too am well acquainted with the familiar 'pulling teeth' model of class discussion and the strategies one has to resort to to keep the lesson moving.

Interestingly, the participation structure of Extract 2, while very different from that of the first extract,also raises the question of whether the teacher was adapting to the students or vice versa. Here, the students take almost complete control of the classroom talk, bidding to speak, addressing one another directly and actively positioning themselves in relation to the topic at hand and to one another. The teacher's role is predominantly that of directing the speaking traffic. Thus the question this time is whether the teacher's relatively uninvolved role is the cause or the effect of increased student participation. Together these two questions underscore the fact that the classroom is indeed co-constructed by teacher and students alike, with ongoing negotiation occurring continually in often imperceptible ways.

In Extract 1, because the classroom talk remains superficial and fragmented, no significant discourses emerge and it is difficult to discern subject positions being taken up in any noticeable way. In Extract 2, however, students take ownership of what can be said, completely altering the discursive structure of the discussion. This is a key moment in the teaching intervention whenstudents take up subject positions *as* South African youths and speak from authority from those positions – unlike the positions taken up in the poster work where they speak *about* the youth. Thus even while some students argue that young people have no power to effect change, they do so in assertive and strongly positioned ways. Moreover, their investment in the discussion contradicts the 'apartheid is dead, let's move on' discourse of earlier discussions since they are deeply engaged in discussions about the extent to which they are trapped in historicised subject positions or are able to escape them.

6.3 Classroom talk in Site 2: Crime, place and privilege

6.3.1 General norms of classroom discourse

As with Site 1, my classroom observations over the period of the teaching intervention in Site 2 enabled me to discern some of the general characteristics of the classroom discourse. The seating arrangements mirrored those of Site 1 almost exactly. As Figure 6.2 shows, this classroom too has the students' desks arranged in two horse-shoe shapes that are open towards the front of the classroom and the patterns of gaze are such that most students can look at their peers' faces during their speaking turns. During the course of discussion, the teacher normally takes a chair and places it within the inner circle of desks.




Figure 6.2: The seating plan for Site 2

The teacher usually initiates discussion through direct questioning but then allows the students to run with the discussion as soon as it gathers momentum. She continues to facilitate the discussion, directing the verbal traffic (Cazden, 2001) without allowing her voice to dominate. Individual students usually get the floor by raising their hands and bidding to speak or else they insert themselves into the conversation by taking advantage of brief pauses between speakers' comments. Only when discussions become enthusiastic to the point that multiple students begin calling out simultaneously does the teacher enforce a one-at-a-time rule. Although the majority of students' talking turns are self-initiated, the teacher does contrive to include students who are not forthcoming by directing questions at them at particular points in the conversation.

By and large, the teacher's questions to the class are open-ended and their opinions on issues are elicited with the teacher often engaging with the same student over a number of turns in order to probe the student's position and ideas. Students seem practised at listening and responding to one another and there is a high frequency of direct address among students; a student getting the floor often directs her response to a previous speaker whose comments she is engaging with.

6.3.2 Rationale for selection of extracts

Three extracts have been selected for analysis from this site because taken together they typify what the prevailing structure in this pedagogic space makes possible. In this site, long conversations occur frequently with multiple students engaging with an issue in an extended way, sometimes returning to it in a later lesson and developing the discussion further. This exemplifies Bakhtin's metaphor of language as a 'chain of communication' (1981, 1986). In this case I trace the chain of communication over three extracts, each taken from a different lesson. The first two extracts (taken from Lessons 1 and 8) form part of the spill-over discussion which occurs in the informal discussion spaces between the tasks of the teaching intervention. The third is taken from the interaction that takes place with the class after two students have presented their youth posters in Lesson 10. These extracts constitute an extended conversation in which issues of crime, place, fear and safety, privilege and representivity – raised by the students themselves – are intertwined and continually revisited. I discuss each extract individually, in chronological order.

6.3.3 Extract 1

As with the first extract from Site 1, this extract too is from the first lesson and is part of the discussion generated when the teacher asks: *'How would you describe being South African? Or being a South African teenager?'* After hearing from a number of students, some of whom touch on the notion of the rainbow nation and others who discuss the different feelings associated with being South African abroad versus being South African at home, the teacher turns to Nina and asks for her input. Nina identifies fear of crime as a defining feature of being a South African teenager. In the discussion that ensues students take up different positions towards crime and the various ways in which it impacts on their lives.

The teacher's role in this discussion consists of drawing out student response. The ratio of teacher talk to student talk is therefore particularly low with only 13% of the total words spoken attributable to the teacher. In addition, 5 of the 10 participating students each have a higher individual word count (>112) than the teacher, indicating that each one holds the floor for longer than the teacher and suggesting a high degree of student control over the classroom discourse. A tabular summary of the forms the participation and turn-taking is provided in **Appendix F3**.

Extract 1:

1 T: *Okay, then Nina, I haven't had you.*

2 Nina: *I can say that I'm quite honoured to be a South African... but the only thing is being a teenager in South Africa, I would say, I'm petrified – of being a teenager in South Africa.*

3 SS: *Ja... ja...*

4 T: *Why?*

5 Nina: *Just because there's so many things to get you down, you know, and like – yes, to be a teenager in South Africa there's no positiveness to it. like I can't really think of any ups to being – ja, any positive things to being a teenager growing up in South Africa...*

6 T: *Compared to anywhere else?*

7 Nina: *...compared to anywhere else* [background chatter] *– I can only think of bad things.*

8 T: *Girls, you must listen, because I want some of you to respond. Nina says she doesn't see anything positive about being a teenager in South Africa.*

9 Nina: *I mean, adding to your culture and who you are, yes, that's good but I'm just like I don't think it's a very wholesome environment.*

10 T: *Okay. And then Bontle.* [Bontle looks puzzled.] *South African identity?*

11 Bontle: *No, I don't have anything to say about it.*

12 T: *Still confused?* [laughter] *Lesego.*

13 Lesego: *I also don't have anything.*

14 T: *Ok, Jody?*

15 Jody: *I find that it's so nice being South African because we're almost unique in the way that we can still speak so well about our country when we're in a differentenvironment and be so proud but there's so much corruption and stuff goingon but we're still so proud – which I think is really really unique.*

16 T: *And then Kelsey?*

17 Kelsey: [looking puzzled for some reason, although her hand is raised – lots of laughter] *Ok, I'm getting there. Oh yes. I kind of – in a way I kind of disagree with Nina. Like I understand we're growing up and life might not be like it is in America where you can just walk around and not feel like you're going to get raped or something like that but like in a way it educates you to the pointwhere like you know – you're more streetwise than you would be. Like you know to go overseas you know not to leave your cellphone lying there because it's going to get stolen.*

18 Susan: *[If you're streetwise you don't have to know?]*

19 S: *No but – can I – [Alice?]*

20 Sonia: *No, but Ms Y!*

21 Kelsey: *No, I disagree with that.* [to Susan]

22 T: *Because you can get your cellphone stolen overseas. Mrs ? had her whole bag taken from her.*

23 Kelsey: *Ja, but like the people in America, like when I went there they're like – like when I went there I used to leave my cellphone in my bag around the school and like stress about it, like 'Guys I have to go fetch my cellphone' – and they'd be like 'No, just leave it, it's fine, it'll be there when you get back'. Then you come back here and we're so used to living in this kind of environment that it makes you so much more aware of what's going on, because you're not ignorant to what's actually happening in the world and that there is poverty and that there is stealing and that there is – it's not like all butterflies and roses like they show in America, ja.*

24 T: *Okay, and I want to hear from Nguvi ..?... because she's in South Africa but also a Zimbabwean ...*

25 S: [laughing] *Look at that big smile on your face!* [to Nguvi]

26 Nguvi: *I was actually going to – like going back, it sort of links up with Nina's point of view. I don't think it's a very positive thing because I do go to Zim every now and again and although the economy is a different issue – it's so different being a teenager there and here because there there's so much more freedom. It's so safe there, like you could say to your parents – like when I'm there, I could say to my parents no, I'm going to friends, or I'm going wherever, they don't worry, they don't even – I mean they'll check up on me maybe the next day –*

27 T: *Really?* [disbelieving tone]

28 Nguvi *Ok, not really* [laughter] *but here I can't even – you know, like the yard, that's – you know. And it's different.*

29 T: *I'm sorry to keep you with your hands up so let's go with Alice, Sonia and then Michelle, okay.*

30 Alice: *Um, you know, I think it's quite strange how we look – we think that we so accustomed to the dangers of being a teenager in South Africa or whatever and then we like go overseas and it's good and everything. I mean like we – the girls in this class, we're like the top 2% of South Africans, we're like the highest class, you know. And then we say ja, no it's really terrible you know we can't walk in the streets but I mean imagine living in Diepsloot, you know –*

31 T: *Interesting.*

32 Alice: - I mean we can't even touch on how dangerous it is in South Africa. So when we go overseas and we say we're proud South Africans, we shouldn't be proud because we're not truly – we don't face what the other 98% of South Africans face every day, you know.
33 T: Ok.
34 Alice: We're not a real representation of South Africa.
(from Site 2, Lesson 1, 15/09/08)

The fact that the first crime-related discussion occurs in the first lesson, as a topic initiated by a student, and stands out as the single most salient chain of communication over the course of the teaching intervention attests to the dominance of this issue in the students' imaginaries. Although Nina's turn (T2) is not self-initiated, she takes up the teacher's offer of the floor with no hesitation. Her first utterance creates a stark and disorientating juxtaposition between pride and fear – she is simultaneously *'honoured'* to be a South African and *'petrified'* (of being a *teenager* in SA). The spontaneous chorus of 'ja's that follow this assertion is a form of social evaluation (Candela, 1999), group comments (such as gibes, laughter, chorused assent or dissent, murmuring) that in this case indicates that they too identify with her fear of crime. The teacher overlooks this collective response and maintains her focus on Nina, directing two consecutive questions at her (T4, T6). However, these questions, in addition to providing Nina with the opportunity to explain her stance, also have the effect of making her need to defend her position. While the teacher's question (T4) is a perfectly valid follow-up question designed to probe student thinking, the fact remains that she does not at any point during any lesson ask a student to explain why she feels positively towards South Africa or in relation to her identity as a South African. Thus the positive is automatically rendered the preferred discourse and Nina is subtly positioned as the producer of an alternative, slightly unwelcome discourse. After her initial dramatic utterance, Nina seems to take refuge in euphemistic language. Although it is clear that she is talking about crime and personal safety, she does not once refer to directly to crime, referring instead to there being *'so many things to get you down', 'no positiveness'* (T5), *'bad things'* (T7), and finally, describing South Africa as not being *'a very wholesome environment'* (T9). These comments are vague and are not linked to anything that accounts for the feeling of being *'petrified'.*

In response to some background chatter, the teacher calls on students to *'listen because I want some of you to respond'* (T8). The expectation that students should listen to their peers in order to respond to their comments is a key characteristic of the interactional order of this classroom. At this point, however, the teacher's comment

has the dual function of orientating the students towards the speaker and of suggesting that Nina's position be challenged. Immediately after this Nina adds that one's culture and identity are positive things which, at this point, has overtones of back-peddling. On one hand it speaks to the pride she alludes to in her opening utterance; on the other, it could be an attempt to try to re-position herself in the teacher's eyes.

At this point, the teacher turns to the only two black South African students in the classroom and, one after the other, invites their comment although neither of them is bidding to speak. This has the appearance of being an attempt to elicit a counter-discourse based on the racialised assumption that these students will have positive things to contribute about South Africa. If they were to do so, this would re-establish the preferred discourse that has been disrupted by Nina's comments. However, both students decline the opportunity to comment.

Jody has her hand up and is given the floor next by the teacher. The somewhat twisted logic of her utterance (T15) seems to support the idea that a discourse of positivity prevails. While she concedes that the negative exists *('so much corruption and stuff'*), this is backgrounded. Instead the ability to feel pride and *'speak so well about our country when we're in a different environment'* – especially in the face of the negativity – is foregrounded. And this *'uniqueness'* – in being able to hold these two conflicting ideas together, or reconcile corruption and pride – is held up as a positive aspect of being South African. The basis for this national pride is not made clear. Students often make bold, unelaborated statements about national pride which are left unsubstantiated and moreover seem to run counter to the negative issues that are focused on and discussed at length. This foreshadows some of the poster presentations in this site where there was evidence of a positive spin that students sometimes used to represent themselves or their lives – with Jody and Susan's poster being a case in point (S2P2), as I will show in Extract 3. This is another glimpse of how hard these young people work cognitively to sustain their determined positivity. It seems to be something they constantly need to reinforce, strengthen and justify.

A 'streetwise' theme, which emerges at this point and continues beyond this lesson, is a prime example of the way in which the negative is minimised through positive spin. Kelsey bids to speak and tackles Nina's euphemistic comments about crime head on, mentioning both rape and theft (T17). Kelsey concedes that the South African environment is dangerous, constructing a binary between the dangerous South

African environment and a safe American or 'overseas' environment where, to her mind, the fear of rape is not pervasive. But then, in a neat discursive manoeuvre, she constructs a benefit to living in a crime-ridden society, claiming that it educates you and makes you 'streetwise'. She draws on her own experience of being in America, explaining how blasé it was possible to be about the safety of one's personal possessions, contrasting this with South Africa that *'educates you to the point where you know you're more streetwise'* (T17). This triggers a flurry of spontaneous, overlapping and inaudible comments from students as well as a comment from the teacher, challenging the suggestion that there is no theft overseas (T22). But Kelsey sticks to her position, elaborating on her experience in America and then beginning to conflate awareness of personal security with awareness of social issues. Americans, because they are perceived to live in a crime-free society, are constructed as living in a *'butterflies and roses'* state (T23) and, by implication, as being *'ignorant to what's actually happening in the world'*. The logic is flawed but the suggestion is that poverty produces stealing so that being victims of theft (or constantly feeling like you could become one at any time) makes you aware of poverty and its consequences thereby forcing you to confront the realities of the world you live in and be more socially aware.

The streetwise discourse produces a strong sense of not wanting to gloss over the negative – being aware of it, being able to face up to issues of crime, poverty and other 'developing world' problems. But, despite this, there is also the feeling that while the negative must be faced up to, it also needs to be re-framed positively – so that crime becomes educational, and living in a developing country helps you not to take what you have for granted.

In turn 24, the teacher offers Nguvi the floor, constructing her as speaking from both a South African and a Zimbabwean perspective. Nguvi, who is originally from Zimbabwe and foregrounded this aspect of her identity in the earlier part of the lesson, draws on her knowledge of Zimbabwe to challenge the link that Kelsey draws between poverty and crime. She maintains that teenagers have much greater freedom in Zimbabwe because, despite the poverty, there is no reason for parents to worry about their personal safety. She begins to get carried away with a somewhat utopian idea of complete parental leniency – *'they don't worry, they don't even – I mean they'll check up on me maybe the next day –*' (T26) but when the teacher challenges this through her disbelieving tone *('Really?*', T27), Nguvi laughingly backs down but remains adamant that in Zimbabwe she has far greater freedom of

movement than in South Africa. She returns to this point in a later lesson, captured in Extract 2.

At this point there are a number of students with hands raised, bidding to speak, and the teacher allocates a speaking order to these students (T29).

As I have argued in Chapter 5, discourses of privilege are pervasive in the posters and poster talk of this site. This discussion, taking place in the first lesson of the teaching intervention, introduces these discourses and foreshadows some of the forms they take. Alice, in turns 30 and 32, challenges her peers' fears of crime, as well as their sense of being 'streetwise', by pointing out the obvious protection that their elevated socioeconomic status affords them as a privileged minority *('the top 2% of South Africans'*, T30). In doing so, she also draws attention to the more real dangers experienced by those on the opposite end of the socioeconomic spectrum by asking them to *'imagine living in Diepsloot'* (T30). Diepsloot is a sprawling township on the northern edges of Johannesburg. It is a densely populated area comprising a mix of shacks and low-cost housing, lacking in basic services and infrastructure and associated with high levels of unemployment, crime, and drug and alcohol abuse. It is not far from the affluent areas where many of these students live. While *'the girls in this class' – 'the top 2% of South Africans'* – are understood to be wealthy and largely white, the residents of Diepsloot are understood to be poor and black. While Alice constructs Diepsloot residents as the racial and economic Other, she also calls for empathy for them and their heightened vulnerability to crime, working against a pervasive public discourse that constructs (wealthy) white people as the victims a black crime[12]. Although race has not been mentioned in this conversation, place – in the form of lingering apartheid geographies (Shephard and Murray, 2007) – becomes a proxy for race. So patriotic evocations of an overarching national identity become unsustainable and place is no longer 'South Africa' but gets broken up in raced and classed ways into the affluent suburbs in which these students live versus 'Diepsloot'. These differently raced and classed places are presented as providing different levels of safety.

But there is an additional angle to Alice's challenge, one that she seems to struggle slightly with, judging by the fact that she does not finish her sentence, saying '*we shouldn't be proud because we're not truly – '* (T32). In the context of this

[12] This discourse reached its apotheosis when South African Brandon Huntley was granted refugee status in Canada in 2009 on the grounds that he was the victim of crime in South Africa because he was white. This refugee status was later revoked.

conversation and given her comment in turn 34, she seems to be suggesting that she and her classmates might *'not truly'* be South African by virtue of the fact that the lifestyle of a privileged minority may make them un-representative of the nation. To her mind, the privileged lives she and her classmates are living are so distanced from the realities of the lives of most South Africans that she calls into question their ability to speak as 'ordinary South Africans'. The question she seems to be grappling with is, if we're this privileged in this national context, how South African are we really? This becomes part of the recurring theme of privilege which continues to be explored.

6.3.4 Extract 2

Extract 2 is taken from the lesson in which students respond to the question about whether or not the TRC is relevant to the present. The analysis of these answers formed the bulk of Chapter 4. The discussion that is captured here forms part of the spill-over discussion. The extract begins when the teacher turns to Lily, an 'Asian' student, and asks her opinion. The ensuing discussion moves away from the TRC, re-engages the issues of crime, place and privilege.

The turn-taking and turn functions during the talk that is captured in Extract 2 are not significantly different from those of Extract 1 and are captured in tabular form in **Appendix F4**. This is a particularly long extract comprising of 98 turns. For ease of analysis, the full extract is split into two sections with Extract 2a and Extract 2b.

Extract 2a:

1 T: *Ok. And Lily?*
2 Lily: *I don't find the TRC that relevant.*
3 T: *Okay. And is that because – what are your plans after matric? Are you going to go back to... uh*...[laughter] *... university in the East, or are you going to become a confirmed South African citizen?*
4 Lily: *I don't know... I'm still deciding... Like I might go overseas.*
5 T: *So what are your views now, while you're living here? Was it a nice theoretical investigation but quite meaningless or...* [laughter] *I guess I deserved that, thank you. How do you feel?*
6 S: *Awkward!* [laughter]
7 Lily: *What do you mean? Like from the country as like now?*
8 T: *Yes, just listening to everybody and doing some research on your own, how do you feel about this whole situation, and being a teenager now, in this place, for the next two years?*
9 Lily: *In this place? It's actually really dangerous.*
10 T: *Really?*
11 Lily: *I still find it dangerous.*
12 S: *She's just scared.*
13 T: *Are you afraid?*

14 Lily: *Ja, I guess, in a way.*
15 T: *Why?*
16 Lily: *Just with all the crime and everything going on...you know.*
17 T: *And is that because you know differently and the memories are still with you? You know a different lifestyle?*
18 Lily: *Just like when I go overseas and stuff, because we go overseas quite a bit. When we go overseas we just walk around.*
19 Kate: *But wouldn't you prefer to be streetwise than be completely ignorant?*
20 SS: *I agree...*
21 Alice: *But guys, ignorance [?]*
22 Kate: *I mean I know it's nice to feel safe but [T: Ssshh* to chattering*] ...?... to feel streetwise. Like in London I would much rather prefer to be streetwise than to be completely ignorant and do the everything's fine kind of thing, and I mean there are people who hijack. And I mean at least when you're streetwise you have the ability to like prepare yourself for it. If you grow up in a safe society, you come to like for example like South Africa or another like crime-ridden place, I mean and you get completely caught off guard. I mean that could sometimes even cost you your life.*
23 Kelsey: *But you're not necessarily streetwise just because of the place that you live in. I mean I live in like – I mean most of us live in South Africa and most of the girls that come to [school name] come from very good families and they kind of live in their own bubble. I mean, um –*
24 Multiple spontaneous comments [unclear], challenging Kelsey.
25 Kate: *But Kelsey, don't you think – don't you think –*
26 Kelsey: *You live in a protected area –*
27 T: *But you're always aware, aren't you?*
28 Kelsey: *...you're not exposed to half of the bad things that are...* [Ongoing buzz of responses.]*Not to the same extent...*
29 Sonia: *Ja,* [speaking loudly over the buzz] *we don't have any reason to be as scared as a person living in Soweto and like...*
30 S: *But you're not living in Soweto.*
31 Kate: *I just prefer to be aware, like streetwise, than live in a kind of like safe community and be completely ignorant.*
32 T: *Girls, I have to introduce something new and I know this debate is hotting up so I'm going to take a few more points here* [hands shoot up – laughter]. *Thistime I'm giving you numbers 'cos it's quicker – ok, one, two, three, four, let's go*. [pointing to Sonia, Michelle, Kelsey, Bontle]
33 Sonia: *Ok, like you said, a lot of people like knowing themselves better now or in the past but I think that's like because in the past they were more aware of what they weren't – like in South Africa you were aware that you weren't white, or you weren't black – I don't know, like you were aware of what you weren't rather than what you were. And I think that like now we can't like say that it's because of South Africa that we're like this, it's because of the whole world. Like we've like globalised and we always – because of technology and like –*
34 T: *Yes.*
35 Sonia: *... and not even like* [multiple voices] *– not that we aren't – that we've maybe like lost our culture or –*
36 T: *A little bit American, ... a little bit German, ...*
37 Sonia: *Ja –*
38 SS: *Yes...*
39 Sonia: *It's not because of any – it's not because of anything to do with – well, I don't think it's anything to do with like anything from our past, it's just*

about the way the world's developed and I don't think that's – I don't know [if it's quite bad of me to say?] – that's it's because of apartheid, it's –

40 T: *Number 2 on my list!*

41 Michelle:: *Um, in response to Kate, I don't think that we've become – I don't think that as South Africans, especially our little micro-community – I don't think that we're all streetwise, I think we're just paranoid. And I think that makes a difference, like..* [laughter]

42 S: *I agree, I agree with Michelle.*

43 T: *?*

44 Michelle: *I think the only way to get streetwise, like 'streetwise', is like if you really live in Hillbrow...*

45 SS: *Ja...* [buzz]

46 Alice: *[The problem about living in Hillbrow is?] you get dead, you don't get streetwise!* [laughter] *...?... in Soweto, you get streetwise.* [laughter, buzz]

from Site 2, Lesson 8, 30/09/08

The extract opens with Lily responding to the teacher's questions and her description of South Africa as a *'really dangerous'* place (T9) has the effect of re-introducing issues in Extract 1, generating a slightly different iteration of the same discussion which goes further than the previous one and where students take up new or different positions.

Lily's statement about finding South Africa a dangerous place is once again linked to the binary of dangerous South Africa / safe 'overseas' and the ability to *'just walk around'* (T18) overseas. Although this opinion has been expressed by others before her, Lily's statement is not supported by anyone and instead a strong othering discourse comes into play. The teacher nominated Lily to speak and Lily does not hesitate to answer the question, stating her feelings quite clearly: she does not find the TRC '*that relevant'* (T2). In her follow-up question, the teacher checks out the hypothesis that it is because Lily feels connected to *'the East'* and is thus not fully South African that she feels this way – i.e. she has yet 'to become a confirmed South African citizen' (T3). The structure of the teacher's utterance reveals that she constructs this student as an outsider but she is unsure about where the student is from. When she asks *'Are you going to go back to... uh... university in the East'* (T3), it is clear – as the laughter from the class indicates – that she does not know Lily's country of origin, she simply knows that she is 'Asian'. She thus constructs Lily as a 'temporary' South African, asking her about her views *'while you're living here'* (T5) and alluding to a childhood in a foreign country by asking if *'the memories are still with you?'* (T17). In fact, Lily is born in South Africa (as she indicated in her demographic questionnaire) and speaks both English and Mandarin at home and she

seems to answer the teacher's questions in much the same way as would any of the other students who have family ties overseas and frequently travel abroad.[13]

The students too participate in othering Lily. When Lily remarks that she finds South Africa dangerous (T9, 11), a student calls out *'She's just scared'* (T12). This seems an odd thing to be accusing Lily of, given the similarity between this view and the one expressed by Nina in Extract 1 (T2) – a view that was then spontaneously supported by several voices. More significant, however, is the use of the third person pronoun which turns what could have just been a playful jibe ('*You're just scared*') into an strongly othering statement, constructing Lily as the outsider ('*she*') and the class collectively as insiders (the implied 'us'). This has the effect of rendering her an object of interest or amusement rather than a participant with whom one is interacting. These racialised discourses seem to be the unintended consequence of the teacher's attempt to make space for difference by involving Lily in the conversation in the first place, and point to the difficulties in doing so without othering or exoticising difference.

Lily's final comment, about being able to *'just walk around'* (T18) overseas, triggers the 'streetwise' theme which resurfaces here in direct opposition to her fear of crime. At this point the discussion takes a natural flow with students responding spontaneously to their peers' comments and inserting themselves into the conversation in such a way that only occasionally is there a need for the teacher to direct the verbal traffic. Kate responds to Lily's final comment by addressing her directly (T19), asking if she wouldn't rather be streetwise than ignorant thereby re-invoking the streetwise/ignorance binary. The argument is similar but the circular logic is more evident, going something like this: you live in an unsafe place → unsafe places make you streetwise → it's better to be streetwise for your own safety → being streetwise is beneficial when you go to an unsafe place. Once again, being streetwise is constructed as desirable, putting a positive spin on living in a high-crime society.

And then, as with the previous conversation, the streetwise discourse is challenged using the counter-discourse of privilege but positions shift and it is Kelsey, the student who introduces the streetwise discourse in Extract 1, who comes forward to challenge

[13] When I conducted the member check with Lali, the teacher, she expressed concern about how she had come across during this incident. While she did not object to the interpretation itself, she wanted to point out that Lily belonged to a group of students from Korea, Japan and China to whom she taught additional English Enrichment classes. Most of these students came from their home countries to this school specifically to develop their English skills in order to gain access to top universities either in the United States or in their home countries.

it. She does so in ways that echo Alice's position in Extract 1, suggesting that she has assimilated her utterances from the previous lesson and incorporated them into a more nuanced understanding of how one comes to be 'streetwise'. In turns 23, 26 and 28, she suggests that becoming streetwise does not come about because of the place you live in but as a result of the lifestyle you lead. The *'very good families'* that are able to *'live in their own bubble'* (T23) is a clear reference to class, and the ability of affluent classes to create a protected and insular world around themselves. This is reinforced by the fragmented utterances she makes subsequently, referring to living 'in a protected area' (T26) the and therefore *'not exposed to half the bad things'* (T28) – a reference to the racialised comfort zones constituted by gated communities (Ballard 2004, 2005). South Africa is therefore no longer one undifferentiated crime-ridden place – it depends on *where* in South Africa you live, and *how* you live, and thus, by implication, who you are. Her peers, however, resist this ideologically-charged critique of their lifestyle and multiple, overlapping voices are raised in dissent. Sonia, however, who raises her voice and makes herself heard above the ongoing buzz of voices (T29), supports Kelsey's stance by revoicing the idea of the township as a dangerous place. And Kate reiterates her initial position, demonstrating that what contrives to make one streetwise is now becoming more narrowly defined.

At this point the teacher tries to draw the discussion to a close, asking for final points (T32). Four hands fly up and the teacher assigns a sequence to the speakers. Driven by these four students this discussion takes up most of the rest of the lesson.

Sonia, the first of the four students to speak, introduces the notion of living in a globalised world (T33), suggesting that current day South Africa is less influenced by its past than it is by the globalised present. Over her four consecutive speaking turns (T33, T35, T37, T39), Sonia – a confident and normally articulate speaker – hesitates over her sentences and seems to be policing herself and leaving much unsaid. In her final speaking turn, she finally seems to make the point she has been working up to: that apartheid is not responsible for where we are at the moment. She seems to be working at disconnecting from the local past *('I don't think it's anything to do with like anything from our past'*) and instead connecting to a globalised present, privileging the global over the local (Steyn, 2005) in a way that takes for granted the elite position from which she is speaking by constructing herself as a transnational global citizen.

The final points of this extract come from Michelle and Alice who work together to disrupt the smugness of privilege. The attempts of the privileged minority to consider

themselves streetwise are redefined by Michelle as paranoia, and she includes herself and her peers in this: 'we're just paranoid' (T41). The distinction between safe and dangerous places has shifted is now taking shape as a hierarchy of dangerous places within South Africa, starting with the relative safety of the 'micro-communities' in protected affluent suburbs where these students live (T26, T41) to Diepsloot (Extract 1) and Soweto (T29, T46) and, ultimately, Hillbrow (T44, 46). Thus far the talk in this lesson is a revisiting, in a more nuanced way, of some of the discourses and positions on crime that emerged in Extract 1, with new students joining the conversation and taking up discourses that surfaced in the earlier iteration of the discussion and some students, such as Kelsey, repositioning themselves. As the conversation continues, in Extract 2b, the shifting and repositioning continues as new students enter the discussion and introduce new discourses.

Extract 2b:

47 T: *Right, okay, we're gonna leave that. Number 3!*
48 S: *Bontle was number 3.*
49 T: *Yes.*
50 Bontle: *I just wanted to say that what – Kathy? Kate?*
51 S: *Kate.*
52 Bontle: *Kate, sorry – what Kate said [laughs embarrassedly] what Kate said about people in Soweto being more in danger or whatever. I feel like – I only started living in the suburbs like last year, okay, so my whole life I grew up in Tembisa. So all I'm saying is that I felt more at home in –*
53 SS: *Where?*
54 Bontle: *In Tembisa.*
55 S: *Where's that?*
56 Lesego: *It's in Soweto.*
57 Bontle: *No!* [laughter]
58 Lesego: [laughing] *it's on the other side...*
59 T: [laughing] *Don't go saying that you know places that you don't know!* [laughter, buzz] *Could we do a quick location first, Tembisa...?*
60 Bontle: *Ok, uh, this is Midrand, that's Tembisa* [gesticulating to the far right of Midrand].
61 T: *So it's towards Pretoria. Oh my god, Lesego – geography!* [laughter] *Get it going.*
62 Sonia: *Was is it like, there?*
63 Bontle: *Oh, I feel that it's so much more homely than, um than Sandton [with dismissive hand gesture]. Because I think that the only reason you guys might feel that you are in danger is because you don't know these people. Um, it's how the people in Salem were to like the natives, like –*
64 Lesego: *Salem?*
65 Bontle: *Ja, that whole witch hunt that happened. Ja, I think that's just fear of the unknown, that makes you think that you are in danger. Like all those people in the township, like I might not know them but when I like walk there I'm like 'hi', you know. It's like they're family, that's how it is. Like I feel more like...um... uh...*

66 T: *At home?*
67 Bontle: *No, no, no – not at home overseas or – that I feel like...*
68 T: *But greeting them, would you also walk on the streets of Tembisa after 7?*
69 Bontle: *Ja. My mom used to send me like at 9 to like go to the tuckshop – well, not a tuckshop but...*
70 T: *But that's next door, isn't it?*
71 Bontle: *It's not next door, it's up the road and over the next road – but it's like so safe. But obviously you can't be walking around at 1 and expect to be fine.*
72 T: *Ja, ja. Because that would be way past your bedtime.* [laughter]
73 Nguvi: *Ms Y.*
74 T: *Yes.*
75 Nguvi: *I totally agree with Bontle because it's like when I lived in Zim, like – okay, I always grew up – like we lived in a more uptown part of town, but I did have family that lived more in the location parts – and even when I went to visitthere and stay over, it was so homely like – you know how everyone's like 'oh my god, you went to that place is-!' – you know how everyone's like 'oh no, Soweto, you've got to be streetwise' – there it actually wasn't. It was exactly the way Bontle described it, where it's actually so homely. But obviously you can't expect to walk around at [T: Ja].., you know, and come back alive, that kind of thing. [T: Ja]*
76 Multiple simultaneous voices.
77 T: *I do however believe that Michelle said Hillbrow, which is very different from either Tembisa, Soweto or Bryanston.]*
78 T: *Lesego – oh it's so rare that Lesego puts up her hand to make a comment without me forcing it out of her.* [laughter]

Lesego has put her head down on her desk in response to this.

79 Lesego: *I'm shy [much laughter]*
80 T: *I'm sorry [laughing]*
81 S: *Is the camera still on?*
82 Lesego: *I'm just... ?... what Bontle said about ..?... Okay, fine, I moved to Randburg when I was 5. And I actually realised something. My parents are really strict, I'm the only right so they're very protective over me. And I've realised that since I've been living in them suburbs they want to know every single move I make* [murmurs of agreement] – *where am I going? What am I doing? Who am I with? And if I – if I – if I lived in Soweto all of this time, from when I was [?] till now, I would just like walk out the house and it would be like okay, cool, I'll see you later. Because I actually went to Anele's house and um she's just living the life!* [laughter]
83 Sonia: *Doesn't she [?]*
84 Lesego: *She just leaves the house and I remember she was like to her parents 'no ok sharp we'll see you at 8' and it was like cool, and we left at like 10 in the morning and we actually came back at half past nine and they were like 'oh, how was your day?' This is like half past nine at night. And she was like 'no it's okay, it's all good' and stuff like that. And she's like 'mom I'm coming back I'm just going to the garage' – and the garage is like down [wild gesture to indicate far distance, laughter] and it was like half past nine at night –*
85 T: *And your mouth was hanging open!*
86 Lesego: *And it was like 'are you serious? Does your mom-?' She's out the door...*

87 Alice: *I want to go to Anele's house, guys!* [laughter]
88 T: *Lesego, with your parents, isn't it your parents, even in Soweto would be saying 'okay, what time are you leaving...? / What time are you getting home?/*
89 Lesego: [shaking her head] */No... no... no.../*
90 T: *They're worried about the area?*
91 Lesego: *Ja. They just really – right now, if I was in Soweto, it would be so much different. The lifestyle's like – okay, with my friends, Soweto lifestyle, Sandton lifestyle [indicating difference by placing hands far from each other] two totally different things. Totally different.*
92 Michelle:: *It's like even with my parents, like they won't let me walk around Sandton on my own, like my mom gets a bit nervous, like she'll let me but she'll be a bit iffy about it. But like if you go to town, for like jobs with my dad, she'll let me walk around on my own [S: Yes.] ..[too fast, unclear...]*
93 T: *Which part of town?*
94 Michelle:: *Like around Ella Fitzgerald Square* [sic] *where all the museums and stuff and all the way past Sci-bono on the other side, and like they're fine with it.*
95 Multiple voices and conversations
96 T: *..?.. new Market...*
97 Sonia: *Yes, that's so nice, Newtown.*
98 Nguvi: *I agree with [?]. When I'm in Zim my parents are like – we leave and we just come back. Like they don't ask you. They'll just be like, 'oh okay do you need anything? – like, they don't bother you. But when I'm here it's like oh my gosh you can't go outside your gate, type of thing.*

from Site 2, Lesson 8, 30/09/08

Bontle, one of the four students who raised her hand to speak earlier (T32), now introduces a counter-discourse that seeks to overturn the prevailing discourse of townships as crime-ridden, dangerous places. From turns 52 to 65 she challenges her peers' perceptions of townships, speaking from her position as someone who has experience of both Tembisa, the township where she has lived most of her life, and the suburbs, where she has lived since last year. As a black student at an elite private school who has recently moved to the affluent northern suburbs of Johannesburg, she embodies the trajectory of social mobility playing itself out among the emerging black middle class (Soudien 2007b). By presenting the township as convivial and *'homely'* (T63) in contrast to Sandton, which she dismisses with the wave of a hand (T65), she disrupts the safe suburbs/crime-ridden township binary that had been set up.

Referring to Arthur Miller's *The Crucible*, a recent setwork, Bontle deconstructs her peers construction of townships as dangerous places. She explains that they associate the townships with fear and danger because they fear the unknown, in the same way that the unknown is feared in *The Crucible*. The suggestion is that to her

(white) peers, the townships are ‘other’ places with ‘other’ people, unknown and dangerous. But by providing an counter-discourse, one in which the township is celebrated, she reverses this othering, constructing her peers as outsiders, as not belonging, as being incapable –because of the othering of their gaze – of recognising the sense of community that she and other township residents experience. This disrupts the fixed relationship that her peers have been constructing between place and fear, claiming that certain places were inherently deserving of fear, on a sliding scale of sorts. By taking this discursive position, Bontle is suggesting that fear is not something that emanates from place and its fixed characteristics but that it is a product of the relationship between identity and place. It is not about where you are – but about who you are in relation to where you are. Spatial anchorings, or one’s sense of belonging to a place, organises references to other places and is constitutive of the ‘moral economy by which judgements of people and activities are made’ (Blommaert, 2005, p. 222). Such spatial anchorings in South Africa, in the aftermath of apartheid, are related to class divisions and continue to be deeply overlain with race. Thus the discourse introduced by Bontle makes clear that her peers’ gaze as outsiders is both classed and raced.

But Bontle’s insertion of herself into the conversation at this point and her reference to *The Crucible* are significant in additional ways. It says something about the concepts of self at play and what kind of work students have to do to get their voices heard so that what bears analysis is not only what they say but when and how they say it. Thus far the conversation has been dominated by the talk of the white students. Both Bontle and Lesego were invited by the teacher to take the floor in the earlier iteration of this conversation (Extract 1, T 10-13) but both declined. Nguvi has participated (Extract 1, T26, 28) but her contribution, suggesting that the link between poverty and crime was not inevitable, was not taken up by others. The timing of Bontle’s challenge, coming as it does after an accumulation of township-as-dangerous-place comments from her peers, suggests that she was no longer able to remain silent in the face of the racialised stereotypes being invoked (Proweller 1999). But it is particularly interesting that she recruits high cultural capital, in the form of the literary classic *The Crucible*, to assist her in her challenge. By doing so she is employing the middle class ways of arguing that have shaped her subjectivity in this pedagogic context, drawing metaphorically on the experiences depicted in a literary text to legitimise her own line of reasoning. This functions as a hybrid moment where this text, which is shared classroom knowledge, is used to introduce new knowledge, namely knowledge of the townships and township life to which Bontle has access.

The racialised asymmetries of classroom knowledge (McKinney, 2011) are particularly evident when it becomes clear that almost no one knows where Tembisa, a large township to the northeast of Johannesburg, is located (T54-61). None of the suburbs that have been mentioned during this lesson have required any input regarding their location precisely because suburban life in Johannesburg is the taken-for-granted experience which is assumed to underpin these students' subjectivities. Lesego works hard to construct herself as someone 'in the know' but, in fact, she too does not know where Tembisa is after all (T56-57).

After Bontle introduces the counter-discourse of the township, one by one the other two black girls in the classroom insert themselves into the conversation and take up positions of solidarity with Bontle. For Nguvi, this consists of revoicing her earlier comments on Zimbabwe, now shaping them to foreground the way in which class divisions within Zimbabwe are also tied to place, to perceptions of place and their levels of safety (T75). Nguvi offers the differences between *'a more uptown part of town'* and *'the location parts'* in Zimbabwe as a parallel to the differences between suburb and township in South Africa, suggesting that in Zimbabwe people who do not live in the 'locations' express the same sort of ignorant fear, which she parodies through her statement of *'oh my god you went to that place!'* (T75).

For Lesego, her attempts to construct for herself a subject position which is at once both tied to the township and in solidarity with Bontle (next to whom she sits) seem particularly marked. Lesego's participation is not only self-initiated – and untypically so, as her teacher and peers' responses make clear (T78) – but taken together (T79, 82, 84, 86, 89, 91) her turns make her the student who holds the floor for the longest time in any of the three extracts from this site. Judging from the nature of her contribution to the conversation, it seems likely that this unprecedented level of engagement from this student is a response both to the topic under discussion and to the ways in which her black peers have opened up space in the classroom discourse for her to step into, although clearly these two features – topic and classroom discourse – are inextricably intertwined.

Lesego's contribution surfaces a discourse that has been embedded in the fear of crime discourse – that of parental control. She ties this discourse to place arguing that in the suburbs parents are excessively strict because of fear of crime and in the townships parents are pleasantly lenient because it is a safe environment. But Lesego indicates that she's been living in the suburbs since she was five and her description of how much freedom she would have if she still lived in the township is

littered with ‘ifs’ and modalised verbs (e.g. *‘if I lived in Soweto... I would... it would...’*, T82) and her story begins to come across more as a fantasy than a credible argument. To lend support to her position, she draws on her friend Anele’s experience of living in the township, describing her as someone who is *‘just living the life!’* (T82) because of her lenient parents.

The teacher’s response to Lesego’s narrative of parental leniency in the township (T88) suggests that she is aware of, and gently challenges, the romanticised view of township life that Lesego is in the process of constructing. But Lesego remains adamant (T89, 91). It seems clear that together the three black girls are intent on showcasing township life for their white peers and perpetuating a township/suburb – or Soweto/Sandton – binary which overturns the usual dynamic between the desirable suburb and the undesirable township. In this pedagogic space, who has and does not have knowledge of the townships is racialised. The white students do not have their own direct knowledge of the townships to draw on and therefore operate on heresay, assumptions, stereotypes and rumours. In relation to this topic, the students ‘in the know’ are the black students who, while they are each differently positioned in relation to the townships and their connections to them, all have cross-over knowledge of the suburbs and the townships. Although none of these girls is currently living in a township, they either have memories of living in the township or are connected to the township through family and friends. From this position, they step in to ‘correct’ their peers’ perceptions and then seem to over-romanticise the townships, particularly as a zone of parental leniency and teen freedom.

The fact that this is indeed a partial and romanticised notion of the township is not in question. Much has been written about townships as complex, varied and shifting spaces in the post-apartheid geography of South Africa (Dlamini, 2009; Mbembe et al, 2008; Murray, 2004) and none of the students engage with this complexity. Despite this, however, in the context of this classroom talk, the emergence of this particular township discourse has some interesting effects. Firstly, simply by virtue of the fact that two contrasting discourses on townships co-exist in this pedagogic space, townships can no longer be viewed as one-dimensional – as would be the case if either of these discourses existed unchallenged. Secondly, because knowledge of the townships is racialised, the white students – without any direct knowledge of their own – are unable to question the authority of the black students. Moreover, in addition to being constructed as convivial and homely, townships are rendered even more attractive by their associations with parental leniency and teen

freedom. The fact that the white students are not impervious to the seductiveness of the alternative discourse of the townships is evident when Alice, who was the first student to introduce the discourse of the dangerous township (Extract 1, T30), enthusiastically expresses a desire to visit the township (Extract 2b, T87). Shifting power relations between the students and their different knowledges are thus suggested by the ways in which they are repositioning themselves and one another. Michelle (T92, 94) attempts to construct similarity with Lesego, maintaining that her mother is more comfortable letting her walk around Newtown[14] on her own than around Sandton alone. Michelle has no personal experiences of the township to draw on and for her the 'closest' she can get to it – or the furthest away from white suburbia – is Newtown with its urban, edgy feel of an African city.

It therefore seems clear that the black students' participation in the classroom talk had a discernible effect on the kinds of discourses that emerged and that, working together, these three students introduced new discourses powerful enough to reposition some of the students that had been working with contrasting discourses. It is important to bear in mind, as Dyson (1997) reminds us, that alternative discourses do not necessarily dislodge the discourses they are challenging nor do these challenges necessarily effect permanent change. The transcripts being analysed simply capture the voices of those students who spoke and makes visible their positions in that moment. What is perhaps more important is that when the taken-for-granted has been questioned, it can no longer be taken-for-granted (Dyson, 1997, p. 16) and that the contrasting discourses on townships that co-exist in this pedagogic space by the end of this interaction can only mean that neither discourse is operating invisibly.

6.3.5 Extract 3

The third and final extract of the classroom talk analysis is taken from Lesson 10, one of the lessons in which the students present their youth posters. It captures the interaction that takes place after Jody and Susan have presented their poster (S2P2), a neat, seamless, computer-generated design of the South African flag which has three panels filled with personal photographs of the students, their friends, and of various school and social events; the fourth panel contains images indexing South African politics. In their talk, Jody and Susan take up positions as proud South Africans and state their decision to focus on the positive world of the self rather than

[14] Newtown is a cultural precinct on the edge of the inner city of Johannesburg.

what they perceive to be the negative social context. (See Chapter 5 section 5.4.3 for a detailed discussion.) After the presentation, the teacher asks a number of exploratory questions. The extract begins with the final question addressed by the teacher to the presenters. Six students, including the two poster-makers, participate in the ensuing discussion. Turn-taking is too rapid and students' voices too intertwined to make it possible to separate them out in the ways previous tables have done. **Appendix F5** is a tabular summary of what can be determined about the forms of participation.

Extract 3:

1 T: *Are you excited about the future of the teenager in 2008 in South Africa?* [Sonia rolls her eyes at this question.]

2 Jody: *Yes, if you look at the positive aspects of our community and our country at the moment then definitely.*

3 T: *Ok.*

4 Kelsey: *But ma'am, can I just make a comment.*

5 T: *Yes please.*

6 Kelsey: *Because like –*

7 T: *Sorry, those girls who are having their own little conversations, or filing, or doing all the other things, this is a full-class discussion and you do have to be involved. Yes?*

8 Kelsey: *Like I understand that they say that they want to focus on just the positive aspects but don't you think that's a little bit idealistic? I mean you can't expect South Africa to be all flowers and roses because it's not going to be like that. I mean you can focus mainly on the positive points but it's not all about the positive points.*

9 Multiple comments...

10 Alice: *But they did put a bit of negative in with their politics.*

11 Susan: *But it's like, we were thinking that like –*

12 Kelsey: *Ok, like for future reference you're going to think like okay yes you've got to think on the good points of the future. But you've got to think where our government is at the moment and you've got to think 'okay what part does this have to play for my future, where am I going to be in 20 years? Will South Africa still be as successful as it is at the moment? Will it be going into ... the dumps?' Or, you know, it's just a little bit idealistic.*

13 Susan: *I think that when we like – say you like wake up every morning, I'm not going to check that no one burgled my house, that my car's still there, that my tv's –*

14 Kelsey: *But that's just realistic though.*

15 Susan: *I wake up and I don't think of that...*

16 Multiple comments flying...

17 Alice: *No, but you know, that the thing is she's not being negative, she's being realistic. [Kelsey: realistic] You know there's a difference between not actually noticing that anything's going on around you and being blind to the fact that – that there's like – there's terrible atrocities, like atrocities literally, like going on in South Africa and then you know like rather then not even noticing, you know, it's just like – there's a difference between being positive and being blind.*

18 Sonia: *Ja, but they aren't being naïve to it they're just –*
19 Jody: *We're not – okay – we're not making an assumption that our country – when we're representing our youth that we want to represent our youth positively.*
20 Alice: *Yes but then you're looking at your country at like 20% of your country, not even 20%. You only have to –*
21 Multiple responses flying...
22 Susan: *But I don't want to represent my country using some poor child [?] then I'll stick a stickman on it. It's like what I represent.*
23 T: *Kylie...*
24 Kylie: *Ja, I was just like ... what says there. Like they don't represent the negative things in the country, that's what represents them. It's about your youth in your country.*
25 Multiple responses...
26 Alice: *Yes, I know, but the thing is like is it really like fair you know to represent only yourself? I mean you may only –*
27 Multiple responses...
28 Sonia: *That's the topic!*
29 Kylie: *That was what it was about – this task.*
30 Alice: *Yes, but I mean like – does crime have no effect on you – at all?*
31 Kylie: *No, they've never been part of crime.*
32 Jody: *We don't want to see our youth as being crime, politics, we want –*
33 Alice: *So you'd rather not see the wrong things that are happening, you*
34 SS: *Alice let her talk!... Alice just listen!*
35 Alice: *Sorry* [covering her mouth]
36 Susan: *How about we just move on and see what was said on yours?*
37 S: *Ja, ja, then you can show us ...*
38 Alice: *I'm not saying... I'm not saying – you guys are taking it personally...*
39 Multiple undecipherable responses...
40 Sonia: *But you're saying that they mustn't be so naïve, and they mustn't ...*
[Teacher intervenes]

from Site 2, Lesson 10, 15/10/08

This is the most heated discussion that takes place in this classroom during the teaching intervention. It ends with the teacher stepping in with praise for the students' ability to take up and defend their positions and a reminder that they should not allow such arguments to become personal. The topics the discussion touches upon are clearly sensitive ones, many of which are directly tied to class-based distinctions in the experience of being a young South African.

Jody and Susan's poster presentation has foregrounded the positive by limiting the focus almost exclusively to the narrow world of the self. Kelsey and Alice respond with two slightly different but intertwined counter-discourses which take issue with the poster-makers' selections and exclusions. Kesley contends that their decision to leave out the negatives is *'idealistic'* (T8, 12). Kelsey is the student who introduced the 'streetwise' theme (Extract 1, T17) and there are echoes here of her belief in the need to look the negative in the eye, so to speak, and *'not expect South Africa to be*

all flowers and roses' (T8). Alice begins by pointing out, in response to Kelsey's critique, that the poster was not fully positive since it included the negative in the form of politics in the black panel of the flag (T10) but she shifts tack after Kelsey and Susan debate attitudes towards being burgled (T12-15). Although neither camp's line of reasoning is ever spelt out here, it seems that the kinds of attitudes that Jody and Susan are defining as *'being positive'* and *'being negative'*, Alice (and to some extent Kelsey) are defining as '*being blind'* and '*being realistic'*, respectively. So for Susan when she does not check each morning to see whether she has been burgled, it is because she refuses to be negative; whereas to Kelsey and Alice this seems to simply suggest a realistic attitude towards a crime that may never occur.

But in addition to arguing in favour of acknowledging realities that are negative, Alice's participation in this interchange has a subtext which engages privilege. She points out that the poster-makers' highly selective focus on the positive realities of a privileged minority (T20) by implication excludes the majority of the country and she eventually asks the question: 'is it really like fair you know to represent only yourself?' (T31). This unleashes a flurry of responses in defence of poster-makers' decision to take a narrow personal focus, some of which are adamant that this is what the poster task called for (T28, 29). For Alice, her critique of the poster is underpinned by a concern with the ethics of self-representation – in particular she is interrogating whether it is possible, as a member of a privileged minority, to speak as a South African or for South Africa, a question she has raised before (see Extract 1, T32). The implication is that one of the benefits of enjoying an elevated socioeconomic status is that one always has choices. One can choose what to filter out and what to allow in because one has the ability to insulate oneself from the broader social context – by living behind high walls, in gated suburbs, sending one's children to exclusive schools. And Alice finds this problematic, talking about the willful avoidance of *'terrible atrocities'* going on in South Africa (T17) and the decision to *'rather not see the wrong things that are happening'* (T33) in critical terms.

The debate is not resolved but it is clear from the responses of her peers that Alice's comments strike at the heart of privilege and unsettle its complacency. They imply that there is a need to subject to scrutiny the ethics of the choices one makes about how to position oneself in relation to the broader social context when privilege affords one choices. Choice, middle class notions of individualism and agency are thus central to this debate and this is evident in some of the patterns of language use during this discussion. As Jody and Susan are placed in the position of having to

defend their poster, their language becomes emphatically agentive and forceful, with the words 'we want' or 'we don't want' being frequently uttered, as in: *'we want to represent our youth positively'* (T19); *'I don't want to represent my country using some poor child'* (T22); and *'We don't want to see our youth as being crime, politics, we want–'* (T32). This attests to the confidence in making choices about what to let in, what to filter out and their decisions to separate themselves from the negative aspects of South African life that they do not want to be affected by. And the possessive individualism (Skeggs 2008) inherent in the subject positions they take up as young South Africans is also evident in their language – *'our country'* (T19), *'my country'* (T22) – as well as that of the peers who are defending them, e.g. *'it's about your youth in your country'.* It seems likely that it is this 'take charge' attitude that precludes these students from coming across as victims, even in the face of so much talk of crime, and enables them to remain resolutely positive and proud.

Contrasting discourses of privilege are able to co-exist in this pedagogic space. It is significant that the teacher, when she intervenes at the end of the extract, does not seek to arrive at a resolution or achieve consensus, she merely restores what one could perhaps refer to as an ethos of open discussion to the classroom, saying:

> *It is absolutely fantastic to differ and to fight the point out okay but when you make a point… it's not a personal attack… you must be able to defend it without getting upset so yes people will argue with you and you have to defend it and you still have to see that they are presenting an argument… and we will go out of here being friends* (Teacher, S2, L10, pp 255-257).

These words serve as a reminder that for 'volatile conversations' (Geschier, 2010b) to occur in pedagogically sound ways, students need to feel safe to take up positions that may run counter to the prevailing discourse and to know that the pedagogic space which they inhabit has a level of protection built into it that allows for open dialogue to take place.

6.3.6 Discussion

Tracking the ebb and flow of a particular pattern of discourses across a number ofinterconnected lessons generates some interesting insights about the discursive structure of classroom talk. Firstly, the fact that the same topics keep coming to the fore during open-ended discussion suggests that these are issues that are significant to the speakers. The shifting positions of speakers, the deepening engagement with the issues and the new perspectives that arise generate opportunities for learning and point to the pedagogic value of allowing for extended conversations where issues can

be tackled in depth and students have opportunities to re-think their positions in relation to the new discourses to which they are exposed.

The open discourse structure is underpinned by a listen-and-respond discourse that foregrounds direct address among students and allows for multiple voices to co-exist. The teacher's participation in the classroom talk is minimal. She is hardly ever the one to initiate topic change and she seldom nominates students to speak instead simply managing the sequence of the students who are bidding to take the floor. Despite this, however, there are moments when the questions she asks particular students function either to maintain a preferred discourse or else unintentionally show up the dominant knowledges which are operating in the classroom. It was notable that students drawing on patriotic discourses in relation to South Africa are not asked to defend their positions whereas those students who expressed negative sentiments towards living in South Africa are. This suggests that a preferred discourse is accepted at face value and no elaboration is required whereas an alternative, less welcome discourse is subjected to scrutiny. This scrutiny, however, never took the form of critique or disapproval from the teacher. The teacher either posed questions that required the student to justify her position, or else, during her follow-up interaction with the student introducing the unwelcome discourse, she reminded the class that she expected them to respond to their peers' comments. The teacher is thus able to use questioning strategies as a way of working towards reinforcing a favoured discourse and dislodging an unwelcome one. Once again, these discursive manoeuvres are by no means coercive but when they are discernedby students – albeit unconsciously – they can get bound up with discourses of teacher approval (Baxter, 2002a) and function to encourage students to work to maintain the favoured discourse and argue against the alternative.

6.4 Concluding thoughts

The analysis of the interplay between interaction patterns, topics of conversation and discourse addresses the second research sub-question, namely: How does the classroom discourse work to position students and how, in turn, do the subject positions that students take up shape the classroom discourse?

The most salient insight gained is that classrooms are complex spaces that are continually in the process of being (re)constructed by the actions and interactions of their participants. Not only do different interactional norms hold sway in different

classrooms but, as the analysis of the extracts from Site 1 shows, even within the same classroom, the same participants can generate very different discursive spaces. Different topics produce different levels of investment and this can shift interaction patterns considerably. In the process, power relations are often reconfigured. The difference between the two extracts from Site 1 show that the students take control of the conversational interaction when they are meaningfully engaged with the topic, and can be relatively passive and compliant and hand the authority over to the teacher when they are not roused by the subject matter. In Site 2, the manner in which the conversation around suburbs and townships and their relative safety evolves shows that racialised asymmetrical relations of knowing exist in the classroom and that these can be 'flipped' when topics shift and enable different students to draw on their own experience and expertise regarding the issue under discussion. This is closely aligned with a pedagogy that is open to diverse viewpoints and difference in general and which thus consciously seeks to enable students to learn from one another by having the opportunity to be exposed to new discourses.

An additional point can be made regarding the openness of the classroom space to multiple and contrasting discourses. Despite the fact that in both classrooms students are ostensibly free to take up whatever positions they wish on the issues at hand and to construct/represent their identities in whatever ways they choose, they are operating within discursive structures which make certain discourses and the subject positions that they entail more powerful than others. This does not mean that the discursive terrain is fixed and that the same discourses continually dominate. Rather what a fine-grained analysis of extended moments of classroom interaction suggests is that once a discourse establishes itself as dominant, it is difficult to dislodge. Less energy is required to sustain the prevailing discourse than to introduce an alternative discourse. Alternative discourses are riskier, require greater elaboration and, more often than not, need to be defended. This is because they do not operate in the taken-for-granted territory that dominant discourses inhabit. Students introducing alternative discourses need to work harder precisely because they have to tackle the unstated assumptions that buttress preferred discourses, and they have to find ways of doing so that will be heard by the speakers of those preferred discourses.

But perhaps most significantly, what emerges from the analysis of each of these classrooms is that the discourses in the different classrooms are linked to who the participants are in each site and thus can only be analysed in relation to that context and the particular discursive space that prevails in the moment.

7

CONCLUSIONS

> *It is not necessary to say everything about the argumentative fabric of a society to say something* (Wetherell, 1998, p. 403)

This research has explored the relationship between subjectivity and pedagogy in the secondary school English classroom in South Africa during a time characterised as one of considerable social change. The research questions guiding this exploration focused on students' engagement with a teaching intervention that invited them to take up historicised and sociopolitically located subject positions. Using a two-case case study research design informed by poststructuralist theories of subjectivity and discourse, it has therefore sought to understand the subject positions students in two separate classrooms took up in the talk and texts that they produced in and around the teaching intervention. In this final chapter, I indicate the contribution this research makes to knowledge, drawing out key insights that have emerged, and pointing out potential directions for future research.

7.1 On the research design

Research on subjectivity has become commonplace, especially if one also takes into account research done in the area of identity. What lends originality to this study, however, is that subjectivity is explored specifically in relation to pedagogy. This narrows the focus to the processes of subjectification as they play out in the classroom space. In addition, the subjectivity/pedagogy relationship is scrutinised

against the broader sociopolitical context of a society in transition, taking into consideration students' locations in the social fabric and how these might inflect – at different times and in different ways – the subject positions they take up in the classroom. This particular combination of concepts has enabled me to derive a number of insights about the historically constructed and contingent nature of subjectivity (Hall, 1996), as I discuss below.

One of the more significant contributions that this research makes is to be found in the way in which it places at its centre a *sustained* engagement with the subject positions students take up during classroom interaction. The activities and conversations in which students participate are tracked across multiple lessons. This prevents students' subjectivities from being reified since subjectivity is being understood in relation to multiple, accumulated subject positions that are themselves understood as providing an open-ended and partial representation of the underlying process of subjectification (Weedon, 1997). From this perspective, it becomes possible to discern shifts and continuities among various subject positions taken up by students, and to consider how these are shaped by the conditions of possibility of the discursively structured classroom space, a point I return to below.

An additional significant feature of this study is its multifaceted and multilayered research design. This is partly due to the way in which the teaching intervention is designed and implemented. Firstly, the pedagogy of the teaching intervention is varied. Students are required to engage in different types of activities – sometimes individually, sometimes in pairs or groups – across various modes, dealing with various topics. Secondly, as a result of this, different types of data are generated, ranging from transcripts of classroom discussion, to multimodal artefacts, to journal writing and focus group discussions. Thirdly, while all the data is subjected to poststructuralist discourse analysis, the precise form which this analysis takes is adjusted to suit the kind of data being analysed. Poststructuralist discourse analysis is thus appliedto various semiotic modes and interactional situations, often drawing on additional methods for preliminary analysis (e.g. visual content analysis and conversational turn-taking). It is this multifaceted and multilayered research design that is captured in Figure 7.1 below.




Figure 7.1 The multilayerd, multifaceted research design

7.2 On emerging findings

With regard to the subjectivity/pedagogy relationship, the most signficant finding to emerge is that students' subjectivities are not fixed but shift in ways that are contingent on the pedagogic context. This is evident across the data, with students – sometimes collectively, sometimes individually – taking up different subject postions at different times, and frequently taking up positions that contrastwith or even contradictearlier positions. It therefore becomes interesting to consider what shifts occur, as well as when and under what conditionsthey occur. By way of reminder, I briefly consider the shifting subjectivities of three individual students whose

participation has been discussed in earlier chapters before dealing with broader patterns of shifting.

Moipone, the student in Site 1 who enjoys a high degree of academic credibility from teacher and peers, takes up multiple subject positions. She speaks as, *inter alia*, a young Pedi girl from the rural areas and a believer in God in her journal; as a member of the post-apartheid generation of youth in her poster presentation; and as a writer in her focus group discussions. Her early position on the importance of apartheid history is reinforced during the open-ended classroom discussion where she argues for the youth to be proactive in shaping the future and states that they should do this by drawing on lessons from history. The various subject positions she takes up do shift across interactional situations in relation to the topic at hand, but – unlike a number of other students – this does not create discernible tensions or contradictions among her various subject positions.

Notable contradictions occur, for example, with Thabiso in Site 1 and Adele in Site 2. Thabiso, shortly after making the statement during class discussions on the youth, that '[i]t's not what you wear, it's how good you look in it' (S1, L6), produces the poster that clearly delineates the 'cool'/'uncool' binary related to the youth code (see Chapter 5, section 5.4.1). Adele, after having explicitly represented herself and her peers as having life offered to them 'on a silver platter' in her poster and poster talk, rejects that very idea in her focus group discussion, insisting that 'life is not offered to me on a silver platter, like I have to work for everything that I want' (S2, FG2, p 30).

These kinds of shifts in individual subject positions should not be dismissed as trivial nor should they be treated as irrelevant; rather they point to the broader processes of subjectification and their contingent nature. The findings bear this out, showing that shifts in subject positions taken up in relation to a particular topic or view can occur (1) when there is a change in the interactional situation; (2) when moving between different semiotic modes; (3) or when provided with the opportunity for extended conversational interaction around the issue.

Change in the interactional situation

Firstly, the full spectrum of the data analysis shows that two classes engaging with the same teaching intervention generated different pedagogic discourses by virtue of the fact that the interactions of the teacher and students are not identical. The mediation of the teacher and the participation of the students ensure that in each case the teaching intervention is enacted in contextually-specific ways. Secondly, and

more significantly, the fine-grained analysis of the classroom talk shows that the same participants can generate considerably different discursive spaces at different times. This was evident in the two contrasting extracts of open-ended classroom talk from Site 1 (see Chapter 6, section 6.2). This suggests that the topics of conversation can shape the participation structure of the classroom talk and thereby enable particular discourses to arise. Moreover it reinforces the proposition that the pedagogic space is discursively structured and co-constructed by the actions and interactions of its participants, foregrounding the interconnectedness of subjectivity and pedagogy as well as the fluid and contingent nature of the pedagogic space.

In Site 2, the differences between the five Afrikaans students' classroom participation and their focus group participation reinforces the finding that changes in the interactional context can generate shifts in subject positions. Those who participated in class discussions, took up a range of positions. This was most notable in the case of Sonia whose class participation showed her negotiating the tensions between various nuanced positions related to her pride as both a 'new South African' and as an Afrikaner, her revulsion at the atrocities committed by the apartheid regime as well as her anger and distress at being automatically blamed for apartheid as an Afrikaner. Yet, in the focus group discussion, where all five of the participants shared an Afrikaans heritage, they all took up their subject positions as Afrikaners very strongly, speaking at length about an anti-Afrikaans bias in the re-writing of history and drawing strongly on discourses of that construct Afrikaners as victims and as marginalised. While a focus group discussion is a particular interaction that cannot be straightforwardly equated with the classroom, the composition of the group clearly tapped into to a sense of solidarity around Afrikaner identity. In this context, having strongly taken up a subject position as an Afrikaner, Adele's refusal of the 'silver platter' metaphor is thus consonant with the idea of the Afrikaner identity as a beleaguered one – rather than the socioeconomically privileged identity position with which she associated the image on her poster. Also significant is the fact that the students admitted to consciously restraining themselves from adopting these positions during classroom interactions due to the need for circumspection in that particular interactional context.

Moving between semiotic modes

A significant finding emerging from the analysis of the posters and the poster talk (Chapter 5) is that students are sometimes able to take up different subject positions in different modes. This was particularly evident in the poster work in Site 1 where the

analysis of the predominantly visual poster collages produced discourses that in some cases were considerably different from those of the students' poster talks (see section 5.4.). While this points to the danger of analysing visual artefacts without taking into consideration the meanings at the site of production (Rose, 2001), it is also a consequence of the open-ended and less stable way in which meaning is made in the genre of the collage. However, as I have argued, a number of students were able to capitalise on this very open-endedness in order to adjust their poster talk to the prevailing classroom discourse, taking up considerably different subject positions from what their posters suggested. This implies that when subjectivity is at play, the move between the predominantly visual mode of the poster collage and the performative verbal mode of the poster presentation does not simply comprise a different way of realising the same subject positions but is actually a matter of drawing on different repertoires of discourse and subjectivity. Furthermore, the different moment of production or articulation enables the subject position to shift in keeping with the conditions of possibility of the new moment and new context including, if necessary, adjusting the subject position to the demands of the occasion, i.e. to the pedagogy of the task. Thus the 'talk around the text' (Lillis, 2001, 2008) is not the text nor is it a version of the text, or even 'the' explanation of the text. It is *an* explanation of the text – the one which resulted from a combination of the makers' authentic meanings and the discursive structure of the space into which these meanings were being spoken.

The fact that different semiotic modes have different affordances and constraints means that shifting between modes in itself constitutes an opportunity not only for re-articulating but for re-thinking. Asking students to engage with a topic or issue in different modes therefore has pedagogic value as well as having implications for identity work.

Extended conversational interaction around an issue

Finally, shifts in subject position were also evident when there was the opportunity for extended conversational interaction around an issue. This finding relates specifically to the analysis of the classroom talk in Site 2 (see Chapter 6, section 6.3). This 'long conversation' (Maybin, 1994; Mercer, 2001) shows what is possible when students and teacher have developed a pedagogic disposition towards extended dialogue where the ability to take up and argue for particular positions co-exists alongside openness to the positions of others. The conversation on crime, place and privilege which extends across a number of lessons allows for increasingly in-depth

engagement with the issues. Students' positions shift over time as they have the opportunity to re-think issues in light of their peers' contributions. This is evident with Kelsey who, having introduced the 'streetwise' discourse early in the conversation, takes up a considered position against it in a later phase of the conversation, having shifted her position from that of a South African needing to be vigilant in the face of widespread crime to that of a member of a privileged minority who was less vulnerable to crime than most – a shift enabled by Alice's critique of privilege. The extended nature of the conversation also allowed for students to evaluate the arguments being made against their own life experiences and to use these experiences to contest knowledge that was in the process of being naturalised in the classroom talk. Thus Bontle, along with the other two black students in this classroom, steps in during the latter part of the conversation to contest the prevailing discourse of townships as crime-ridden, dangerous places, introducing a counter discourse of townships as homely and convivial, thereby revealing racialised asymmetries of knowledge (McKinney, 2011) and prompting shifts in the white students' perceptions of townships. This kind of extended dialogue has implications for post-conflict classrooms, something I expand on below.

7.3 On the limitations of this study

The fact that this research study is based on a three-week teaching intervention which is designed by the researcher and taught by the English teacher is both a strength and a weakness. The strengths have been outlined above and pertain to the ways in which the classroom interactions are able to be aligned with the research questions and are subjected to sustained scrutiny. However, it is also precisely the fact that this research is based on a fairly lengthy teaching intervention that would need to be inserted into the already overloaded Grade Eleven English curriculum that generates difficulties in finding classrooms where such a research project would be feasible.

It also needs to be acknowledged that while this two-case case study was not set up as a comparative study between the two participating schools, a certain degree of comparative analysis became unavoidable. By placing these two schools side by side, particular aspects of each site are thrown into relief. The fact that race and class emerged as significant features of the data analysis enabled these aspects to be probed in ways that may not have presented themselves had different sites been placed together – or indeed had only one sight been used for this study. On the other

hand, however, despite the considerable differences between these two sites, it bears reminding that, within the national context, both schools fall on the privileged end of the schooling spectrum.

7.4 On implications for post-conflict pedagogy

This research was undertaken with the understanding that South Africa can be seen as a post-conflict society and that school classrooms can be sites for helping the new post-apartheid generation to make sense of social change. The point needs to be emphasised, however, that the primary aim of the teaching intervention being reported on was not to facilitate such change but to better understand how students are positioning themselves in relation to this change and what the implications of this might be for further work on post-conflict pedagogy.

Firstly, this study shows that engaging with the past in the post-apartheid South African classroom can be uncomfortable and can have unpredictable results. The fact that Rwanda placed a ten-year moratorium on the teaching of history after the 1994 genocide (Freedman et al, 2008) is an example, albeit an extreme one, of what can happen in the desire to avoid further conflict. The students in this study showed uneven levels of engagement with varying degrees of interest and resistance. Although neither group of students showed the levels of engagement with the work of the TRC that were present in one of the classes in the earlier study (Ferreira and Janks, 2007), the fact that varied positions can be aired is itself a positive thing.Expressions of apartheid fatigue co-existed alongside comments welcoming a focus on local history. A classroom space that can accommodate these various perspectives would seem to be an important element of a post-conflict pedagogy.

Secondly, while the argument for the pedagogic value of extended conversation has already been made above, it has particular implications for a post-conflict pedagogy. In her recent workon ‘volatile conversations’, Geschier mounts a compelling argument for the value of engaging with difficult issues in extended and open-ended ways (2010b). In a post-conflict context, conversations across historically constructed differences in ways that generate pedagogic dissonance by challenging received knowledge (Jansen, 2009a) are to be sought after. The discussion of racialised discourses of place and safety in Site 2 is one such example. However, facilitating talk in this way requires considerable skill and it is thus important that teachers working in post-conflict contexts be given the opportunity to learn these skills.

Thirdly, the analysis of students' positionings on history (see Chapter 4) corroborates previous research that has found that students at an Afrikaans medium university were reluctant to engage with the apartheid past because in taking up strongly racialised identities, they became positioned in uncomfortable ways (McKinney 2004b). In the current study, this reluctance cut across race, with a range of students demonstrating discomfort with the ways in which the black victim/white perpetrator binary (Jansen, 2009a) works to suture them into historically constructed racial identities. Moreover, even when the pedagogy of the post-conflict classroom attempts to avoid such binaries, students do not arrive at this latest pedagogic encounter with history as blank slates. They have already been exposed to a range of discourses on the recent past and inevitably arrive at this latest encounter with discursive 'baggage'. In Site 2, for example, the Afrikaans students' dramatic response to the teaching intervention as expressed in their focus group discussion, indicates that they were not only responding to the current teaching intervention but were invoking previous positionings, such as the one narrated in class by Sonia where her Grade 8 peers blamed her for apartheid. The effects of an unnuanced victor narrative (Jansen and Weldon, 2009) continue to be counter-productive for Afrikaans youth who wish to position themselves as tolerant, open-minded and embracing of racial diversity but feel consistently constructed as political villains.

It therefore seems clear that an important step in a post-conflict context would be construction of a History curriculum that approaches the recent past in a more subtle and complex manner – one that would disrupt racialised binaries, with attention given to cooperation between black and white against the apartheid regime, to stories of white resistance to apartheid, and to small tales of everyday resistance across race to such things as segregation, separate amenities and so on. This should not be seen as an attempt to deracialise history but rather as an attempt to provide multiple positions from which the narrative of the past can be engaged. Research has shown that the inability to access new and different discourses can keep students and teachers trapped in discourses that are not helpful (Davies and Baker, 1989; Luke et al, 1995; McKinney, 2007). A post-conflict society needs post-conflict discourses. While Foucault's statement that 'it is not easy to say something new' (1972, p. 49) reminds us of the difficulties of generating new meanings, it would seem that the production of a History curriculum that addresses the racialised past in more nuanced ways would be a step in the right direction for a post-conflict society. This would need to be done in a way that would not simply exonerate those who benefitted from apartheid or ignore ongoing, historically constructed inequalities. Some might argue

that white discomfort is appropriate and that it is still too soon for such a curriculum. Although, it may be more productive to take up Soudien's challenge(2012) of finding everyday, post-race ways of personally addressing social differences and social inequalities.

7.5 On young people's shifting identities in contemporary South Africa

What can this study tell us about the sense that young people are making of social change in this 'ontological hotspot' (Soudien, 2011) that is contemporary South Africa? Again, a number of interesting insights have emerged.

It seems that these young people are well aware that they are living in a world which is socially, politically and technologically radically different from that of their parents' generation. With regard to race relations, there is evidence of students consciously seeking to take up positions that are different from those of their parents and attempting to escape racialised reasoning and predetermined raced positions. In Site 1 a number of students took up positions of critique on racialised attitudes among the older generation. In Site 2, a number of white students either distanced themselves from older family members' racist attitudes or challenged their positions of avowed ignorance towards the oppression that took place under apartheid.

While this is hopeful there is also evidence that parental discourses are not that easy to escape and can surface unexpectedly, such as the way in which Thabiso's desire for a white butler undoes his earlier critique of his father's position on employing white people (see Chapter 4, section 4.3.2). The discursive terrain which students are navigating is therefore one of ambiguity, ambivalence and inconsistencies.

Furthermore, contrary to many of the frequent statements students make suggesting that their current lives are unaffected by the past, there is evidence that students' subject positions are frequently tied up with their historically constructed locations in the sociopolitical and economic landscape of South Africa. Students in Site 1 demonstrate the kind of interest in 'conspicuous consumption' (Farber, 2002) that is tied to the aspirations of post-apartheid youth in the emerging middle class, although attitudes vacillate between seduction and critique. And many students in Site 2 articulate elite subjectivities, some of whom draw on various forms of 'white talk' (Steyn, 2005) that naturalise privilege and they are significantly orientated towards global mobility. In both sites, experiences and understandings of place are overlain

with lingering racial discourses tied to apartheid geographies which persist despite desegregation.

7.5 On future directions

A number of interesting questions are thrown up by this research, pointing to possibilities for future research. Given the highly situated nature of the relationship between subjectivity and pedagogy, it would be interesting to understand how this relationship is playing itself out in schools that are on the less privileged end of the schooling spectrum in South Africa, particularly in relation to the issues focused on in the teaching intervention. Furthermore, while this study focused on student subjectivity, it would be beneficial to understand more about teacher subjectivity and how it shapes pedagogic interactions. This would be a valuable aspect of a more longitudinal pedagogic study that tracks the subjectivity/pedagogy relationship with the teacher, with individual students and with more attention to the specific occurrences in the sociopolitical terrain and how these may shape classroom discourses.

Overridingly, however, more research is needed on how to develop pedagogies that are suited not only to the particularities of the post-conflict classroom but to any classroom that seeks to become a pedagogic space where open dialogue takes place, multiple positions can co-exist and where students are encouraged to challenge their own and others' naturalised positions. Rather than the relative safety of certainty and fixed positions, teachers and students should strive to become comfortable with discomfort and to be able to tolerate – and work productively with – contingency and heterogeneity.

REFERENCES

Adam, H. (1994). Ethnic versus civic nationalism: South Africa's non-racialism in comparative perspective. *South African Sociological Review, 2*(2).

Ahluwalia, P., Atkinson, S., Bishop, P., Christie, P., Hattam, R. & Matthews, J. (Eds.) (2012). *Reconciliation and Pedagogy*. London: Routledge.

Anderson, B. (2006). *Imagined communities*. (Rev. ed.). London and New York: Verso.

Anzaldúa, G. (1999). *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza*. (2nd ed.). San Francisco, USA: Lute Books.

Appadurai, A.(1996).*Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Baker,C. (1991). Reading the texts of reading lessons. *Australian Journal of Reading, 14*(1): 5-20.

Bakhtin, M.M.(1981).*The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Austin and London: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M.M. (1986).*Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Ballard, R.(2004a). Middle class neighbourhoods or 'African kraals'? The impact of informal settlements and vagrants on post-apartheid white identity. *Urban Forum, 15*(1): 48-73.

Ballard, R.(2004b). Assimilation, emigration, semigration and integration: 'White' peoples' strategies for finding a comfort zone in post-apartheid South Africa. In N. Distiller & M. Steyn (Eds.),*Under Construction: 'Race' and Identity in South Africa Today*. Sandton: Heinemann.

Ballard, R. (2005). Bunkers for the psyche: How gated communities have allowed the privitisation of apartheid in democratic South Africa. Dark Roast Occasional Papers, 24, 1-49.

Baxter, J. (2002a). Competing discourses in the classroom: A post-structuralist discourse analysis of girls' and boys' speech in public contexts. *Discourse & Society, 13*(6), 827-842.

Baxter, J. (2002b). A juggling act: a feminist post-structuralist analysis of girls' and boys' talk in the secondary classroom. *Gender & Education, 14*(1), 5-19.

Baxter, J. (2003).*Positioning Gender in Discourse: A Feminist Methodology*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Baxter, J. (2008). Post-structuralist analysis of classroom discourse. In M. Martin-Jones, A.-M. de Mejia & N. Hornberger (Eds.),*Encyclopedia of Language and Education: Discourse and Education: Volume 3* (2nd ed; pp. 69-79). New York: Springer.

Bell, T.& Ntsebeza,D.B. (2003). *Unfinished Business: South Africa, Apartheid and Truth*. London & New York: Verso.

Bentley, K.&Habib, A. (2008). Racial redress, national identity and citizenship in post-apartheid South Africa. In A. Habib & K. Bentley (Eds.),*Racial Redress and Citizenship in South Africa* (pp. 3-32). Cape Town: HSRC Press.

Billig, M.(1999). Whose terms? Whose ordinariness? Rhetoric and ideology in Conversation Analysis. *Discourse & Society*, *10*: 543-58.

Blommaert, J. (2005).*Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blommaert, J., Collins, J. & Slembrouck, S. (2005). Spaces of multilingualism. *Language and Communication*, *25*, 197-216.

Bogatsu,M. (2002).'Loxion Kulcha': Fashioning black youth culture in post-apartheid South Africa. *English Studies in Africa*, *45*(2): 1-12.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2003). *Racism without Racists*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Bourdieu, P. (1984).*Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, P.(1991).*Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bremner, L. (2008). Reframing township space. In S. Nuttall & A. Mbembe (Eds.), *Johannesburg: The Elusive Metropolis* (pp. 337-347). Johannesburg: Wits University Press.

Butler, J.(1992). Contingent foundations: Feminism and the question of 'postmodernism'. In J. Butler & J.W. Scott (Eds.),*Feminists Theorize the Political* (pp. 3-21). New York: Routledge.

Caldeira, T.P.R. (1996). Fortified enclaves: The new urban segregation. *Public Culture*, *8*, 303-328.

Candela, A. (1999). Students' power in classroom discourse. *Linguistics and Education, 10*(2), 139-163.

Carrim, N. (1998). Anti-racism and the 'new' South African education order. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 28*(3), 301-320.

Carrim, N.& Soudien, C. (1999). Critical antiracism in South Africa. In S. May (Ed.), *Critical multiculturalism: rethinking multicultural and antiracist education*. London: Falmer Press.

Castells, M.(2000). *The Rise of the Network Society*. (2nd ed.). Malden, Massachussetts: Blackwell.

Cazden, C. (2001). *Classroom discourse: the language of teaching and learning.*(2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Chipkin, I. (2002). Commissioning the past: Interview with Deborah Posel and Graeme Simpson. WISER newsletter, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 8-9.

Chipkin, I. (2007). *Do South Africans exist? Nationalism, democracy and the identity of 'the people'*. Johannesburg: Wits University Press.

Chisholm, L.& Sujee, M. (2006). Tracking racial desegregation in South African schools. *Journal of Education, 40*, 141-159.

Christou, M. (2007). The language of patriotism. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *28*(6): 709-722.

Coetzee, J.M. (2001). *Stranger Shores: Literary Essays 1986-1999*. London: Secker & Warburg.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research methods in education* (5th ed.). London: Routledge.

Czeglédy, A.P. (2003). Villas of the Highveld: A cultural perspective on Johannesburg and its 'Northern Suburbs'. In R. Tomlinson, R.A. Beauregard, L. Bremner & X. Mangcu (Eds.),*Emerging Johannesburg: Perspectives on the Post-Apartheid City* (pp. 21-42). New York & London: Routledge.

Darder, A., Baltodano, M. & Torres, R.D. (2003). Critical Pedagogy: An introduction. In A. Darder, M. Baltodano & R.D. Torres (Eds.),*The Critical Pedagogy Reader* (pp. 1-21). New York and London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Davies, B. (1983). The roles pupils play in the social construction of classroom order. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 4*(1), 55-69.

Davies, B. (1989). *Frogs and Snails and Feminist Tales*. NSW, Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Davies, B. (1994). *Poststructuralist theory and classroom practice*. Victoria, Australia: Deakin Press.

Davies, B. (1997). The subject of post-structuralism: A reply to Alison Jones. *Gender and Education, 9*(3), 271-283.

Davies, B. (2003). *Shards of glass: Children reading and writing beyond gendered identities* (2nd ed.). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Davies, B. (2006). Subjectification: The relevance of Butler's analysis for education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 27(4): 425-438.

Davies, B. and Baker, C. (1989). A lesson on sex roles. *Gender and Education*, *1*(1): 59-76.

Davies, B.& Harré, R. (1990). Positioning: The discursive production of selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour, 20*(1), 43-65.

Davies, B.& Harré, R. (1999). Positioning and personhood. In R. Harré & L. van Langenhoven (Eds.), *Positioning Theory* (pp. 32-52). Oxford: Blackwell.

Dawson, A. (2006). Geography of fear: Crime and the transformation of public space in post-apartheid South Africa. In S. Low & N. Smith (Eds.),*The Politics of Public Space*(pp. 123-142). New York: Routledge and Taylor & Francis.

Department of Education. (2003). *National Curriculum Statement: Grades 10-12. Languages: English Home Language*. Pretoria, South Africa.

Distiller, N. & Steyn, M. (2004). Introduction: Under construction. In N. Distiller &M. Steyn (Eds.),*Under Construction: 'Race' and Identity in South Africa Today*(pp. 1-11). Sandton: Heinemann.

Dixon, J.(1997). Discourse and racial partition in the 'New' South Africa. In A. Levett, A. A. Kottler, E. Burman & I. Parker (Eds.),*Culture, Power and Difference: Discourse Analysis in South Africa* (pp. 17-30). London & New Jersey: Zed Books.

Dixon, J., Foster, D., Durrheim, K. and Wilbraham, L.(1994). Discourse and the politics of space in South Africa: The 'squatter crisis'. *Discourse & Society*, *5*(3): 277-296.

Dixon, J. & Durrheim, K. (2000). Displacing place-identity: A discursive approach to locating self and other. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *39*, 27-44.

Dixon, J., Tredoux, C.& Clack, B. (2005). On the micro-ecology of racial division: A neglected dimension of segregation. *South African Journal of Psychology*, *35*(3): 395-411.

Dlamini, J.(2009). *Native Nostalgia*. Auckland Park: Jacana.

Dolby, N. (1999). Youth and the global popular: The politics and practices of race in South Africa. *European Journal of Cultural Studies, 2*(3), 291-309.

Dolby, N. (2000). The shifting ground of race: The role of taste in youth's production of identities. *Race, Ethnicity and Education, 3*(1), 7-23.

Dolby, N. (2001a). White fright: The politics of white youth identity in South Africa. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 22*(1), 5-17.

Dolby, N. (2001b). *Constructing race: youth, identity and popular culture in South Africa*. Albany, USA: State University of New York Press.

Dolby, N.& Rizvi, F.(2008). Introduction: Youth, mobility and identity. In N. Dolby & F. Rizvi (Eds.) ,*Youth Moves: Identities and Education in Global Perspective* (pp. 1-14). New York and London: Routledge and Taylor & Francis.

Dreyfus, H.L.& Rabinow, P. (1982). *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. Sussex: Harvester Press.

Durrheim, K. (2005). Socio-spatial practice and racial representations in a changing South Africa. *South African Journal of Psychology*, *35(*3): 444-459.

Durrheim, K., Mtose, X., & Brown, L. (2011). *Race Trouble: Race, Identity and Inequality in Post-Apartheid South Africa*. Scottsville, KZN: University of KwaZulu Natal Press.

Dyer, R. (1997). *White*. London: Routledge.

Dyson, A.H. (1997). Rewriting for, and by, the children: the social and ideological fate of a media miss in an urban classroom. *Written Communication, 14*(3), 275-312.

Eagleton, T. (1991). *Ideology: An Introduction*. London: Verso.

Egan-Robertson, A.& Bloome, D. (Eds.)(1998). *Students as researchers of culture and language in their own communities.* Cresskill, New Jersey: Hampton Press.

Elbaz-Luwisch, F. (2009). The uses of conflict in the pedagogy of teacher education. *Perspectives in Education*, *27*(2): 169-176.

Erasmus, Z. (2005). Race and identity in the nation. In J. Daniel, R. Southall & J. Lutchman (Eds.),*State of the Nation: South Africa 2004-2005* (pp.9-33). Cape Town: HSRC Press.

Erasmus, Z. (2008). Race. In S. Shepherd& S. Robins (Eds.),*New South African Keywords*(pp. 169-181). Johannesburg: Jacana Press.

Fanon, F. (1952). *Black Skin, White Masks*. London: Pluto Press.

Farber, T.(2002). *Loaded with Labels: The meanings of clothing amongst urban black youth in Rosebank, Johannesburg*. Unpublished Master'sresearch report, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

Ferreira, A. (2008). Postcards from the edge: exploring multimodal pedagogies for reconciliation pedagogies. *South African Review of Education, 14*(3), 37-54.

Ferreira, A., & Janks, H. (2007). Reconciliation pedagogy, identity and community funds of knowledge: borderwork in South African classrooms. *The English Academy Review, 24*(2), 71-84.

Ferreira, A., & Janks, H. (2009). Doves, rainbows and an uneasy peace: student images of reconciliation in a post-conflict society. *Perspectives in Education, 27*(2), 133-146.

Ferreira, A., Janks, H., Barnsley, I., Marriott, C., Rudman, M., Ludlow, H., et al. (2012). Reconciliation pedagogy in South African classrooms: From the personal to the political. In P. Ahluwalia, S. Atkinson, P. Bishop, P. Christie, R. Hattam & J. Matthews (Eds.). *Reconciliation and Pedagogy*(pp. 173-193). London: Routledge.

Finders, M.J. (1998/1999). Raging hormones: stories of adolescence and implications for teacher preparation. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, *42*, 252-263.

Fine, M. (1996). *Off White: Readings on Race and Power*. London: Routledge.

Fontana, A., & Frey, J. (1998). The interview: from structured questions to negotiated text. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials* (pp. 61-106). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Foucault, M. (1970). *The Order of Things*. London and New York: Routledge. [Fr. 1966]

Foucault, M. (1972). *Archeology of Knowledge*. London and New York: Routledge. [Fr. 1969]

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and Punish*. London: Penguin. [Fr. 1975]

Foucault, M. (1978). *The History of Sexuality: Volume 1: The Will to Knowledge.* London: Allen Lane. [Fr. 1976]

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge: selected interviews and other writings 1972-77*. Brighton, Sussex: Harvester Press.

Foucault, M. (1981). The order of discourse. In R. Young (Ed.), *Untying the Text: A Post-structuralist Reader* (pp. 48-78). Boston, London and Henley: Routledge and Kegan Paul. [Lecture, 1970]

Foucault, M. (1982). The Subject and Power. In H.L. Dreyfus and P. Rabinow,*Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*(pp. 208-226). Sussex: Harvester Press

Frankenberg, R. (1993). *White women, race matters: the social construction of whiteness.* London: Routledge.

Freedman, S.W., Weinstein, H., Murphy, K. & Longman, T. (2008). Teaching history after identity-based conflicts: The Rwandan experience. *Comparative Education Review*, 52(4): 663-690.

Gaganakis, M. (2004). Imposed identities: adolescent girls' perceptions of being black and being white. *Perspectives in Education, 22*(1), 5-17.

Gamede, T. (2005). *The biography of 'Access' as an expression of human rights in South African education policies.* Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Pretoria, Pretoria.

Geschier, S. (2010a). 'South Africans did, Miss, we, we fought for our freedom': Pedagogy and the potential of primary narratives in a history classroom. *Education as Change*, *14*(1): 47-60.

Geschier, S. (2010b). Vulnerability and belonging in the history classroom: A teacher's positioning in 'volatile conversations' on racism and xenophobia. *Perspectives in Education*, *28*(3): 23-33.

Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity: self and society in the late modern age*. Cambridge: Polity press.

Gilroy, P. (1993). *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Gonzalez, N., Moll, L. & Amanti, C. (Eds.). (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorising practices in households and classrooms.* Mawah: Lawrence Erlbaum & Associates.

Gqola, P. (2001). Defining people: analysing power, language and representation in metaphors of the New South Africa. *Transformation, 47*, 94-106.

Hall, D. (2004). *Subjectivity*. New York and London: Routledge and Taylor & Francis.

Hall, S. (1992a). The question of cultural identity. In S. Hall, D. Held & T. McGrew (Eds.), *Modernity and its futures* (pp. 273-316). Cambridge: Open University Press.

Hall, S. (1992b). New ethnicities. In J. Donald&A. Rattansi (Eds.),*'Race', Culture and Difference* (pp. 252-259). London: Sage & Open University Press.

Hall, S. (1996). Who needs identity? In S. Hall & P. d. Gay (Eds.), *Questions of cultural identity* (1-17). London: Sage.

Hall, S. (2001). Foucault: power, knowledge and discourse. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor & S.J. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse Theory & Practice: A Reader*(pp. 72-79). London: Sage.

Harvey,D. (1989). *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hoffman, E. (2004). *After such knowledge*. London: Vintage.

Hook, D.& Vrodljak, M.(2002). Gated communities, heterotopia and a 'rights' of privilege: A 'heterotopology' of the South African security-park. *Geoforum*, *33*, 195-219.

Hues, H. (2011). 'Mandela, the terrorist': Intended and hidden history curriculum in South Africa. *Journal of Educational Media, Memory, and Society*, *3*(2): 74-95.

Hull, G. & K. Schultz (Eds.) (2002).*School's out! Bridging out-of-school literacies with classroom practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Ignatieff, M. (2001). Introduction. In J. Edelstein. *Truth and Lies: Stories from the Truth and Reconciliation Commission in South Africa* (pp. 15-21). Johannesburg: M&G Books.

Jansen, J. (2004). Race and education after ten years. *Perspectives in Education, 22*(4), 117-128.

Jansen, J. (2009a). On the clash of martyrological memories. *Perspectives in Education*, *27*(2): 147-157.

Jansen, J. (2009b). *Knowledge in the blood: Confronting race and the apartheid past*. Cape Town & Stanford, California: UCT Press & Stanford University Press.

Jansen, J.& Weldon, G. (2009). Editorial: The pedagogical transaction in post-conflict societies. *Perspectives in Education*, *27*(2): 107-108.

Jayanthi, M., & Nelson, J. (2002). *An administrator's guide to using focus groups in schools*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press.

Jewitt, C.(2006). *Technology, Literacy and Learning: A Multimodal Approach*. London: Routledge.

Jones, A. (1989). The cultural production of classroom practice. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 10*(1), 19-31.

Jürgens, U., Gnad, M. and Bähr, J. (2003). New forms of class and racial segregation: Ghettos or ethnic enclaves? In R. Tomlinson, R.A. Beauregard,

L. Bremner & X. Mangcu (Eds.),*Emerging Johannesburg: Perspectives on the Post-Apartheid City* (pp. 56-70). New York & London: Routledge.

Keet, A., Zinn, D. & Porteus, K. (2009). Mutual vulnerability: A key principle in a humanising pedagogy in post-conflict societies. *Perspectives in Education*, *27*(2): 109-119.

Keith,M. (2005). *After the Cosmopolitan? Multicultural Cities and the Future of Racism*. London: Routledge.

Kenway, J. & Bullen,E. (2008). The global corporate curriculum and the young cyberflâneur as global citizen. In N. Dolby & F. Rizvi (Eds.),*Youth Moves: Identities and Education in Global Perspective* (pp. 17-32). New York and London: Routledge and Taylor & Francis.

Kincheloe, J.& McLaren, P. (2000). Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed; pp. 279-313). California: Sage.

Knobel, M., & Lankshear, C. (1999). *Ways of knowing: researching literacy*. Newtown, NSW: PETA.

Kress, G.(1993). Against arbitrariness: The social production of the sign as foundational issue in critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, *4*(2): 169-93.

Kress, G. (2000). Multimodality. In B. Cope & M. Kalantzis (Eds.),*Multiliteracies: LiteracyLearning and the Design of Social Futures* (pp. 182-202). South Yarra, Australia: Macmillan.

Kress, G.& Van Leeuwen, T.(1996). *Reading Images: The Grammar of Visual Design*. London: Routledge.

Kress, G.& Van Leeuwen, T.(2001). *Multimodal Discourses: The Modes and Media of Contemporary Communication.* London: Arnold.

Krog, A. (1999). The TRC and national unity. In R. Dorsman, H. Hartman & L. Noteboom-Kronemeijer (Eds.), *Truth and Reconciliation in South Africa and the Netherlands* (Vol. SIM Special No. 23, pp. 15-31). Utrecht: Netherlands Institute of Human Rights.

Laclau, E. (1990).*New reflections on the revolution of our time*. London: Verso.

Liebenberg, I., & Zegeye, A. (2001). The Truth and Reconciliation Commission in South Africa: Tentative implications drawn from public perceptions and contemporary debates. In A. Zegeye (Ed.), *Social identities in the New South Africa: after apartheid* (Vol. 1; pp. 321-331). Roggebaai, SA: Roggebaai and SA History Online.

Lillis, T. (2001). *Student writing: access, regulation, desire*. London: Routledge.

Lillis, T. (2008). Ethnography as method, methodology and 'deep theorizing': Closing the gap between text and context in academic writing research. *Written Communication*, *25*(3): 353-388.

Lomnitz, C. (2000). Nationalism as a Practical System: Benedict Anderson's Theory of Nationalism from the Vantage Point of Spanish America. In M. A. Centeno & F. Lopez-Alves (Eds.),*The Other Mirror: Grand Theory through the Lens of Latin America*. (Pp. 329-360). Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Luke, A., Kale, J.& Singh, M.G. (1995). Talking difference: Discourses in Aboriginal identity in Grade 1 classrooms. In D. Corson (Ed.),*Discourse and Power in Educational Organizations* (pp. 211-231). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Mamdani, M. (1999). The TRC and justice. In R. Dorsman, H. Hartman & L. Noteboom-Kronemeijer (Eds.), *Truth and reconciliation in South Africa and the Netherlands* (Vol. SIM Special No. 23, pp. 32-41). Utrecht: Studie- en Informatiecentrum.

Mansfield, N. (2000). *Subjectivity: theories of self from Freud to Haraway*. NY: New York University Press.

Maré, G. (2001). Race counts in contemporary South Africa: 'An illusion of ordinariness'. *Transformation, 47*, 75-93.

Martin-Jones, M.& de Meija, A. (2008). Introduction to Volume 3: Discourse and education. In M. Martin-Jones, A. de Meija & N. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopaedia of Language and Education, Vol. 3: Discourse and Education*(pp. xiii-xxxii)*.* New York: Springer.

Massey, D. (1998). The spatial construction of youth cultures. In T. Skelton & G. Valentine (Eds.), *Cool Places: Geographies of Youth Cultures* (pp. 121-129). London: Routlege.

Matlepeng, A. (2011). *Bommastandi of Alexandra township*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

Maybin, J. (1994). Childrens' voices: Talk, knowledge and identity. In D. Graddol, J. Maybin & B. Stierer (Eds.), *Researching Language and Literacy in Social Context* (pp. 131-150). Celvedon: Multilingual Matters.

Mbembe, A. (2004). *Re-imagining Townships*. Unpublished paper, WISER, University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

Mbembe, A., Dlamini, N.& Khunou, G. (2004). Soweto now. *Public Culture*, 16(3): 499-506.

Mbembe, A.& Nuttall, S. (2008). Introduction: Afropolis. In A. Mbembe & S. Nuttall (Eds.),*Johannesburg: The Elusive Metropolis*(pp. 1-33). Johannesburg: Wits University Press.

McCarthy, C., Rodriguez, A.P., Buendia, E., Meacham, S., David, S., Godina, H., et al. (1997). Danger in the safety zone: Notes on race, resentment, and the discourse of crime, violence and suburban security. *Cultural Studies*, *11*(2): 274-295.

McGregor, L. (2005) *Khabzela: The life and times of a South African*. Johannesburg: Jacana.

McHoul, A.& Grace, W. (1993). *Discourse, Power and the Subject*. New York: New York University Press.

McIntosh, P. 1988. White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming to see correspondences through work in women's studies. Working paper No. 189. Center for Research on Women, Wellesley College.

McKinney, C. (2004a). 'It's just a story': 'White' students' difficulties in reading the apartheid past. *Perspectives in Education, 22*(4), 37-45.

McKinney, C. (2004b). 'A little hard piece of grass in your shoe': Understanding student resistance to critical literacy in post-apartheid South Africa. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies, 22*(1 and 2), 63-73.

McKinney, C. (2007). Caught between the 'old' and the 'new'? Talking about 'race' in a post-apartheid university classroom. *Race, Ethnicity and Education, 10*(2), 215-231.

McKinney, C. (2009). What's cool at Girls' School: (Subverting) assimilation in a South African desegregated school. InM. Nkomo& S. Vandeyar (Eds.),*Thinking Diversity, Building Cohesion: A Transnational Dialogue on Education* (pp. 75-93). Amsterdam and Pretoria: Rozenberg Publishers & Unisa Press.

McKinney, C. (2010). Schooling in black and white: Assimilationist discourses and subversive identity performances in a desegregated South African girls' school. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *13*(2): 191-207.

McKinney, C. (2011). Asymmetrical relations of knowing: Pedagogy, discourse and identity in a de(re)segregated girls' school. *Journal of Education*, *51*, 29-51.

McKinney, C.& Soudien, C. (2007). Editorial: Language, Identity and English Education in South Africa. *English Academy Review*, *24*(2), 1-5.

McKinney, C.& van Pletzen, E. (2004). '...This apartheid story... we've finished with it': Student responses to the apartheid past in a South African English Studies course. *Teaching in Higher Education, 9*(2), 159-170.

McLeod, J.& Yates, L. (2006). *Making modern lives: Subjectivity, schooling and social change*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

McNay, L. (1994). *Foucault: A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Mda, T. (2004). Multilingualism and education. In L. Chisholm (Ed.), *Changing Class: Education and Social Change in Post-apartheid South Africa* (pp. 177-194). Cape Town: HSRC Press.

Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning Lessons: Social Organisation in the Classroom*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mercer, N. (2001). Language for teaching a language. In C.N. Candlin & N. Mercer (Eds.), *English Language Teaching in its Social Context: A Reader* (pp. 243-257). London: Routledge.

Moje, E.B. (2002). Re-framing adolescent literacy research for New Times: Studying youth as a resource. *Reading Research and Instruction*, 41(3): 211-228.

Moletsane, R., Hemson, C., & Muthukrishna, A. (2004). Educating South African teachers for the challenge of school integration: towards a teaching and research agenda.In M. Nkomo, C. McKinney & L. Chisholm (Eds.),*Reflections on school integration: Colloquium proceedings* (pp. 61-77). Cape Town: HSRC Press.

Moll, L., Amanti, C., Neffe, D. & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice*, *31*(2): 132-141.

Morely, D.& Robbins, K. (1995). *Spaces of Identity: Global Media, Electronic Landscapes and Cultural Boundaries*. London: Routledge.

Morris, M. (2004). *Every Step of the Way: The Journey to Freedom in South Africa*. Cape Town: HSRC Press.

Motsemme, N. (2003). Distinguishing beauty, creating distinctions: the politics and poetics of dress among young Black women. *Agenda*, *17*: 12-19.

Muller, S. (2001). Exploring the aesthetics of reconciliation: Rugby and the South African national anthem. *SAMUS*, *21*, 19-37.

Murphy, K. & Gallagher, T. (2009). Reconstruction after violence: how teachers and schools can deal with the legacy of the past. *Perspectives in Education*, *27*(2): 158-168.

Murray, N.(2004). Spatial (re)imaginings? Contesting township 'development post-apartheid. Paper presented at 'The Townships Now' Symposium, WISER, University of the Witwatersrand. Retrieved from http://www.lwandle.com/docs/noeleenarticle.pdf

Naidoo, J. P. (1996). *The racial integration of schools: a review of the literature on the experience in South Africa*. Education Policy Unit, University of Natal.

Ndimande, B.(2004). (Re)anglicising the kids: Contradictions of classroom discourse in post-apartheid South Africa. *Perspectives in Education*, *22*(4): 47-57.

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, 8*(1), 131-147.

Nielsen, L. (1998). Playing for real: performative texts and adolescent identities. In D.E. Alverman, K.A. Hinchman, D.W. Moore, S.F. Phelps & D. Waff (Eds.),*Reconceptualizing the Literacies in Adolescents' Lives*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Nkuna, L.(2006). 'Fitting-in' to a 'classy place': The Zone and youth identity. In P. Alexander, M. Dawson & M. Ichharam (Eds.), *Globalization and new identities: view from the middle*(pp. 261-274). Johannesburg: Jacana.

Nuttall, S.(2004). Stylizing the self: the Y Generation in Rosebank, Johannesburg. *Public Culture*, 16(3): 430-452.

Nuttall, S.(2008). Youth cultures of consumption in Johannesburg. In N. Dolby & F. Rizvi (Eds.),*Youth Moves: Identities and Education in Global Perspective* (pp. 151-177). New York and London: Routledge and Taylor & Francis.

Nuttall, S.& Michael, C.(2000). Imagining the present. In S. Nuttall & C. Michaels (Eds.), *Senses of Culture: South African Culture Studies* (pp. 1-23). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Omi, M.& Winant H. (2005). The theoretical status of the concept of race. In C. McCarthy, W. Crichlow, G. Dimitriadis&N. Dolby (Eds.),*Race, Identity and Representation in Education*. (2nd ed; pp. 3-12). New York and London: Routledge and Taylor & Francis.

Orfiled, G. (2004). The American experience: Desegregation, integration, resegregation. In M. Nkomo, C. McKinney & L. Chisholm (Eds.),*Reflections on school integration: Colloquium proceedings* (pp. 95-124). Cape Town: HSRC Press.

Pahl, K. & Rowsell, J. (Eds.) (2006). *Travel Notes from the New Literacy Studies*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Parlevliet, M. (1999). Introduction. In R. Dorsman, H. Hartman & L. Noteboom-Kronemeijer (Eds.), *Truth and Reconciliation in South Africa and the Netherlands* (Vol. SIM Special No. 23, pp. 15-31). Utrecht: Netherlands Institute of Human Rights.

Pennycook, A. (1995). Incommensurable discourses? *Applied Linguistics, 15*(2), 115-138.

Pieterse, J. N. (1992). *White on Black: Images of Africa and Blacks in Western Popular Culture.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Posel, D.(1983).Rethinking the 'race-class debate' in South African historiography. *Social Dynamics*, *9*(1): 50-66.

Posel, D. (2001). Race as common sense: Racial classification in twentieth-century South Africa. *African Studies Review, 44*(2), 87-113.

Posel, D., Hyslop, J.& Nieftagodien, N. (2001). Editorial: Debating 'race' in South African scholarship. *Transformation47*, i-xviii.

Posel, D., & Simpson, G. (Eds.). (2002). *Commissioning the past: understanding South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission*. Johannesburg: Wits University Press.

Quaynor, L.J.(2011). Citizenship education in post-conflict contexts: A review of the literature. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, *7*(1): 33-57.

Rizvi, F.(2005). International education and the production of cosmopolitan identities. In A. Arimoto, F. Huang & K. Yokoyama (Eds.), *Globalization and Higher Education* (pp. 77-92). Hiroshima University, Research Institute for Higher Education, International Publications Series No. 9.

Robson, C. (1993). *Real world research: a resource for social scientists and practitioner researchers*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Rose,G. (2001).*Visual Methodologies*. London: Sage.

Salomon, G.& Nevo, B. (Eds.). (2002). *Peace education: the concept, principles and practices around the world.* London: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Sarup, M. (1993). *An introductory guide to post-structuralism and postmodernism* (2nd ed.). Athens: University of Georgia Press.

Schaafsma, D. (1998). Performing the self: constructing written and curricular fictions. In T. Popkewitz & M. Brennan (Eds.), *Foucault's challenge: discourse, knowledge, and power in education* (pp. 255-277). New York: Teachers College Press.

Schegloff, E.A.(1999). Schegloff's texts as Billig's data: A critical reply. *Discourse & Society*, *10*: 558-570.

Schrieff, L., Tredoux, C., Dixon, J.& Finchilescu, G. (2005). Patterns of racial segregation in university residence halls. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 35(3): 433-443.

Seekings, J.& Nattrass, N.(2006).*Class, Race, and Inequality in South Africa*. Scottsville: University of Kwazulu-Natal Press.

Sharp, J. (1988). Introduction: Constructing social reality. In E. Boonzaier & J. Sharp (Eds.), *South African Keywords: The Uses and Abuses of Political Concepts* (pp. 1-16). Cape Town: David Philip.

Shepherd, N.& Murray, N.(2007). Introduction: Space, memory and identity in the post-apartheid city. In N. Shepherd & N. Murray (Eds.),*Desire Lines: Space, Memory and Identity in the Post-Apartheid City* (pp. 1-18). London & New York: Routledge and Taylor & Francis.

Silverman, D. (2000). *Doing qualitative research: a practical handbook*. London: Sage.

Simon, R. (1992). *Teaching against the grain: Texts for a pedagogy of possibility*. NY: Bergin & Garvy.

Simpson, G. (2002). 'Tell no lies, claim no easy victories': A brief evaluation of South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission. In D. Posel & G. Simpson (Eds.). *Commissioning the Past: Understanding South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission* (pp. 220-251). Johannesburg, South Africa: Wits University Press.

Sinclair, J. M., & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an Analysis of Discourse: The English used by Teachers and Pupils*. London: Oxford University Press.

Singh, M. (1997). Identity in the making. *South African Journal of Philosophy, 16*(3).

Skeggs, B. (2008). The problem with identity. In A. Lin (Ed.), *Problematizing Identity: Everyday struggles in language, culture and identity* (pp. 11-34). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Skelton, T. & Valentine, G. (Eds.) *Cool Places: Geographies of Youth Cultures*. London: Routlege.

Soudien, C. (1998). 'We know why we're here': The experience of African children in a 'coloured' school in Cape Town, South Africa. *Race, Ethnicity and Education, 1*(1), 7-29.

Soudien, C. (2001). Certainty and ambiguity in youth identities in South Africa: Discourses in transition. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 22*(3), 311-326.

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 changed in post-apartheid South Africa* (pp. 89-114). Cape Town: HSRC.

Soudien, C. (2007a). The asymmetries of contact: an assessment of 30 years of school integration in South Africa. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, *10*(4), 439-456.

Soudien, C. (2007b). *Youth Identity in Contemporary South Africa: Race, Culture and Schooling.* Claremont, SA: New Africa Books.

Soudien, C. (2010). The reconstitution of privilege: integration in former white schools in South Africa. *Journal of Social Issues*, *66*(2): 352-366.

Soudien, C. (2011). Opening address. Mobility Language Literacy Conference, University of Cape Town, Cape Town.

Soudien, C. (2012). *Realising the Dream: Unlearning the Logic of Race in the South African School.* Cape Town: HSRC Press.

Soudien, C.& Sayed, Y. (2003). Integrating South African schools? Some preliminary findings. *IDS Bulletin, 34*(1), 29-42.

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), 101-115.

Spivak, G. (1987). *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics*. New York: Methuen.

Stake, R. (2000). Case studies. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 435-454). California: Sage.

Stein, P. (2008). *Multimodal Pedagogies in Diverse Classrooms: Representation, Rights and Resources*. London and New York: Routledge and Taylor & Francis.

Steyn, M. (2001). *'Whiteness just isn't what it used to be': White Identity in a Changing South Africa.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Steyn, M. (2003). *White talk: White South Africans and the strategic management of diasporic whiteness*. Unpublished doctoralthesis, University of Cape Town, Cape Town.

Steyn, M. (2005). 'White talk': white South Africans and the management of diasporic whiteness. In A. López (Ed.),*Postcolonial Whiteness: A Critical Reader on Race and Empire* (pp. 119-135). Albany: State University of New York Press.

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

Steyn, M. (2012). The ignorance contract: Recollections of apartheid childhoods and the construction of epistemologies of ignorance. *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power*, 19(1): 8-25.

Storey, J. (2003).*Inventing Popular Culture*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Storey, J. (2012). *Cultural Theory and Popular Culture*. (6th ed.). Essex, England: Pearson.

Sujee, M. (2004). *Deracialisation of Gauteng schools - a quantitative analysis.* Paper presented at the Reflections of school integration, Johannesburg.

Swann, J. (1994). Observing and recording talk in educational settings. In D. Graddol, J. Maybin & B. Stierer (Eds.), *Researching language and literacy in social contexts* (pp.26-48). Clevedon: Open University Press.

Thornton, R. (1988). Culture: A contemporary definition. In E. Boonzaier & J. Sharp (Eds.). *South African Keywords: The Uses and Abuses of Political Concepts* (pp. 17-28). Cape Town: David Philip.

Tomlinson, J.(2007). Cultural globalization. In G. Ritzer (Ed.), *The Blackwell Companionn to Globalization*(pp. 352-366). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Tortsi, P. (2009). People's attitudes versus politics: segregated education in post-war Bosnia and Herzegovina. *Perspectives in Education*, *27*(2): 190-198.

Tredoux, C., Dixon, J., Underwood, S., Nunez, D. & Finchilescu, G. (2005). Preserving spatial and temporal dimensions in observational data of segregation. *South African Journal of Psychology*, *35*(3): 412-432.

Twine, F.W.& Gallagher, C. (2008). The future of whiteness: A map of the 'third wave'. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *31*(1): 4-24.

Unterhalter, E., Epstein, D., Morrell, R., & Moletsane, R. (2004). Be yourself: Class, race, gender and sexuality in South African schoolchildren's accounts of social relations. *Pedagogy, Culture and Society, 12*(1), 53-72.

Van der Westhuizen, C. (2007). *White Power and the Rise and Fall of the National Party*. Cape Town, South Africa: Zebra Press.

Van Wyk, C.(2004). *Shirley, Goodness and Mercy*: *A childhood memoir*. Northlands, South Africa: Picador.

Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *30*(6): 1024-1054.

Walker, M. (2005a). Race is nowhere and race is everywhere: Narratives from black and white South African university students in post-apartheid South Africa. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 26*(1), 41-54.

Walker, M. (2005b). Rainbow nation or new racism? Theorizing race and identity formation in South African higher education. *Race, Ethnicity and Education, 8*(2), 129-146.

Walkerdine, V. (1990). *Schoolgirl fictions*. London & New York: Verso.

Weedon, C. (1997). *Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.

Weedon, C. (2004). *Identity and culture: narratives of difference and belonging*. Berkshire: Open University Press.

Weldon, G. (2009). Memory, identity and the politics of curriculum construction in transition societies. *Perspectives in Education*, *27*(2): 177-189.

West, C.(2002). Peeling an onion: A critical comment on 'Competing discourses'. *Discourse & Society*, *13*(6): 843-851.

Wetherell M. (1998). Positioning and interpretative repertoires: Conversation analysis and post-structuralism in dialogue. *Discourse & Society*, *9*(3): 387-412.

Wiebe, E., Durepos, G.& Mills, A.J. (Eds.).(2009).*Encyclopedia of Case Study Research, Vol 2.*Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Wolpe, H. (1988). *Race, Class and the Apartheid State*. Paris: UNESCO.

Yin, R.K.(2009).*Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Zegeye, A. (2001). Imposed ethnicity. In A. Zegeye (Ed.),*Social Identities in the New South Africa: After Apartheid, Vol. 1* (pp. 1-23). Cape Town: Kwela Books.

Zembylas, M., Bekerman, Z., McGlynn, C., & Ferreira, A. (2009). Teachers' understandings of reconciliation and inclusion in mixed schools of four troubled societies. *Research in Comparative and International Education, 4*(4).

Zembylas, M., & Ferreira, A. (2009). Identity formation and affective spaces in conflict ridden societies: Inventing heterotopic possibilities. *Journal of Peace Education, 6*(1), 1-18.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A (1-5):	Teaching intervention materials	ii-xi
APPENDIX B (1-4):	Data gathering tools	xii-xvi
APPENDIX C:	Youth posters, Site 1	xvii-xxiv
APPENDIX D:	Youth posters, Site 2	xxv-xxxi
APPENDIX E (1-5):	Tables for coding of poster analysis	xxxii-xxxviii
APPENDIX F (1-5):	Summaries of participation in classroom talk	xxxix-xliii

LESSON 1	**WHO ARE YOU?** *Part 1* Teacher to lead a discussion on identity, asking students to think about who they are, how they see themselves and how (whether?) they see themselves as young South Africans. General discussion could be broken up to include pair/small-group discussion. Examples of possible discussion questions: • Who are you? How do you see yourself? What makes up your identity? • How would you describe being South African, or being a South African teenager? • What makes us 'South African'? Is there a collective South African identity? • **What is it like to be a teenager in South Africa in 2008? Are you a typical South African teenager?** (Is there such a thing?) **Who are you? Who are you here and now?** (Would you be different if you were somewhere else?) *Part 2* This discussion to be followed by the first piece of journal writing. Students to respond to the last question above in their journals.This writing should be started in class and **finished for homework** for the next lesson.
LESSON 2	**INTRODUCING THE TRC** [student handout: see Appendix A2] Teacher to begin a discussion on the TRC, eliciting any previous knowledge / remote ideas / misconceptions students may have before handing out the double-page TRC sheet. The exploration of this worksheet can form the basis of this lesson, with additional input from the teacher and students. What could be foregrounded in this discussion are the reasons for having such a commission and the wide range of attitudes and perspectives towards it. There have also been some recent films on the TRC – *Forgiveness* (Gabriel, 2004); *Red Dust* (Hooper, 2004); and *In My Country* (Boorman, 2004). Perhaps students have seen some of them and can comment on them and the perspectives they seem to adopt. If the discussion does not take off, the teacher could have one or two of the many TRC narratives up her/his sleeve to relate to the students.
LESSON 3	**TRC INTERVIEWS: TASK BRIEFING** [student handout: see Appendix A3] Teacher to brief students on the interviews, talking through the written student brief. Focus: on the TRC's social impact, on ordinary people's understandings and perceptions of the TRC – not on the TRC as a historical event where facts and figures are prioritised. The aim is gather a variety of perspectives from ordinary people. The questions are pre-set so that students can return to class and compare their findings. Students should each do two interviews and they should attempt to select two adults who are likely to have different perspectives (e.g. very different in age, career, gender, race, etc.). The need to be professional about requesting people's permission to interview them and sensitive to their responses should be stressed.
Break in teaching of unit: students need a few days to gather their interviews, preferably including a weekend.	
LESSON 4 (double period, if possible)	**STUDENTS REPORTING ON THEIR INTERVIEWS** *Part 1* Teacher to initiate a discussion where students share their interview experiences collectively. This could start in pairs/small groups before becoming a general discussion. The aim is to get a discussion going where students are comparing their different responses from their interviewees, voicing their opinions and feelings about what they found out. Ideally key issues and themes around reconciliation should emerge spontaneously through interaction among the students. If the discussion dries up quickly, students findings could be discussed in relation to the perspectives provided on the TRC handout (Are they similar? Different? Contradictory?); or if

	students struggled to access interviewees who had something to say/interesting perspectives, they could attempt to say why they think this is so, and what might they have needed to do to access a broader range of perspectives. Conversely, if students feel they didn't get a chance to speak or voice their opinions, they could be directed to do so in their journals before proceeding with the following task. *Part 2* Students to respond in their journal to the following question: • **How is this relevant to the present? To my generation? To me?** This writing should be started in class and **finished for homework** for the next lesson.
LESSON 5	**LINKING TO THE PRESENT**[student handout: see Appendix A4] Teacher to begin a discussion around the journal question that was responded to for homework, asking students to share their opinions on it: What relevance does this (the TRC/SA's past) have at this point in time, to these particular students, to this particular generation? This would then move into a discussion of how these students see themselves and their generation. At some point in this discussion the handout with different representations of today's youth should be distributed and discussed. Focus: most (all?) of the portrayals/comments on today's youth are made from the perspectives of adults (or 'outsiders'). As 'insiders', how do students feel about the accuracy / fairness of these representations? What issues may have been left out? In particular, how do they respond to the texts that comment on their attitudes to recent SA history and current politics (i.e. *Madam&Eve*, Zapiro, 'Educ for all' and some of the headlines on p. 3)?
LESSON 6	**REPRESENTING TODAY'S GENERATION: TASK BRIEFING** [student handout: see Appendix A5] Teacher to brief students on their A3 representation of being teenagers in South Africa now, working through the written student brief. Students will work in pairs to put together a multimodal piece of work which speaks to both of their perspectives – allowing them to convey differences between them if necessary. Focus: using this page to 'talk to' a future generation of South African teenagers to give them some sense of what it was like to be a young person in South Africa nowadays. The idea of collating the pages into a book that will work as a sort of 'time capsule' should be emphasised. Students should be encouraged to use the space of the page in ways that enhance the 'message' they wish to convey. They need to use a combination of words and images, or even objects (within reason!). Handout C should have signalled that music, clothes, politics, etc. are all suitable issues for their youth page but they need to be encouraged to think beyond these issues and not to allow Handout C to limit what they can work with. Once students are fully briefed, the rest of the lesson can be used to start working in their pairs.
Students need a couple of days to design their representations. Perhaps they can be given class time to work together in pairs.	
LESSON 7 & 8	**STUDENTS PRESENT THEIR DESIGNS TO THE CLASS** Students to place their designs/representations on display in the classroom. Each pair to explain to the class why they chose to design their poster/page in the way that they did.
LESSON 9	**FINAL PIECE OF JOURNAL WRITING** Teacher to provide students with a final question to respond to in their journals. *What has this TRC/youth identity project meant to you? Do you think there would be any value in doing such a project with future generations? Explain your reasoning.* [Answers in prose form, a min. of two paragraphs.] Students to be encouraged to think deeply and really explore how they respond to this – and they should be reminded that there are no right or wrong responses but that their responses can only really be taken seriously if they provide reasons for why they think and feel the way that they do. Journal entry to be handed in to the teacher the next day.

THE
Truth
&
Reconciliation
Commission
MAIL&GUARDIAN
The half-truth commission
Everyone loses in rugby row
Mokaba: Of politics and perms
Cathartic at truth hearings
Theatre of pain and catharsis
[M&G, April 1996]
[Pieter-Dirk Uys M&G, March 1996]
'The arteries of our past bleed'
Truth trickle becomes a flood
Voice after voice; account after account — the four tenets of the truth commission hearings were like prodding on a raw nerve, like pressing on a bruise, like feeling a huge track breaking wave. Again wave on the window, and one can't overlake, and one one can't see; and one can't lessen speed or stop, because then one will never progress
[A. Krog in M&G, May 1996]
If it was a momentous event: the two sides of a long, bitter war explaining why they had shed so much blood. But the gaps were as telling as the evidence
• More reconciliation than truth – pages 6&7
• FW says: 'Ag, I'm sort of sorry' – page 26
M&G front page, August 1996
Reconciliation between victims and perpetrators is not enough. For social transformation to take place, reconciliation has to be between victims and beneficiaries. That is the challenge facing South Africa today.
Pumla Gobodo-Madikizela
(TRC psychologist) 2001
If the wounds of the past are to be healed, if a multiplicity of legal actions are to be avoided, if future human rights violations are to be avoided and indeed if we are to successfully initiate the building of a human rights culture, then disclosure of the truth and its acknowledgement are essential. We cannot forgive on behalf of victims, nor do we have the moral right to do so. … The fundamental issue for all South Africans is therefore to come to terms with our past on the only moral basis possible, namely that the truth be told and that the truth be acknowledged.
Dullah Omar, 1994
How could we report the police to the police? 9 — Elizabeth Hanhs, widow of Sipho Hanris, who disappeared on his way to the airport in Port Elizabeth 10 years ago. Hanris' killers confessed after reporting an attack on her house
His brain was plucked out, his tongue pulled, his fingers cut, his calf bitten by a dog and there were wounds all over his body. 9
Nomonde Calata, widow of Fort Calata, describing her husband's body, after he was killed with Matthew Goniwe and two other Cradock community leaders on the way back from a meeting in July 1985
Rabbi Harris, a man known to respond adversely when he felt his authority was being challenged, who at times reacted angrily to perceived criticism, could nonetheless say before the Truth and Reconciliation Commission: "The Jewish community benefited from apartheid and an apology must be given … We ask for forgiveness."
M&G online, 17 September, 2005
"Joyce Mtimkulu, who discovered that her son, Siphiwo, had been shot and detained, poisoned by the security police, released, kidnapped again and finally killed, seemed to speak for many when she told me, after listening to the testimonies of those responsible, 'at least now we know what happened'".
Jillian Edelstein, TRC photographer, 2001
"I still don't really know what has been achieved by the Truth Commission. I'm not really happy … because I think some of the answers are not there."
Antoinette Sithole, Oct 1998
"An American friend said after a recent trip to South Africa that it is impossible to find any whites who supported apartheid. This represents the major challenge for racial reconciliation: for a true transformation to take place in South African society, victims, perpetrators and bystanders alike must acknowledge the past."
Pumla Gobodo-Madikizela (TRC psychologist) 2001
South Africa's truth and reconciliation process is actually a mini-theory about the process of achieving democracy:
Amnesty → Truth → Reconciliation → Democratization
(Gibson, 2004)
In time to come, when whites are emigrating and there is grumbling in the suburban gardens that the country is going to hell, when they are tempted to say: the old days weren't so bad, just maybe, the words will die in their throats. Because the Truth Commission had rendered some lies about the past simply impossible to repeat.
Michael Ignatieff (historian) 2001
"It was strange to come face to face with a man like Dirk Coetzee, whose actions epitomized the atrocities of the apartheid regime, and there he was all smiling and sweet and charming, offering me English Breakfast tea with his gun strapped to his wrist. Good and evil are simple concepts, but they can wear all kinds of disguises."
Jillian Edelstein, TRC photographer, 2001
I continue to be puzzled at why so many South Africans still do not significance the historic TRC. If we had chats, and sent of the TRC war crime tribunals and their route of of apartheid politicians and their dozens to jail, we by and stability we foot soldiers had the peace, if we had chosen not have enjoying right now are enjoying a general amnesty and declare levels of black ignorance to decide the past, the never have subsided. resentment would rage.
Max du Preez, The Star, 30 June 2005
We are charged to unearth the truth about our dark past: to lay the ghosts of that past so that they may not return to haunt us.
"Truth is good, but not all truth is good to say"
African proverb

1994
SA'S FIRST NON-RACIAL DEMOCRATIC ELECTIONS
President: Nelson Mandela
Deputies: FW de Klerk, Thabo Mbeki
1995
THE TRC IS ESTABLISHED
1996
April: Hearings begin
1998
July: TRC officially ends its work
2003
Final reports from TRC tabled in parliament
Here & Now 2008
...the need for understanding but not for vengeance, need for reparation, but not for retaliation, a need for ubuntu but not for victimisation.
written into the Constitution
STRUCTURE
The TRC consisted of 3 committees
The Human Rights Violations Committee
The Amnesty Committee
The Reparations & Rehabilitations Committee
MANDATE
The mandate of the TRC was to establish as complete a picture as possible of the causes, nature and extent of gross violations, killing, abductions, torture and severe mistreatments carried out between 1 March 1960 and 10 May 1994.
Its overriding goal was to promote national unity and reconciliation.
THE PROCESS
There were three phases of the process: first, the victims testified at vast public hearings carried on South African television and radio; then there were amnesty hearings in which perpetrators testified and were cross examined in order to receive amnesty; finally there were specific sectoral hearings, on the judiciary, business, the media.
During the life of the Commission, Commissioners and staff travelled the length and breadth of South Africa. Hearings were held in rural towns and urban cities – in small church halls and large, dignified city halls, in the offices of NGOs, school classrooms, town halls and magistrates' courts. Sometimes attendance was quite small – an intimate community huddled together in grief and memory. On other occasions, halls have been packed to overflowing.
LISTENING
Above all, the Commission tried to listen, really to listen – not passively but actively – to voices that for so long had been stilled. And as it listened to the stories of horror, of pathos and of tragic proportion, it became aware again of the high cost that has been paid by so many for freedom. Commissioners were almost overwhelmed by the capacity of human beings to damage and destroy each other. They were also listened, too, to stories of great courage, concluding often with an astonishing generosity of spirit, from those who had for so long carried the burden of loss and tragedy. It was often a deeply humbling experience.
[TRC Report, vol. 5, 1998]
TRC COMMISSIONERS
Archbishop Desmond Tutu was appointed chairperson of the TRC and Alex Boraine was his deputy. Another 17 commissioners were also appointed, including lawyers, clerics and academics.
Dec 1997: Winnie Madikizela-Mandela, giving evidence for the first time to a Commission hearing, describes evidence against her as 'ludicrous' and says the Commission is a 'mud-slinging exercise'.
March 1998: In testimony on the death of black leader Steve Biko in 1977, police officers who interrogated him admit they beat him but still say his death was an accident.
A day before the TRC report is published , FW de Klerk wins a court action forcing the TRC to remove a section of the report which implicates him in a series of bombings.
Just hours before the final report is to be published, the ANC fails in a court bid to prevent its publication.
Some facts & figures
The TRC process lasted 7 years and cost R70 million
More than 21 000 victims' statements were taken, relating to some 38 000 incidents and to the killing of 14 000 people.
7 127 applications for amnesty were received, of which only 1 146 were granted
All victims are getting a once-off payment of R30 000.
ONCE-ONLY OFFER!!
AMNESTY
BLOODSTAINS IN YOUR CLOSET?
GET AMNESTY
(YOU'D BE CRAZY NOT TO!!)
but only after you've died!!
GET YOUR HEAD OUT OF THE SAND!
JOIN PROJECTS
In detention by Chris van Wyk
He fell himself
He slipped on a piece of soap while washing
He hanged himself
He slipped on a piece of soap while washing
He slipped from the ninth floor
He fell himself while washing
He slipped himself ninth floor
He slipped from the ninth floor while washing
He hung from the ninth floor while slipping
He slipped on a piece of soap
He fell from the ninth floor while slipping
He washed from the ninth floor while washing
He washed from the ninth floor
He hung from a piece of soap while washing
PASSES AND PERMITS FOR 51 A DAY
FROM 26TH OF JUNE
IN THE WORLD
MAYDAY IS OURS!
BIKO AND SOLIDARITY
OUR students
OUR teachers
SIPHIWO MTIMKULU
STUDENT LEADER
MISSING

Finding out about the TRC: gathering interviews

Interview two different adults from your community or social network in order to find out their memories of the TRC and their attitudes towards the commission and its work. Use the questions below to structure your interview although, as you interact with each of your interviewees, you are likely to ask additional questions in response to what they tell you.

1. What do you think the TRC was about? What do you think it was for? What do you think it was trying to achieve?

2. How did you find out about the TRC? How did you get to know about it? How did you become aware that it was in progress?


Interview protocol: Transparency, permission and convenience are important. Explain to the person whom you would like to interview that we are looking at the TRC at school. Since you and your classmates were only about 3 or 4 years old at the time, you have no memories of your own to draw on and this is why you need to speak to some adults about it. Check if the person is prepared to be interviewed by you. Check if this would be a convenient time for the person to be interviewed, or schedule another time. Explain to your interviewee that you may be making some written notes while s/he speaks, or ask permission to record them. Ask your interviewee how s/he wants you to refer to her/him. Make a note of the date and place of the interview.

After each interview: Go back to your scribbled notes and add as much as possible that you didn't take down but can still remember. Include details such as pauses and silences, tone of voice, general responses and behaviour of your interviewee as well as your own responses and reactions. For each interview, write up a report to be handed in.

In class: You will also report back to the class on your interviews, saying who you interviewed, explaining what you found out about the TRC from your interviewees and how you experienced your interviews.



"today's youth..."



May 5 to 11 2006

Salim Vally and **Mandla Seleoane** discuss the complex legacy of the Soweto Uprising 30 years ago

Educate for justice


SV: I was 16 years old and most of the participants were my age or slightly older. There was no clear ideological line. Some vaguely talked about the civil rights movement in the United States, the Vietnamese struggle and Che Guevara. We were more concerned about taking the struggle forward. In hindsight, there were a few striking issues that come to mind. The lack of personality cults and how, despite the terrible divisions wrought by apartheid policies, the participants from different townships had a common identity. By contrast, today, the attempts to foist a national identity from above or through the advertising industry seem so artificial. The experiences 30 years ago have convinced me of the view that identity is not derived from some common ethnic, colour or language property, but rather the praxis of citizens who actively pursue their rights. There were a significant number of young women who were present. Yet, the mood was such that any hint of sexual harassment would have been considered completely outlandish and would have been met with a firm and collective response.


MS: Your point about the advertising industry calls to attention the question whether latter-day "celebrations" of the uprising really capture the spirit of the day. Lately, to get people to these events you have to have a "bash" or a party, you have to bring popular musicians, you attract people on the basis of the funds you command. It leaves me uncomfortable — it appears almost like bribing people.

SV: I understand that the American artist, Snoop Dogg, was meant to be the star attraction at one of the Freedom Day celebrations last week. One wonders whether anyone checked his sexist and chauvinist lyrics, or whether his version of freedom is the one in Iraq courtesy of Pax Americana? Of course, our point is that the fact that you have music is not the issue. Neither does one want to argue that commemorations must be a sombre affair. But what social message comes across? A few years back, the independent social movements together with the Education Rights Project organised a march that retraced the original 1976 march, stopping at places where students were known to have been killed and re-enacted this. During the course of the march, to our horror, we saw people stumbling away drunk from the "official" celebration at Orlando Stadium. Do you remember how for many years we braved the tear gas and armed cordons around key commemoration sites like Regina Mundi? Once divisions between BC and pro-ANC organisations became more hostile, joint commemorations ended and rival ones competed for attention. Many people were alienated from attending because often these events became an occasion to hurl abuse at rival organisations. Commodification interspersed with long self-congratulatory messages from politicians seems to be the hallmarks of the commemorations today.

MS: It seems to me the sense of purpose we had about what the commemoration was about is being lost. I remember the disgust we felt when the commemoration in Mmabatho in 1995 was marked by fighting between fans, many of whom were hospitalised. They came to a pop concert. It is important to preserve our history in order to move forward in a meaningful way. If we lose the meaning of days like June 16 then it begins to explain the many things we see in our society today, especially in relation to many of our youth.

SV: June 16 2007 brought to you by Coca-Cola? The rapid MacDonaldisation of our culture is quite apparent. I guess there is constant tension between the values of cooperation, of solidarity that existed among many of the generation of 1976, and the dominant values of the market today.



Oscar- nominert og vinner av publikumsprisen
i Toronto, Los Angeles og Edinburgh
Vi velger ikke vårt
liv begynnelse og slutt,
men i øyeblikket i mellom
kan vi velge hvem vi skal være.
Tsotsi
[sot-si] Røver. Gangster. Bølle.


Dick likes Jane.
Jane likes Dick.
Dick has no condom.
See Jane run.
the young designers emporium


KIDS THESE DAYS
BY DOME


MAKGOA ANA A TENA WA TSEBA!
E, ME JUALE BA SE BA LEKA HORE NKELA DITEKESI TSA RONA.
BA TLAMEHILE HO TSEBA DIPLEKE TSA BONA?
HAONA NNETE E FETANG EO!
TSHWARELO BO MME KE KOPA LE SUTE KE THEOHA MOO.
#1
#2
#3
1) YOU KNOW THESE WHITE PEOPLE ARE ANNOYING.
2) I KNOW! NOW THEY ARE TRYING TO TAKE OVER OUR TAXES
1) SOMEONE SHOULD PUT THEM IN THEIR PLACE!
2) THAT IS VERY TRUE!
1) SORRY LADIES, CAN YOU PLEASE MOVE, I'M GETTING OFF HERE.


1976
WANTED BY THE STATE
FIERY YOUTH LEADERS
2004
RAVE TONITE
WANTED BY THE STATE: FIERY YOUTH LEADERS
ZAPIRO


Coconut
a novel
KOPANO MATLWA
Winner of the European Union Literary Award

8 *Mail&Guardian* April 28 to May 4 2006

Born free

Tomorrow people eye SA

Have our children been changed by 12 years of democracy? **Kwanele Sosibo**, **Monako Dibetle** and **Niren Tolsi** report

The more children we spoke to, the more certain general attitudes emerged. The most clear-cut was a widespread lack of interest in politics, a belief in racial equality, adoration of the United States and admiration of Nelson Mandela.

JULY 2 2006 www.sundaytimes.co.za

Born-frees embrace struggle chic

They aspire to Model C accents — but they also remember the heroes of liberation, writes **Futhi Ntshingila**

for a better life. A recent study by the International Marketing Council (IMC) of SA has found that posh Model C accents and fancy cars are symbols of upward mobility among South African youth.

Though the study encompassed youth of all races, the issue of accents was raised by blacks.

Youngsters, many of whom were too young to have witnessed the release of Mandela in 1990, have not forgotten the freedom fighters who paved the way for them to enjoy the fruits of liberation.

Mail&Guardian **FRIDAY** May 25 to 31 2007

Colour-coded clubbing: Apartheid on the dance floor

Youth have plenty to say about politics

I SPENT a lot of time this week with people in their 20s and I was amazed at how passionate they are about the dismal state of politics in this country.

THE WEEKENDER

SATURDAY-SUNDAY, DECEMBER 1-2 2007



REHANA ROSSOUW



It's about pride ... why can't we all be South Africans without having to qualify the fact by mentioning our skin colour or where we come from, asks the writer.

The Star ... Friday December 12 2003

Mail&Guardian February 16 to 22 2007

The De la Rey uprising

A song about a long-dead general is uniting alienated Afrikaners, old and young

Stirring lyrics

On a mountain in the night
we lie in the darkness and wait
In the mud and blood I lie cold,
grain bag and rain cling to me

And my house and my farm
burned to ashes,
so that they could catch us
But those flames and that fire
burn now deep, deep within me


Chorus:
De la Rey, De la Rey
Will you come to lead the Boers?
De la Rey, De la Rey
General, General, as one man
we'll fall in around you
General De la Rey


And the Khakis that laugh, a
handful of us against their whole
great might,
with the cliffs to our backs, they
think it's all over


But the heart of the Boer lies
deeper and wider,
that they'll still discover
At a gallop he comes, the Lion of
the West Transvaal


Because my wife and my child are
perishing in a concentration camp,
and the Khakis' reprisal is poured
over a nation that will rise up again


General De la Rey
De la Rey, De la Rey
Will you come for the Boers?
We are ready




SL PROMOTION
There is light...
IT'S COMING TO THAT TIME OF YEAR when you know you should have enrolled to study something and varsity cut-off dates are looming...
But no worries, you can still apply to Wits University up until 30 September 2002 and ensure your future looks bright.
Contact The Student Enrolment Centre on (011) 717 1030 or get all the info online.
www.wits.ac.za
Wits gives you the edge.


DIESEL
THE GLOBAL DIESEL INDIVIDUALS MARKET RESEARCH
Diesel Individuals Erogenous Zone Chart
14% lips
13% earlobe
15% nipples
3% wrist
8% hips
22% rear end
17% behind the knee
10% big toe


THIS
vodacom
THIS
sovlet
and THIS
CORSA
WANNA GETCHA HANDS ON CRUCIAL STUFF REAL SOON?
ENROL BEFORE DECEMBER 4 AND WIN IT ALL!
REAL LIFE STARTS NOW!
Damelin
CAMPUS
www.damelincampus.co.za


MY CULTURE IS NOT A TOURIST ATTRACTION
Wish you were here
Levi's
501
STAY TRUE
www.levi.co.za

What is your sense of what it's like to be a young person in South Africa in 2008?

Working with a partner, use the A3 page you are given to represent what it's like for you being a young person in South Africa today.

Your representation should give the next generation of teenagers an idea of what it is like to be a teenager in South Africa nowadays.

You and your partner need to think deeply about what you want your page to be like... How can you get it to capture what your life is all about, what's important to you and ***what's particular about being part of the current generation of South African youth****? What counts as your world? How relevant is the past? What aspirations do you have for the future?*

¿¡¿¡ How are you going to represent this on a single page !?!?

You can use the space of your page in any way that you like but must use both words and images. Take some time to plan your page, thinking about how you will use visuals and writing to represent your world, your ideas and your feelings and attitudes. **How will you do this so that your page 'speaks' for both of you to the next generation of South African teenagers?** You can hand-write, type or cut out words from newspapers or magazines; you can draw, use photographs, cut-out pictures or digital designs.

Presenting your page: Each pair will present their page to the class and get a chance to explain why they chose to design their page in the way that they have.

Schedule for pre-intervention teacher interview

Introductory discussion to elicit relevant biographical information and teaching history.

On pedagogy:

1. How do you see your role as an English teacher?

2. What are your preferred teaching strategies? Why?
   What are some of the ways you have of engaging students in the lesson at hand?

3. You've been teaching for almost [x number of] years. Have you needed to adjust your teaching style over this time? Why / why not?

On student identity:

4. Is it important for your teaching that you know who your students are? Why/why not?

5. Do you consider it important for students to learn *about* and *from* one another? If so, how do you enable this?

6. How would you describe this particular Grade 11 class? What is it like to teach them?

On the teaching intervention:

7. How would you **describe** this teaching intervention to, say, an English-teaching colleague at another school?

8. What aspects of the intervention are **similar** to the kinds of teaching you normally do?
   What aspects are **different**?

9. What are your expectations or concerns? Is there anything you'reparticularly looking forward to or feeling uncomfortable about?

APPENDIX B2

Schedule for post-intervention teacher interview

1. What was it like to do this work/this research project with your students? Your overall impression? Any particular moments/lessons/activities that stand out for you? What (aspects) didn't work for you? Was there anything particularly enjoyable/successful?

2. How would you describe the students' response to this work? The level of their engagement? The quality of their work?Do you think they got something out of it?

3. How do you feel about the effectiveness of whole-class discussion?

4. Were there individuals that you feel stood out in terms of more or less participation than usual?

5. Does the TRC have a place in the English curriculum, or does it feel as if History is spilling over into English?
   Are there difficulties of doing apartheid history in the classroom?

6. How easy was it to fit this teaching intervention into your usual kind of teaching programme and your own natural teaching style?
   To what extent was it awkward to teach this work? Did you feel you were just being asked to take someone else's work and teach it? Or were you able to feel some ownership of it?

7. Your own position in relation to the issues under discussion? Be a neutral facilitator? Able to voice a position of your own? How does it work for you?

8. To what extent do you think my presence as a constant observer and the camera's presence had an impact on what was going on?

On pedagogy

1. I am interested in your opinion of the TRC/Youth identity project.
   What parts did you like and why? Which parts did you not like and why do you think that could be?
   Based on this experience, what changes would you suggest to this section of work?

2. There were various different activities – interviews, youth posters, class discussions, journal writing – I'd like to hear your comments on how you experienced some of those.

3. Questions about specific tasks (optional):
   Interviews: Was there any value in discussing your interviews as a class before going into the tasks?
   Youth posters: When future scholars analyse/scrutinise your posters, what do you think they'll think of you?
   Class discussion & journal writing: Is there any significant difference between journal writing & class discussion, particularly since sometimes the same question would form the basis of both?

On identity and/or issues emerging in class discussion

4. *[Mention some of the social changes that have occurred locally during the course of the teaching intervention.]* How do you respond to these changes in your environment? What impact, if any, do they have on you?

5. How important is/are [any of the following] to your identity:
   - the notion of race?
   - your cultural background / your home language?
   - South African history?
   - etc.

6. How different is your world from that of your parents? In what way is it similar? To what extent are attitudes passed down from generation to generation? In what ways are your attitudes similar to or different from those of your parents?

7. How do you imagine your futures?

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

I understand that I do not have to complete this questionnaire.

Signed: _____

I understand that the information collected from this questionnaire is confidential and will only be used by the researcher. My name will not be revealed to anyone other than the researcher.

Please tick the relevant boxes and fill in information in the spaces provided. If you do not wish to answer a question, please leave it blank.

NAME: _____

Sex: ☐ female ☐ male
Race: _____ Age: _____

1. Residence

1.1 I live in _____
(Area name – e.g. Dube, Soweto; e.g. Bedfordview)

1.2 Do you live in more than one home, e.g. one during the week and another on week ends?

☐ yes ☐ no

1.3 If yes: Area you live in during the week _____
Area you live in on week ends _____

2. At home

2.1 I live with:
☐ my parent/s ☐ my grandparent/s Other _____ (please specify)

2.2 How many people do you live with?
Adults: _____ Children: _____

2.3 Parents' occupation (leave blank if not applicable; can also write 'unemployed')
Mother: _____
Father: _____
OR
Guardian's occupation: _____

2.4 How many adults in your home work? _____

2.5 Please tick any of the items you have in your home:
☐ television
☐ M-net
☐ DStv
☐ microwave
☐ computer
☐ internet connection

2.6 Do you personally own any of the following? If yes, tick the box.

☐ a cell phone?
☐ an i-pod?

2.7 Are you on:

☐ MixIt?
☐ Facebook?

3. Languages

3.1 What language do you speak **at home**?

☐ Sepedi ☐ Sesotho ☐ Siswati ☐ Tshivenda
☐ Xitsonga ☐ Afrikaans ☐ English ☐ isiNdebele
☐ isiZulu ☐ isiXhosa Other _____

3.2 What other languages do you speak?

☐ Sepedi ☐ Sesotho ☐ Siswati ☐ Tshivenda
☐ Xitsonga ☐ Afrikaans ☐ English ☐ isiNdebele
☐ isiZulu ☐ isiXhosa Other _____

4. School

4.1 What primary school did you attend?

School: _____

Area: _____

4.2 When did you come to this school?

☐ Grade 8 ☐ Grade 9 ☐ Grade 10 ☐ Grade 11

4.5 How are your school fees paid?

_____

4.4 How do you travel to school?

☐ Bus ☐ Walk ☐ Car ☐ Minibus taxi

5. Country of birth

5.1 Where were you born? _____

5.2 If you were not born in South Africa, how many years have you been living here? _____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND ASSISTANCE

S1 P1: Lebohang &Leila




S1 P2: Tumelo, Sithandi & Thabiso



S1 P3: Thabang & Nkosana



S1 P4: Kekeletso & Ntombi



S1 P5: Luis & Kelebogile



S1 P6: Enoko& Motshedisi



S1 P7: Kholiswa



S1 P8: Dipuo & Moipone




S1 P9: Jayesh & Patrick



S1 P10: Boipelo & Boikanyo




S1 P11: Puseletso



S1 P12: Kabelo & Sebolelo (front)



(back)



S1 P13: Mahendra



S2 P1: Mei-Lin & Jenny



S2 P2: Jody & Susan



S2 P3: Calista & Sonia



S2 P4: Antoinette & Nina



S2 P5: Kate & Lily




S2 P6: Kelsey & Kathy



S2 P7: Lesego



S2 P8: Bontle (with flap closed)



[▲ blue, doughnut page flaps open]

S2 P8 (with flap open)



S2 P9: Adele & Saskia



S2 P10: Nguvi & Nadia



S2 P11: Kylie & Julie



S2 P12: Michelle & Alice



Tabular outline of visual/verbal categories

	CATEGORY	TOTAL	S1	S2	Description of category content	POSTERS	Additional comments
1	**Alcohol**	**15**	11	4	Images of alcohol in bottles or glasses; actual mini bottles stuck down; images of people drinking; alcohol logos or brand names.	S1: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13. S2: 1, 7, 10, 12.	4 refs are explicitly negative (S1P5, S1P9, S1P12, S2P4).
2	**Body image**	**9**	2	7	Refs to cosmetic surgery; tattoos; body size; dieting; obesity/anorexia; braces on teeth; gym.	S1: 6, 8. S2: 1,3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10	
3	**Cars**	**11**	9	2	Images.	S1: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13. S2: 7, 10.	Visual references only.
4	**Cell phones**	**13**	9	4	Images of cell phones, smart phones, Blackberrys. (S2P9 verbal ref)	S1: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 13. S2: 6, 7, 9, 10.	
5	**Condoms**	**9**	6	3	Images of condom wrappers; condoms; actual condoms in wrappers stuck on. (Incl. image in S1P1)	S1: 1, 5, 6, 9, 10, 12. S2: 4, 7, 10.	Visual references only.
6	**Crime**	**8**	4	4	Verbal refs to 'rape', 'crime'; guns/men holding guns; bar graph and child sex law (in S1P9)	S1: 2, 5, 9, 12. S2: 4, 6, 9, 12.	Not including drugging or underage drinking.
7	**Desirable female forms**	**5**	2	3	Images foregrounding desirable female forms (with no ref to body image)	S1: 5, 6. S2: 3, 9, 10.	
8	**Drugs**	**10**	6	4	Images of pills; actual pills stuck on; images of people doing drugs; verbal refs.	S1: 1, 4, 5, 8, 9, 12. S2: 4, 9, 10, 12.	Not including tobacco/ cigarettes
9	**Education**	**11**	3	8	Kids in school uniform; piles of serious-looking books; school badge; own photos of school events. Verbal refs to 'academics', 'education', 'educated', 'School NB', 'School report'.	S1: 8, 9, 12. S2: 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11.	Not including tertiary education refs – captured in 'Future'.
10	**Environmental issues**	**3**	0	3	Images of planet under threat (S2P1); verbal refs to global warming, recycling, green issues, etc.	S2: 1, 8, 9.	
11	**Family**	**5**	2	3	Images of families (S1P7 photo of an extended family?), including photos of self & family. Verbal references to family or parents.	S1: 7, 12. S2: 5, 9, 11.	S2 only: family photos (P11).
12	**Fashion**	**23**	13	10	Images of clothing, shoes, bags, sunglasses, watches, perfume, make up, jewellery. Also brand names, logos & verbal refs to 'beauty', 'glamour', etc.	S1: all. S2: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12.	References to fashion brands: S1: 10/13 S2: 3/10
13	**Food**	**5**	2	3	Images and verbal ref.	S1: 6, 13. S2: 6, 8, 12.	
14	**Friendship**	**11**	5	6	Incl. ordinary people together socializing or posing (S1P6? S1P7?). Also verbal refs to friends, incl 'BFF' (S1P1). S2P4: 'best mates' alluding to cross-racial friendship.	S1: 1, 6, 7, 10, 12. S2: 2, 4, 5, 6, 9, 11.	S2 2, 5, 6, 9, 11 – all have own photos of self and friends.

	CATEGORY	TOTAL	S1	S2	Description of category content	POSTERS	Additional comments
15	**Future**	**9**	4	5	S1: 'future dreams'; 'careers'; refs to Soccer World Cup 2010; 'tomorrow is ours... ' (P12). S2: Refs to matriculation; 'the big break'; 'gap year'; refs to tertiary education.	S1: 1, 9, 12, 13. S2: 1, 3, 5, 6, 9.	
16	**History**	**8**	4	4	S1: Biko book; 'acknowledging the past' [+Sarafina/Whoopi Goldberg ref] (P7); 'healing a young nation'; fossil; Ghandi; Mandela dock quote. S2: Jonker apartheid-era poem; 'learning from past mistakes' [+blurred city street]; rock art; anti-apartheid poster; 'birth of our country'.	S1: 3, 7, 8, 9. S2: 3, 5, 6, 8.	
17	**HIV/AIDS**	**5**	2	3	Red ribbon or word. Also refs to STDs.	S1: 5, 12. S2: 4, 7, 9.	
18	**International public figures**	**10**	8	2	Includes recognisable pub figs from the entertainment industry and sport.	S1: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9. S2: 3, 6.	S1: 27 pub figs: music 21 + actors 5 + sport 1. S2: 2 pub figs: actor 1 + celeb 1.
19	**Media**	**3**	0	3	Explicit ref to media or inclusion of media as media: use of newspapers & headlines (S2P3&11); 'media expectations' (S2P8)	S2: 3, 8, 11	
20	**Money**	**8**	7	1	Images, verbal refs (incl. 'moolah', S1P1) or actual coins (S1p13: 'gold'?). Incl. credit cards, bank logos.	S1: 1, 2, 6, 7, 10, 12, 13. S2: 12.	
21	**Music**	**18**	11	7	Images of musicians, cd album covers, ipods/mp3 players, music systems & instruments; words for music, music genres or names of musicians. S1P2 P Diddy under flap of vodka bottle. S2P9 'sex, drugs & rock 'n roll'.	S1: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12. S2: 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12.	
22	**Nation, symbols of**	**13**	6	7	SA flag (incl. on soccer ball); 'Rainbow Nation'/rainbow image; SA national crest; map of SA; any wording referring to 'South Africa' or the 'nation'.	S1: 1, 5, 8, 9, 10, 13. S2: 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 11, 12.	
23	**Other activities/ interests**	**6**	3	3	Art/painting, film, theatre, gambling, horse-riding, piano-playing, literature, exploring nature/wildlife.	S1: 1, 5, 13. S2: 4, 5, 12.	Activities/interests not already covered by: music, sport, multimedia entertainment or the use of technological gadgets.
24	**Other multimedia entertainment**	**7**	5	2	TV screens/shows, dvds, gaming, PSP, etc. Also: 'what's on dstv?' (S2P1)	S1: 3, 4, 6, 10, 13. S2: 1, 8.	Not including cell phones, laptops or music-related technology.
25	**Other technological equipment**	**6**	2	4	Incl. laptops, digital cameras	S1: 6, 8. S2: 1, 5, 7, 10.	'Other' to categories for: cell phones, multimedia entertainment, music (ipods, etc.), social media.
26	**Partying**	**16**	8	8	Verbal refs and partying/clubbing scenes – incl. disco ball.	S1: 1, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13. S2: 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10.	

	CATEGORY	TOTAL	S1	S2	Description of category content	POSTERS	Additional comments
27	**Place: international**	**9**	3	6	Image of world globe; African continent (verbal & visual refs); flags/recognisable images of other countries.	S1: 1, 8, 9. S2: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 11.	S1: incl. refs to Africa (P8, P9). S2: incl. own photos of international travel (P2&11); random image of luxury cruise (P6).
28	**Place: local**	**5**	3	2	SA landscapes & wildlife; SA on African continent (S1P9); 'kasi' (S1P6).	S1: 6, 9, 13. S2: 4, 6.	
29	**Poverty**	**2**	0	2	Images of poverty; verbal refs to poverty or homelessness.	S2: 4, 6.	
30	**Pregnancy**	**6**	4	2	Images or word – not all explicitly 'teen'.	S1: 5, 8, 9, 12. S2: 4, 7.	
31	**Racial harmony**	**5**	0	5	Images of cross-racial friendships; black&white hands shaking; multiracial children holding hands; multiracial symbolic face; 'integration not separation'; 'cosmopolitanism'.	S2: 4, 5, 6, 10, 12.	
32	**Relationships: romantic/ sexual**	**17**	7	10	Images of girl&boy. Verbal refs to sex, love, relationships (boyfriend/ men/ sugardaddy/ hunk/ heart throb).	S1: 1, 3, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12. S2: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12.	Does not include condoms – own category. S2: incl. own photos of self with 'boyfriend' (P2, P5, P6, 11).
33	**Religion**	**2**	1	1	Image of church. Symbols of world religions.	S1: 7. S2: 3.	Visual references only.
34	**SA politics**	**5**	1	4	Image: ANC flag. Verbal: 'uncertainty about future leadership of country' (bar graph in S1P9), 'politics', 'petty politics...', 'corruption' (S2P2)	S1: 9. S2: 2, 8, 9, 12.	Visual references only.
35	**SA public figures**	**11**	6	5	Recognisable pub figs from politics, music, sport, and random celebrities. Mandela & Charlize Theron (both SA figs with global status) included here not in global. *What to do with 2 Zim politicians?*	S1: 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11. S2: 2, 3, 4, 9, 12.	S1: 16 pub figs: music 4 + sport 4 + soapie stars 4 + politics 3 + film 1. S2: 6 pub figs: 5 politics + 1 random celeb.
36	**Self**	**9**	1	8	Visual: own photographs of self Verbal: written name included; hand-written refs to 'me'/'we', 'my...'	S1: 7. S2: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8,9, 11.	Verbally, only including hand-written references to self, not cut-out quotations referring to 'I' or 'we'.
37	**Smoking**	**7**	5	2	Cigarettes/tobacco only – not dagga.	S1: 2, 4, 5, 9, 12. S2: 7, 10.	2 of these refs are explicitly negative (S1P4, S2P10).
38	**Social media**	**7**	1	6	Refs to facebook, MXit, or email.	S1: 12. S2: 1, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10.	Images of cell phones not included unless there's an explicit reference to connectedness, MXit or fb.
39	**Sport**	**9**	6	3	Incl. action shots and sports celebrities. S2P5?	S1: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 9. S2: 2, 5, 6.	Visual references only.
40	**Traditional dress**	**5**	4	1	Images of people wearing traditional African dress.	S1: 4, 7, 8, 9. S2: 6.	Visual references only.

Tabular outline of categories that are verbal only

	CATEGORY	TOTAL	S1	S2	Content (quoted verbatim) and posters
1	**Ambition**	**4**	1	3	S1: status'(10). S2: I won't settle for second best (1); leadership (2); corporate advancement ladder (8).
2	**Discrimination**	**4**	1	3	S1: racial discrimination (in bar graph), lengthy quote from Mandela in dock (9). S2: xenophobia (4); racial inequality (9); racism, sexism (12).
3	**Individuality and personal growth**	**8**	5	3	S1: body and soul (5); true spirit true mind true body (7); no fake Madonna (8); it's better to be hated for what you are than loved for what you are not (12); I am what I am (13). S2: the most important thing you wear is your personality (3); finding out who you are, no clichéspiritual awakening (8); individuality, inner peace (9).
4	**Gossip**	**4**	4	0	S1: gossip & scandal (1); gossip (2); scandal, gossip & scandal (10); scandal (11)
5	**Privilege and materialism**	**4**	1	3	S1: I can't live without... (12). S2: sheltered, materialistic (8); 'Nothing you need. Everything you want.', we have more wants than needs in our lives, life is handed to us on a silver platter, naïve to crime problem fortunate to be less exposed (9); elitism (12).
6	**Susceptibility to pressure**	**5**	3	2	S1: cool, uncool (2); join the club, do cool things, a dead fish goes with the flow (6); caution: peer pressure (9). S2: pressure, stressed (8); peer pressure, battle to 'fit in', we want to look like stars, constant striving for perfection, physical appearance, work pressure, pressure to succeed, success is crucial (9).
7	**Teen affirmation**	**2**	2	0	S1: 'I am an African child who has grown up in the capital cities of the world. Certain things have influenced how I look, dress... It celebrates all the different lives'; 'I don't limit myself on anything. I also don't believe I need a man to be told I'm pretty or that I'm loved.' (8); 'Tomorrow is ours', 'Teenagers are amazing...' [for full poem, see p....] (12).
8	**Teen attitudes**	**9**	7	2	S1: attitude (1); all about you (3); hype (6); rebellion (8); fearless, fun, intelligence (10); backchat (11); explore (13). S2: struggle with no balance, know no bounds, rebels have backbones, experimental, more independence, self indulgent, self-centred (8); we don't have much respect (9).
9	**Twenty-first century lifestyle**	**4**	2	2	S1: the fast and the fabulous (4); quick fixes (11). S2: fast, new, new beginning (1); fast-paced, instantaneous lifestyle, living here and now (8).

The remaining words, phrases and lengthier quotations do not fit into existing categories and are too disparate to form additional categories that would group together two or more quotations. They are captured here in order to provide a complete content analysis of the posters but as they do not represent categories, they have not been included in any of the subsequent tables dealing with categories.

S1: lonelyfinger.com (3); make it better (4); comfort, company, womanhood, confidence [PLUS a lengthy description of what counts for her as identity, see S1P7] (7); better business opportunities elsewhere, poor quality healthcare (9).

S2: self-mutilation (4); view of the minority, time-table rigid, rise to the occasion (8); 'Don't sweat the small stuff'; 'Life is all about ass... Everyone is either coverin' it, laughing it off, kicking it, kissing it, trying to get a piece of it or simply just being one'; 'No one dies a virgin... life screws us all'; 'You're born alone, you die alone'; Life is too short... Break the rules, kiss slowly, love unconditionally, laugh uncontrollably and never forget the moments that made you smile' (10); bad life? (11); philosophy, social conditioning (12).

APPENDIX E3

Tabular summary of SITE 1: Categories by poster (alphabetical)

CATEGORY	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7	P8	P9	P10	P11	P12	P13	Totals
Alcohol	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x		x	x	**11**
Ambition										x				**1**
Body image						x		x						**2**
Cars		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x				x	**9**
Cellphones	x	x	x	x	x			x	x				x	**8**
Condoms	x				x	x			x	x		x		**6**
Crime		x			x				x			x		**4**
Desirable female forms					x	x								**2**
Discrimination									x					**1**
Drugs	x			x	x			x	x			x		**6**
Education								x	x			x		**3**
Environmental issues														**0**
Family							x					x		**2**
Fashion	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	**13**
Food						x							x	**2**
Friendship	x					x	x			x		x		**5**
Future	x								x			x	x	**4**
Gossip	x	x								x	x			**4**
History			x				x	x	x					**4**
HIV/AIDS					x							x		**2**
Individuality & personal growth					x		x	x				x	x	**13**
International public figures	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x					**8**
Media														**0**
Money	x	x				x	x			x		x	x	**7**
Music	x	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x	x	x	**11**
Nation, symbols of	x				x			x	x	x			x	**6**
Other activities, interests	x				x								x	**3**
Other multimedia entertainment			x	x		x				x			x	**5**
Other technological equipment						x		x						**2**
Partying	x				x	x		x	x		x	x	x	**8**
Place: international/global	x							x	x					**3**
Place: local						x			x				x	**3**
Poverty														**0**
Pregnancy (teen)					x			x	x			x		**4**
Privilege & materialism												x		**1**
Racial harmony														**0**
Relationships, romantic/sexual	x		x		x	x				x	x	x		**7**
Religion							x							**1**
SA politics									x					**1**
SA public figures			x		x	x	x		x		x			**6**
Self							x							**1**
Smoking		x		x	x				x			x		**5**
Social media												x		**1**
Sport	x	x	x		x	x			x					**6**
Susceptibility to pressure		x				x			x					**3**
Teen affirmation								x				x		**2**
Teen attitudes	x		x			x		x		x	x		x	**7**
Traditional dress				x			x	x	x					**4**
Twenty-first century lifestyle				x							x			**2**

APPENDIX E4

Tabular summary of SITE 2: Categories by poster (alphabetical)

CATEGORY	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7	P8	P9	P10	P11	P12	Totals
Alcohol	x						x			x		x	**4**
Ambition	x	x						x					**3**
Body image	x		x	x			x	x	x	x			**7**
Cars							x			x			**2**
Cellphones						x	x		x	x			**4**
Condoms				x			x			x			**3**
Crime				x		x			x			x	**4**
Desirable female forms			x						x	x			**3**
Discrimination				x					x			x	**3**
Drugs				x					x	x		x	**4**
Education		x			x	x	x	x	x	x	x		**8**
Environmental issues	x							x	x				**3**
Family					x				x		x		**3**
Fashion	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x		x	**10**
Food						x		x				x	**3**
Friendship		x		x	x	x			x		x		**6**
Future	x		x		x	x			x				**5**
Gossip													**0**
History			x		x	x	x						**4**
HIV/AIDS				x			x		x				**3**
Individuality & personal growth			x					x	x				**3**
International public figures			x			x							**2**
Media			x					x			x		**3**
Money												x	**1**
Music					x	x	x	x	x	x		x	**7**
Nation		x	x		x	x		x			x	x	**7**
Other activities, interests				x	x							x	**3**
Other multimedia entertainment	x							x					**2**
Other technological equipment	x				x		x			x			**4**
Partying	x	x			x	x	x	x	x	x			**8**
Place: international/global	x	x	x		x	x					x		**6**
Place: local				x		x							**2**
Poverty				x		x							**2**
Pregnancy (teen)				x			x						**2**
Privilege & materialism								x	x			x	**3**
Racial harmony				x	x	x				x		x	**5**
Relationships (sexual/romantic)		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	**10**
Religion			x										**1**
SA politics		x						x	x			x	**4**
SA public figures		x	x	x					x			x	**5**
Self		x	x	x	x	x		x	x		x		**8**
Smoking							x			x			**2**
Social media	x				x		x	x	x	x			**6**
Sport		x			x	x							**3**
Susceptibility to pressure								x	x				**2**
Teen affirmation													**0**
Teen attitudes								x	x				**2**
Traditional dress						x							**1**
Twenty-first century lifestyle	x							x					**2**

	CATEGORY	Site 1	Site 2	TOTAL
1	Alcohol	11	4	**15**
2	Ambition	1	3	**4**
3	Body image	2	7	**9**
4	Cars	9	2	**11**
5	Cellphones	8	4	**12**
6	Condoms	6	3	**9**
7	Crime	4	4	**8**
8	Desirable female forms	2	3	**5**
9	Discrimination	1	3	**4**
10	Drugs	6	4	**10**
11	Education	3	8	**11**
12	Environmental issues	0	3	**3**
13	Family	2	3	**5**
14	Fashion	13	10	**23**
15	Food	2	3	**5**
16	Friendship	5	6	**11**
17	Future	4	5	**9**
18	Gossip	4	0	**4**
19	History	4	4	**8**
20	HIV/AIDS	2	3	**5**
21	Individuality & personal growth	5	3	**8**
22	International public figures	8	2	**10**
23	Media	0	3	**3**
24	Money	7	1	**8**
25	Music	11	7	**18**
26	Nation, symbols of	6	7	**13**
27	Other activities, interests	3	3	**6**
28	Other multimedia entertainment	5	2	**7**
29	Other technological equipment	2	4	**6**
30	Partying	8	8	**16**
31	Place: international/global	3	6	**9**
32	Place: local	3	2	**5**
33	Poverty	0	2	**2**
34	Pregnancy (teen)	4	2	**6**
35	Privilege & materialism	1	3	**4**
36	Racial harmony	0	5	**5**
37	Relationships, romantic/sexual	7	10	**17**
38	Religion	1	1	**2**
39	SA politics	1	4	**5**
40	SA public figures	6	5	**11**
41	Self	1	8	**9**
42	Smoking	5	2	**7**
43	Social media	1	6	**7**
44	Sport	6	3	**9**
45	Susceptibility to pressure	3	2	**5**
46	Teen affirmation	2	0	**2**
47	Teen attitudes	7	2	**9**
48	Traditional dress	4	1	**5**
49	Twenty-first century lifestyle	2	2	**4**

APPENDIX F1

Tabular summary of participation and turn-taking, Site 1, Extract 1

Participants	Teacher (1)	Students (24 in the classroom)
Total turns 55	27 (49%)	28 (51%) (with 10 individual students participating in this extract)
Total words 1053	317 (34%)	628 (66%)
Turn initiation	**11** turns used to call on students to speak • **8** – selects and nominates student herself • **3** – names student who is bidding to speak (i.e. hand raised)	**3** self-initiated turns (students insert themselves into the conversation) **2** bids to speak (students raise their hand and wait to be called on)
Turn function	**7** closed questions to the class **2** open-ended questions to the class **7** feedback/evaluation moves • **3** direct questions • **1** reformulations • **2** evaluations	**8** turns responding to teacher's call to speak **2** questions to teacher to verify her question **3** answers to teacher's follow-up questions **7** turns with class responding as a group to teacher's closed questions • **5** chorused, uniform responses • **2** indistinct

* The number of teacher turns across 'Turn initiation' and 'Turn function' do not add up because there are a few turns that have more than one function (e.g. In T3 the teacher makes a feedback/evaluation move and then nominates a student to speak.)

APPENDIX F2

Tabular summary of participation and turn-taking, Site 1, Extract 2

Participants	Teacher (1)	Students (24 in the classroom)
Total turns 63	23 (37%)	40 (63%) (with 8 individual students participating in this extract)
Total words 1574	160 (10%)	1409 (90%)
Turn initiation	**15** turns used to call on students to speak – in all of these turns students are bidding to speak; this includes **7** turns where teacher directs/sequences multiple speaking turns (by numbering students' raised hands)	**9** self-initiated turns (students insert themselves into the conversation) **13** bids to speak (students raise their hand and wait to be called on) – **6** further turns are these speakers continuing with their point in a consecutive turn
Turn function	**11** feedback/evaluation moves • 7 follow-up questions • 3 evaluation • 1 reformulation **11** turns to direct the speaking traffic **1** instruction to the class	**10** turns taking a position on the topic under discussion (all self-initiated; includes self-initiated follow-up turns to elaborate) **19** turns responding to a peer's point (**13** responding via the teacher; **6** responding directly to peer) **7** turns responding to teacher's follow-up question **2** turns constituting overlapping multiple responses from the class **1** aside

APPENDIX F3

Tabular summary of participation and turn-taking, Site 2, Extract 1

Participants	Teacher (1)	Students (22 in the classroom)
Total turns 34	14 (41%)	20 (59%) (with 9 individual students participating in this discussion)
Total words 832	111 (13%)	721 (87%)
Turn initiation	**7** turns used to call on students to speak • **3** – selects and nominates student herself • **4** – names student who is bidding to speak (i.e. hand raised)	**3** bids to speak (students raise their hand and wait to be called on) **2** self-initiated turns (students insert themselves into the conversation) / call out
Turn function	**1** instruction to the class **8** feedback/evaluation moves • **3** direct questions • **5** evaluations	**5** turns taking a position on the topic under discussion (all self-initiated) **3** turns responding to teacher's call to speak **2** answers to teacher's follow-up questions **5** turns where students continue to engage with the teacher, returning to elaborate or make further points (consecutively) **3** turns where students respond directly to a peer's point **1** turn where student bids unsuccessfully to speak **1** turn with multiple students responding to peer's comment

APPENDIX F4

Tabular summary of participation and turn-taking, Site 2, Extract 2

Participants	Teacher (1)	Students (22 in the classroom)
Total turns 98	31 (32%%)	67 (68%) (with 6 individual students participating in this extract)
Total words 1726	335 (19%)	1391 (81%)
Turn initiation	**6** turns used to call on students to speak • **1** – selects and nominates student herself • **5** – names student who is bidding to speak, sometimes multiple students	**22** self-initiated turns (students insert themselves into the conversation) or call out **5** bids to speak (students raise their hand and wait to be called on)
Turn function	**20** feedback/evaluation moves • **14** direct questions • **6** evaluations/comments	**1** turn responding to teacher's call to speak **1** question to teacher to verify her question **13** answers to teacher's follow-up questions **8** turns with class responding as a group to

APPENDIX F3

Tabular summary of participation and turn-taking, Site 2, Extract 3

Participants	Teacher (1)	Students (22 in the classroom)
Total turns 40	4 (10%)	36 (90%) (with 6 individual students participating in this extract)
Total words 606	49 (8%)	557 (92%)
Turn initiation	**1** gives floor to student bidding to speak	• All turns self-initiated, except for the presenters who are responding to questions from teacher or peers. • With the exception of 2 students who ask for permission to speak, all others call out and insert themselves into the conversation in that way.
Turn function	**1** direct question to presenters **1** feedback/evaluation move	Turns are completely chained so that almost all speakers are responding to a peer's utterance or to a peer's question.