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Abstract

Post democracy lecture venues within the Discipline of Occupational Therapy and campus at the University of KwaZulu-Natal display racial clustering where homogenous racial groups self-segregate and sit amongst those that look similar to themselves. This feature which, according to an extensive literature search occurs across the world appears resistant to change even within small occupational therapy classes which create extensive contact between students, with formal and informal opportunities to integrate. This descriptive qualitative study aimed to explore the occupational therapy student participants’ lived reality of racial integration and classroom dynamics from years 2, 3 and 4 in the context of studying at the University of KwaZulu-Natal. The data collection tool was racially homogenous focus groups that yielded deep and rich discourse around an opening vignette and subsequent probes. Thematic analysis with a Critical Race Theory lens informed the data display and reduction process. Data yielded important findings that allude to contemporary racialisation amongst “born-free” occupational therapy students with strong convergence with international research and literature. Themes displayed students’ rationale behind ‘Othering’— the behaviour of creating Us/Them divisions along various factors; the racialising of space as a legacy of apartheid as well as in new ways and forms; varying promoters of social cohesion that they believe enhance integration as well as particular barriers within the academy and particularly the Discipline of Occupational Therapy. Recommendations allude to the need for pedagogical review, staff conscientisation around student lived reality, as well as the creation of a milieu of social cohesion.
# Table of Contents

Supervisor’s Permission to Submit for Examination ........................................ ii  
Declaration .................................................................................. iii  
Dedication .................................................................................... iv  
Acknowledgements ........................................................................ v  
Abstract ...................................................................................... vi  
List of Tables ................................................................................ xi  
List of Figures ............................................................................... xi  
Operational Definitions ................................................................. xii  
Abbreviations ............................................................................... xiii  
Opening Quotation ........................................................................ xiv

## Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Background to the Study ................................................................ 1  
1.2 Historical Context ....................................................................... 2  
1.3 Research Question ....................................................................... 3  
1.4 Aims and Objectives ..................................................................... 3  
1.5 Type of Study and Method ............................................................ 3  
1.6 Significance of the Study ............................................................... 4  
1.7 Research presentation ................................................................... 4  
1.8 Outline of Study ........................................................................... 4

## Chapter 2: Literature Review

2.1 Introduction .................................................................................. 6  
2.2 Race ............................................................................................. 6  
2.3 Trends in South African Race Relation Attitudes ......................... 8  
2.4 Intergroup Relations ................................................................... 10  
2.5 Student Integration ...................................................................... 11  
2.6 Student Reflections ..................................................................... 12  
2.7 Transformation of Higher Education Institutions ....................... 13  
2.8 Contact Theory ........................................................................... 15  
2.9 Ingroup/Outgroup ....................................................................... 17
### Chapter 3: Methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Theoretical Paradigm</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Research Design</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Sampling Procedure</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Pilot Study</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Data Collection Procedure</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6.1</td>
<td>Live Focus Group Procedure</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6.2</td>
<td>E-focus Group Procedure</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Ethical Considerations</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8.1</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8.2</td>
<td>Power Dialectic</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8.3</td>
<td>Respect for Autonomy and Non Maleficence</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8.4</td>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8.5</td>
<td>Beneficence</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chapter 4

**4. A. Introduction to Findings and Discussion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Demographic Details: Understanding the Participants</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4. B. Othering**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Othering: Drivers of Ingroup/Racial Homogeneity</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.1</td>
<td>Apartheid’s Aftermath</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.1.1</td>
<td>Diminished Interpersonal Relationships</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.1.2</td>
<td>Affirmative Action</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.1.3</td>
<td>Segregated Social Spaces</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.2</td>
<td>Us and Them</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.2.1</td>
<td>Cultural Formulation</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.2.2</td>
<td>Choices</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.2.3</td>
<td>Social Dividers</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.3</td>
<td>Relationship Inhibitors</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.3.1</td>
<td>Interpersonal Factors</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 5: Social Cohesion

5.1 Introduction 85
5.2 Social Cohesion 85
5.2.1 Universal Values 87
5.2.1.1 Reciprocal Acts 88
5.2.1.2 Good Character 90
5.2.2 Discovering the Other 90
5.2.2.1 Acculturation 91
5.2.2.2 Discussion 93
5.2.3 Increased Contact Time 94
5.2.3.1 Socialise 95
5.2.3.2 Fun Times 97
5.3 Discussion 99

Chapter 6: Promoters and Barriers within the Occupational Therapy Discipline

6.1 Introduction 101
6.2 Promoters and Barriers 101
6.2.1 Staff 102
6.2.2 In the Work Place 106
6.2.3 Structure 109
6.2.4 Praxis 110
6.2.5 Mentality of the Oppressed 114

Chapter 7: Conclusion

7.1 Introduction 119
7.2 Discussion 119
7.3 Study Limitations 121
7.4 Recommendations 121
7.4.1 Multicultural Adult Learning 121
7.4.1.1 Resources Unlocking 122
7.4.1.2 Inculcating a Liberatory Praxis 122
7.4.2 Facilitating Greater Cohesion 124
7.4.2.1 Facilitating Mutual Self-discovery 124
7.4.3 Areas that Require Further Research 125
7.5 Researcher: Owning my Thoughts; Bracketing them out 125
7.6 Conclusion 127
7.6.1 Significance of the Study 128

Reference List 129
Appendix 1: Ethical Clearance Certificate 131
Appendix 2: Letter of Intent and Purpose of the Study 137
Appendix 3: Letter of Consent 139
Appendix 4: Focus Group Probes 141
Appendix 5: Vignette 142
Appendix 6: Gatekeeper Letter of Permission 143
Appendix 7: Moderator and Fieldworker Notes 144
List of Tables

Table 1: Focus groups-demographic details and number
Table 2: Moderator/fieldworker information

List of Figures

Figure 4.1 Inter-related Macro-themes
Figure 4.2 Overview of Othering (as 1 of 3 macro-themes)
Figure 4.3 Meso-theme 1: Apartheid’s aftermath and micro-themes
Figure 4.4 Apartheid’s aftermath: 1st micro-theme-Diminished IPRS, sub-themes and foci
Figure 4.5 Apartheid’s aftermath: 2nd micro-theme-Affirmative action, sub-themes and foci
Figure 4.6 Apartheid’s aftermath: 3rd micro-theme-Segregated Social Spaces, sub-themes and foci
Figure 4.7 Meso-theme 2: Us and Them and micro-themes
Figure 4.8 Us and Them: 1st micro-theme-Cultural Formulation, sub-themes and foci
Figure 4.9 Us and Them: 2nd micro-theme- Choices, sub-themes and foci
Figure 4.10 Us and Them: 3rd micro-theme- Social Dividers, sub-themes and foci
Figure 4.11 Meso-theme 3: Relationship inhibitors, micro-themes, sub-themes and foci
Figure 5.1 Overview of Social Cohesion (as 2 of 3 macro-themes)
Figure 5.2 Macro-theme 2: Social Cohesion, 1st meso-theme, micro-themes, and foci
Figure 5.3 Macro-theme 2: Social Cohesion, 2nd meso-theme, micro-themes, and foci
Figure 5.4 Macro-theme 2: Social Cohesion, 3rd meso-theme, micro-themes and foci
Figure 6.1 Macro-theme 3: Promoters and Barriers, 1st micro-theme, and foci
Figure 6.2 Macro-theme 3: Promoters and Barriers, 2nd micro-theme, and foci
Figure 6.3 Macro-theme 3: Promoters and Barriers: 4th micro-theme, and foci
Operational Definitions

Apartheid - a South African policy or system of segregation or discrimination on grounds of race upheld by legislation, promulgated by the government of the day

‘Black’ – an umbrella term that refers to all people of colour in South Africa as per Biko (1978/2010)

Critical Race theory – system of discourse and study that looks at racism from socio-political, historical, economic, socio-cultural and in terms of a power dynamic and how this intersects with peoples’ lives

Discrimination – the unjust treatment of people

e-focus group - a focus group held on the internet with no face to face contact

Hegemony - dominance of one over the other through predominant influence which may be direct or indirect

Heterogeneous – Diverse in attributes, traits, lifestyle

Homogenous – of the same kind, for example race or age

Ingroup - an exclusive, typically small, group of people with a shared interest or identity.

Ingrouping – the act of ensuring exclusivity of small group of people identified as having commonality

Other - the perception that people are different and alien from oneself

Othering – the act of perceiving difference in other people as opposed to oneself

Outgroup – those people who do not belong to a particular ingroup

Outgrouping – the act of perceiving people not of the ingroup as belonging to a different group

Praxis – practice of something

Race – social construct that view humankind as being made up of different categories of people predominantly made up of external characteristics

Racism – the use of race and categories of race to create institute/practice discrimination

Stereotypes – a generalised and simplified view of others, often negative in nature

Vignette – a small piece of prose that is rich ion description of a relevant experience
## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRT-</td>
<td>Critical race theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIPRS-</td>
<td>diminished interpersonal relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPRS</td>
<td>interpersonal relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT</td>
<td>Occupational Therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTA</td>
<td>Occupational Therapy Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTT</td>
<td>Occupational Therapy Technician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.S.</td>
<td>Racialised space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUKS</td>
<td>University of Pretoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCT</td>
<td>University of Cape Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDW</td>
<td>University of Durban Westville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKZN</td>
<td>University of KwaZulu-Natal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UP</td>
<td>University of Pretoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFOT</td>
<td>World Federation of Occupational Therapists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>African</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>Coloured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I)</td>
<td>Indian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(W)</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What we should advocate is not a world in which group distinctions and cultural differences are denied or suppressed, but one in which meaningful social identities are contextualized—where neither accidents of birth nor choices of lifestyle limit access to other identities; where being black has no more and no less social meaning than being a social psychologist.

Marilynn B. Brewer
Chapter 1
Introduction

1.1 Background to the Study

The late nineteen eighties was a heady era of activism for young South Africans of colour (like myself) who had grown up in the seventies and eighties with mass democratic movements pushing, calling for disinvestment and toyi toying\(^1\) for change. I was one such youth, bright eyed and full of fury at apartheid’s injustices as I headed for the University of Durban Westville to begin my tertiary journey studying Occupational Therapy. In 1986 this was still a historically black university which was a hotbed of political thought, action and rhetoric. I found the occupational therapy class to have a majority of ‘Indian’ students with minorities of ‘African’ and ‘white’ students and we quickly formed friendship groups predominantly around interests and personalities. This was surprising as often they were across the so called colour bar in a time of limited social integration and political upheaval. We sat where ever we wanted to, partied, did projects and bemoaned the lecturers together; we were a socially cohesive bunch who celebrated apartheid’s dismantling 4 years after graduation with much hope for the future.

I returned to teach at the university eighteen years later and much to my chagrin found that contemporary occupational therapy students sit in clusters according to race even though they are the so called born frees\(^2\) into a rainbow nation\(^3\). This intrigued and concerned me. Was this habitual; the result of continued societal divisions in an inequitable racially fractured world or simply grouping along the familial or was it something else? Were these youth not more exposed to each other now than ever before and why did they continue to group around outward colour?

Academic attempts at integration do not appear to have the desired effect as students appear to have little understanding of one another with conflict across the years of student study often appearing to be race based misunderstandings. In a South Africa that is free of legislation, that enforces racial separateness and within a health profession (Occupational Therapy) that has cultural awareness and understanding of diverse people as one of its central tenets, these perceptions and anecdotal reports of the researcher warrant a closer look.

---

\(^1\) Toyi-toyi- particular dances of resistance to situations of injustice
\(^2\) Born Frees- children/youth born post 1994 and the First democratic elections
\(^3\) Rainbow nation- concept of South Africa as made up of a myriad different type of people (different colours, ethnicities, religion etc.)
1.2 Historical Context

From 1948 onwards, South Africa had a history of legislated segregation of its people, based on racial classification that was promulgated by the government of the day. This system of legislation attempted to separate people along racial lines in everyday activities of life, such as separate living areas, separate amenities, separate local governments and separate educational systems. “The Extension of the University Extension Act of 1959” prohibited the admission of black people to historically white universities.” (Toni, 2011). This in turn resulted in the creation of so called historically black universities which, like apartheid legislation, began to be dissolved circa 1994.

Not only was tertiary education desegregated and opened to all but so were schools across the country. Research has and continues to describe the fractured nature of racial integration amongst students across the nation’s schools (Bhana, 2010; Govender, 2005). The University of KwaZulu-Natal (hereafter UKZN) was formed as an amalgamation of the University of Durban-Westville, a historically black university and the University of Natal, a historically white university on the 1st of January 2004 (Institutional Profile and Brief Description of UKZN, 2009). This merger was ostensibly aimed at equalising resources across the two institutions and integrating students from various racial/cultural groupings. The University currently has 42000 students across five campuses, 64% of which are ‘black’ students (UKZN Transformational Statistics, 2012).

In an attempt to redress inequities in society and within the education field that is a result of the country’s divided past, the University adopted a Transformational Charter, which looks to directly address social injustices that persist as a result of apartheid’s history and enhance the University’s role in a diverse society. It states: “The notion of transformation that the University embrace’s is deeper and broader than a narrow categorization based on ‘race’ and gender representation. It means changing the identity and culture of the University in every aspect of its mission. Transformation is profoundly advanced by improving the quality of human relationships, and meaningful behavioural change can best bring the identity and culture of the University into alignment with its vision.” It aims to promote this by some of the following principles: “healing the divisions of our nation’s past, bridging racial and cultural divides, being socially cohesive and inclusive as well as nurturing collegiality, recognising difference and celebrating diversity” (The UKZN Transformation Charter, 2009).
It is within this transformational and historical context that the Discipline of Occupational Therapy finds itself. The profession is guided by the World Federation of Occupational Therapists (WFOT) position statement on diversity and culture that states that, principles of respect for and cognisance of diversity and culture should be incorporated into knowledge, skills and attitudes of occupational therapy in education, research and practice (Kinebanian, 2009).

1.3 Research question

Following from this the research question at the outset of this research was:

What is the meaning and drivers of racial homogenous clustering of “born frees” 20 years post – apartheid within a degree that creates inter-student contact and promotes multicultural practice as one of its guiding tenets for Occupational Therapy Students at The University of KwaZulu Natal?

This question would create greater awareness among staff of issues around integration with related pedagogical review as well as explore implications of the phenomena into clinical practice.

1.4 Aims and Objectives

Aim

The research project aimed to explore and describe the lived reality of racial integration and classroom dynamics as reported by occupational therapy students in the context of the University of KwaZulu-Natal and the discipline of Occupational Therapy on the Westville campus.

Objectives

The understanding of the students’ perceptions and internal experience around apparent racialisation, integration and racial clustering was sort through their voice and interrogation of the concepts. The study aimed at identifying associated barriers and promoters of integration, across racially heterogeneous students and ultimately to create greater awareness among staff of issues around integration with related pedagogical review.
1.5 Type of Study and Method

This study is a descriptive, qualitative research design. Denzin and Lincoln (2000) say “qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or to interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them” (p. 3). The students lived reality was explored through racially homogenous focus groups with an opening vignette to orient the discussion to the topic and relevant probes posed by an external moderator.

1.6 Significance of the Study

This study aims to draw together information that will deepen understanding among academic staff in and around the perceptions that students hold that drive homogeneous group interaction and decrease intergroup contact. Meaning making will promote a richer and deeper understanding of racial integration, group dynamics and group behaviour amongst students within the Occupational Therapy Department at UKZN. Further this information will be used to facilitate greater social awareness and understanding between students and academics bringing the Other into the ‘us’ and working towards the ideals the University’s Transformation Charter espouses. The study endeavours to provide indicators for appropriate changes to the curriculum as well as focused and relevant strategies to facilitate social cohesion. This will occur at multiple levels including teaching and fieldwork placements, classroom integration and experiential work with an aim to improving race and cultural understanding and graduating occupational therapists that will be able to adjust to the country’s diversity at all levels.

1.7 Research presentation

I present this dissertation from the position that race is a social construct and has no biological basis hence inverted commas are placed only around racial categorisation (from apartheid labelling) such as ‘Indian’, ‘black’, ‘white’ or ‘coloured’. Race is central to this work, and hence was not avoided, however students were required to self-declare racial category.

1.8 Outline of Study

This chapter provides a brief introduction to the exploration of racial integration and dynamics amongst occupational therapy students at UKZN. The background, rationale, aims and the significance of the study were discussed as well as the context historically and locally.
Chapter two reviews and analyses relevant literature which focuses the researcher’s lens on knowledge of the subject both internationally and nationally and concepts related to the research topic.

Chapter three discusses the research methodology utilised within the study.

The data analysis and presentation/discussion occurs over three chapters as a consequence of its complexity. Chapter four reports and discusses the macro-theme of Othering that emerged from the findings.

Following this chapter five reports and discusses findings linked to the macro-theme Social Cohesion, while chapter six completes the discussion and presentation of the findings with the final macro-theme Promoters and Barriers within Occupational Therapy.

Chapter seven concludes the study with discussion, including limitations, significance of the study and recommendations for the discipline of Occupational Therapy and indirectly to the University.
Chapter 2

Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

The crux of this research study is the segregation of people from one another, and researchers have attempted to understand this, particularly race based segregation for decades. This chapter therefore examines associated theories and literature relevant to the research which has been written about both locally and globally. It has been arranged into sections as they allow the reader to focus on the main issues that seek to explain or are associated with the topic. These sections include discussion of race as a social construct as framed within Critical Race Theory; Ingroup/Outgroup is addressed as it is core to understanding of racialisation this is followed by a critical review of Contact theory as this forms the foundation of many research studies on integration. Intergroup relations, trends in South African race relations as well as student experience and the state of transformation amongst South African universities then attempt to contextualise the study.

2.2 Race

There is no biological basis for racial classification and therefore the apartheid government had great difficulty in categorising the South African population through idiosyncratic and ambiguous criteria. Race then is a social construct that is related to ‘privilege, power and domination’ (Carter, 1995; Erasmus & Ellison, 2008). Race classification has been utilised through the ages to divide the human population into groups that have hierarchical significance around power differentials and ensuring subaltern categories (Maré, 2001). Vandeyar (2007) takes this further by saying that race “is an inconstant socio-historical construct dictated by economic variables” (p. 287).

Race is thus a complex phenomenon, which was evident in the above as well as the inconsistent nature of racial classification. Although apartheid has been disbanded for two decades race in South Africa race continues as a classification system of its population, although non-racialism is an essential part of the constitution (Moodley & Adam, 2000). This is as a result of the need for racial redress particularly economically as well as in terms of resource allocation aligned to race. Paradoxically the same race tags that held sway during apartheid are utilised contemporarily for this redress.
The researcher is cognisant of the negative effects of such racial classification and thus a research project such as this runs the risk of formalising the very categories it is researching and lending weight to so called racial labelling. These issues will be discussed in the ethics sections of the research project. Race however remains the focus of the integration patterns and relationships between the students and will have to naturally be part of the discourse. Within the research document I acknowledge race as a social construct and will thus not place race in inverted commas.

The study of race within the research is framed by Critical Race Theory (CRT) which views race and related concepts such as racism in contexts that are historical, socio-economic and political (Delgado & Stefancic in Erasmus, 2010, p. 394). This is seen to be the way to societal transformation regarding race and all its baggage versus attempts such as contact theory to find ways to get the races to mix which Erasmus calls “reformism” (Erasmus, 2010, p. 394). Critical race theory thus attempts to go beyond the essentialism that as humans we categorise (along racial lines) and to the forces within society that foster these unequal relations and thought. New writing nuances CRT as an avenue of social justice in its speaking to conscientisation of “people of colour” to the hierarchical nature of society and injustices that continue overtly and covertly. (Ladson – Billings & Donnor, in Denzin & Lincoln, 2011, p. 92).

If race persists then where is it? In “Doing Race: 21 essays for the 21st century” essayists focus on race and ethnicity in everyday life: what they are, how they work, and why they matter. The editors feel that race and ethnicity are so dominant and present in our lives that we organise ourselves around it as well as allow race to insidiously and perhaps subconsciously influence ones’ occupations of daily life (Markus, 2010). Whitehead’s (2011) research on racial categories supports this as he found that research participants were not intentional in racial categorisation however were caught up in everyday acts that were racialised or open to racial categorisation. If this is so, then are the students at UKZN aware of the drivers that keep them in predominantly racially homogenous groups in their daily life?

If we are to find support for contentions such as Whitehead’s then where do racial categories come from if it is unintentional? Maré links race to social identity formation as race thinking (or racialism) shapes notions of significant ‘similarities and difference’ and thereby creates boundaries, allocating people to those groups” (2010, p. 77). This forms Us/Them dichotomies with people feeling a sense of belonging along homogenous racial lines and conversely alienation towards the Other. Although Social identity theory will be reviewed later racial
classification and its apparent ease at creating social boundaries need to be seen as a by-product of race and thus needs to be taken cognisance of in terms of race discourse and the use of it, to explain drivers or explanations of this trend.

We may well ask if new race labels are evident twenty years post-apartheid in South Africa. We do not appear to be dissimilar to assimilation and acculturation trends in the rest of the world that show little social integration, albeit acculturation and assimilation occur to varying degrees across cultures (Carter, 1995). The legalisation of formal segregation of people under apartheid however appears to have created social dynamics and nuances that are unique to South African people (Moodley & Adam, 2000, p. 51).

2.3 Contact Theory

Allport led the way in American social psychology when in 1954 he postulated that prejudice between groups could be decreased by increasing contact (Baron & Byrne, 1994, p. 241). This theory has been prolifically studied since then with social psychologists finding for and against it however it remains a founding work within this field. The theory proposed that four conditions were the cornerstone to ensuring contact decreases prejudice. These conditions according to (Brehm et al, 2005, p. 178) are:

- Equal status – the contact should occur in circumstances that place the two groups in an equal status
- Personal interaction – The contact should involve one-on-one interactions among individual members of the two groups.
- Cooperative activities – Members of the two groups should join together in an effort to achieve superordinate goals.
- Social Norms – The social norms defined in part by relevant authorities, should favour intergroup contact.

Foster (2005) points out that the apartheid was based on the converse of the above; rather that contact was believed to create hostility and tension between the races. This was the premise for decades of racialisation and separation under apartheid (p. 497). He goes on to conclude that this experiment in converse contact theory resulted in “considerable human misery” (2005, p. 497). Pettigrew and Tropp (2000) in a meta-analysis across twenty four countries found support
for contact hypothesis as long as the four essential requirements were met although all four did not have to be present (In Brehm et al, 2005, p. 178). In a critique of contact theory authors that have researched prejudice and racism within South Africa found three limitations, namely a trend towards experimental designs which did not parody the realities of life, secondly a disregard for personal agency and a leaning towards ideology that promotes social change through change in the individual, i.e. cognitive changes produce behavioural change versus collective action (Dixon et al., 2010). Erasmus takes this further and in an analysis of work done around contact hypothesis within South Africa found some researchers’ findings that contact between groups may conversely trigger “racial conflict” (2010, p. 388). She found specific examples of contact causing “dehumanisation of the Other”, “coerced assimilation into hegemonic norms”, “self- segregation” and “selective contact” (2010, p. 388).

Zuma (2010) critiques contact theory in that it fails to address “social structural conditions of desegregation”. This appears in South African research which has described the everyday segregation of people both socially and spatially with negotiated contact both overtly and covertly in everyday situations (Durrheim & Dixon, 2010; Foster, 2005; Erasmus, 2010; Whitehead, 2011). Of significance Zuma cites research on the micro-ecology of contact being investigated at the University Cape Town (UCT), when she finds that class alienation and place identity are influencing contact among contemporary university students (Zuma, 2010, p. 102). These findings are important as they display the ongoing nuancing of race relations by social structural, spatial and class related factors that are often linked with inequities that are related to the vestiges of apartheid (Vandeyar, 2007).

Researchers have looked to extend contact theory and ingroup favouritism by looking for possible new solutions. Brewer (1997) finds support for two distinct models targeting ingroup bias, namely, the Personalisation Model and the Common Ingroup Identity Model (p. 201). In the first she cites research that found that the under emphasis of categorisation and the structuring of contact to allow the Other to become a person, through the sharing of personal information was successful. In the second, the forming of superordinate goals that brings about porosity of the ingroup boundaries, by re-categorisation on the basis of the superordinate goals (p. 201). This means that the boundaries are re-established following identification around new attributes goals and characteristics. A functional example of this is neighbours that are alienated from each other along class or race lines banding together to fight crime in a neighbourhood watch. It is important to realise in this new boundary formation through “superordinate goals’, new categorisation occurs and a new “them” or out group will be formed paradoxically. Another
method of creating attitudinal change between groups is cognitive dissonance. This is the changing of attitudes and behaviour when confronted or exposed to inconsistencies in attitudes/perceptions (Baron & Byrne, 1997). An example of this would be the perception that “Muslim” people are insular and exclusive to other members of their faith, which is then shown to be inconsistent when one is befriended and recognises commonalities with a “Muslim” at school. So called prejudice reduction frameworks such as those listed above are acknowledged by Dixon et al (2010) as being a favourite choice of social psychologists in their anti-prejudice work however they take issue with the limited focus of collective action models that focus on group agency and motivation in prejudice reduction and racial discrimination.

2.4 Ingroup/Outgroup

The crux of this research study is the segregation of people from one another, and researchers have attempted to understand this, particularly race based segregation for decades. Social psychology has found that people see the world and their relations in terms of an Us/Them dichotomy (Baron & Byrne, 1994). This forms the basis of so called ingroup/outgroup, where the ingroup is where one belongs based on social/racial categorisation while the outgroup is the Other which leads to further layers of social categorisation and differentiation. Unfortunately it is these categorisations which leads to feeling biased towards one’s own ingroup and discriminatory towards the outgroup. This is promoted through cognitive processing such as seeing the ingroup as heterogeneous and the outgroup as homogenous. This forms perceptions that the ingroup has desirable attributes while conversely the outgroup are all the same and do not (Baron & Byrne, 1994). Linville et al (1989) called this phenomenon “the illusion of outgroup homogeneity” which serves to bolster and promote stereotypes and implicit categorisation (p. 166). This has emerged in social cohesion and racial integration studies as a fundamental model to explain segregation or in this case racial clustering.

Brewer (1997) found that this very same phenomenon led to ingroup schema that was positive as a result of the perception of homogeneity within the ingroup and thus like oneself. The ingroup is viewed to have positive traits such as trust and liking which is both ingroup favouritism as well as ingroup accentuation. She further found that this schema led to mutual distrust, preferential treatment of the ingroup and outgroup competition.

Tajfel (1982) and Turner (1987) proposed the concept of social identity theory to describe how and why individuals discriminate against outgroups (cited in Brehm et al. 2005, p. 153). They proposed that the need for self-esteem is filled jointly through personal achievements as well as
achievements within a group. It is this group achievement that creates conditions to show bias for one’s ingroup with discrimination or derogation of the outgroup, with a resultant increase of one’s self esteem (Tajfel & Turner, in Brehm, 2005, p. 153). These models explain intergroup conflict, where Othering such as through social identity theory or ingroup/outgroup perception favours the ingroup over the outgroup while in competition with the outgroup. Levine and Campbell (1972) found that competition over limited resources creates hostility between the groups in so called conflict theory (in Brehm et al, 2005, p. 152). In South Africa with great disparities in socio-economic levels, between races, competition over limited resources as well as attempted redress of historical resource poverty continues to create competition between the races post-democracy (Moodley & Adam, 2000).

Stereotypes promote outgrouping/Othering but also are promoted or created through outgrouping/Othering therefore merits further consideration.

2.5 Stereotypes

In the everyday negotiation of life people have been found to categorise others; one such way is through stereotypes. Baron et al (2009) say, “Stereotypes about groups are the beliefs and expectations that we have concerning what members of those groups are like”, meaning outgroups (p. 191). Stereotypes have been found to cross all characteristics from gender to race and trait specific, however often are associated with negative characteristics of outgroups (Baron & Byrne, 1994). Higgins and Bargh (1987) found that once a person forms a stereotype this serves as an essential categorisation of the stereotyped person on contact which then forms cognitive frameworks which nuance and colour further interactions and perceptions of the Other (in Baron & Byrne, 1994, p. 231).

The study of stereotypes by social psychologists thus stresses the cognitive paths to grouping Others through generalisations. Foster (2005) challenges social psychology’s simplistic assumptions that racism maybe faulty ideology utilised to maintain positions of domination and oppression or prejudice as personal attributes based on stereotypes as above. He like other critics undermines stereotypes as one mechanism of prejudice present in society and advances the dynamics of intergroup relations or “widespread discourses or representation of the other” as an alternate explanation that may be used to form the basis for interventions (p. 496).

In work with strong links with the South African educational domain Steele researched stereotypes that influenced African-Americans interaction with educational tasks. Steele (1997)
coined the term ‘stereotype threat’ which occurs when people believe they will/might be assessed on the basis of negative stereotypes and this affects their performance (in Baron et al, 2009, p. 140). In telling research Steele and Aronson found that by merely asking African-Americans to note their race before taking a difficult verbal test they experienced stereotype threat and underperformed (in Baron et al, 2009). In a bid to explain this phenomena Steel et al (2002) suggest that one explanation would be “disidentification with the domain” where people attempt to limit their vulnerability within stereotypes by avoidance (in Baron et al, 2009, p. 140). This explains in functional terms how stereotype threat works only with vulnerable stereotypes such as faring poorly in educational settings by African-Americans. This same threat might be at play in South African educational settings where ‘black’ youth enter educational settings that are paradigmatically and culturally western in outlook with linguistic hegemony evident.

Work on stereotypes has also revealed confirmation bias, which is the perceptual phenomenon that creates confirmation of stereotypes when in contact with the stereotyped individual or group (Dunning & Sherman, 1997 in Brehm et al, 2005, p. 142). This functionally translates into situations such as holding a stereotype that ‘blacks’ are aggressive and then watching a soccer game and perceiving actions by ‘black’ players on the field as confirmation of the previously held stereotype. In the same disturbing way that confirmation bias works, self-fulfilling prophecy works from the perspective of the individual that is being stereotyped. In this phenomenon the individual is seen to fulfil the stereotype behaviourally (Rosenthal, 2002 in Brehm et al, 2005, p. 144) which is linked to stereotype threat.

2.6 Intergroup Relations

In the continued unveiling of intergroup relations, Hogg and Abram (1988) believe that groups/collectives not only provide the individual within that group with a social identity but also “a shared/collective representation of who one is and how one should behave” (p. 3). This further promotes specific group behaviour and norms including outgroup discrimination. This is a different driver of ingroup/outgroup relations versus theories discussed above. This theory illustrates that group belongingness is not only complex as it allows one to feel part of a particular social group, but it conversely mediates one’s social identity “self-evaluatively” which is juxtaposed against belonginess by being part of a societally named group or being pre-designated into such a group by race classification (Hogg & Abram, 1988, p. 7).

While the social identity theory considers social categorisation to lend itself to forming the structure of society, it strongly identifies that those conditions that a person is born in, or lives in
might influence the social identity of that individual strongly enough that the social identity changes and morphs creating a new belonginess. This perhaps explains South Africans choosing to identify themselves firstly as South Africans and then secondly latterly as a racial being. The racial social identity is then relevant in situations that would reward it as being the most important factor that facilitates a feeling of belonging. This poses the question: Are students within the university subconsciously being rewarded for self-segregation and racial clustering with greater feelings of belonging?

Buttny (1999) strengthens the use of social identity to explain segregation clustering by university students when he found that African American students particularly feared loss of ethnic identity as well as criticism from their peer African American students, while ‘white’ students did not report identity issues. This needs to be seen in the context of American society where ‘blacks’ are the minority and ‘whites’ seemingly belong to the culture which is dominant. Sidanius et al (2004) also studied social identity amongst racially disparate university students in America. His study looked at the effects of university clubs and organisations being racially homogenous and found: “an increase sense of ethic victimisation and a decreased sense of common identity and social inclusiveness” (p. 107). Importantly this was across the races and needs to be kept in mind as perhaps although white students do not report identity issues per se; their identity is influencing their socialisation, choices and behaviours.

These intergroup relations nuanced by factors such as racial identities create contemporary trends within South Africa which leads us to the next section.

### 2.7 Trends in South African Race Relation Attitudes

From a legislated separateness of races to a diverse society where one is free to congregate with whomever one so desires to, as well as enjoy access to any civic/public place without reservations, South Africa has indeed come a long way. Two decades post democratic changes, race relations continue to be discussed both by researchers, the media and everyday folk. Most are concerned with finding answers to social cohesion questions that have bedevilled society across the globe for the past century, but has particular resonance here in South Africa where legislation segregated people formally. Foster (2005) poetically puts this into words: “With the demise of apartheid, this sphere, the everyday spaces in which persons ‘encounter one another in situations of bodily co-presence’ is again open for negotiation.” (p. 495).
Durrheim et al (2011) have published numerous articles focused on getting to grips with contemporary understanding of race relations in South Africa. One of them sought to compare the attitudes of different race groups towards each other from different historical periods on a common metric. Their intention was to firstly chart the effect that racial classification has had on ingroup bias patterns, and secondly to assess changed historical contexts on intergroup attitudes. Their data showed that changes in attitude might be taking place with ‘white’ students displaying declining levels of prejudice, with a slight negative change in attitudes of ‘black African’ participants towards other groups.

Other data from the same researchers reported on survey results from 1991, 2005 and 2006. These results found that ‘black’ people reported racial isolation and while ‘white’ people agreed with desegregation type policies, they were not inclined to act upon this personally. Also of importance was the finding that contacts with the Other decreased stereotypes of ‘whites’ towards ‘blacks’ with a relational increase in support of policies that foster transformation, this was not reciprocated amongst ‘blacks’. Driving this point deeper was the finding that particularly in provinces where ‘whites’ and ‘blacks’ had more contact with ‘coloureds’ and ‘Indians’ they held more negative views about the Other (Durrheim & Dixon, 2010). This is contrary to contact theory assumptions as discussed under 2.3 within this chapter. Also of concern is the finding by Sears (1988) and Dovidio and Gaertner (2004), that racial attitudes has become framed in socially acceptable subtle value laden ways, that are covert, “indirect and rationalisable” in political correct ways (in Durrheim & Dixon, 2005, p. 455). Another take on this is the finding of Essed (1991) who found vastly different perceptions regarding racism amongst the different races in America, namely ‘whites’ either denied racism or felt it was exaggerated while ‘blacks’ felt it was a contemporary problem (in Buttny, 1999).

In South African research that looked at quantity and quality of contact between the races, researchers distinguished between casual contact as informal contact outside the home and intimate contact which is contact with friends and inside the home. Findings revealed oppositional reporting by ‘whites’ and ‘blacks’, with ‘whites’ reporting more contact with ‘blacks’ than vice versa. These findings become more skewed when one focuses on intimate contact. Of interest was an extension to this contact that Durrheim and Dixon (2010) surveyed which looked at the contact in terms of status. ‘Blacks’ reported contact with ‘whites’ of higher status than themselves while ‘whites’ reported interactions with ‘blacks’ of equal or lower status. This adds the dimension of status of the players as another variable that influences contact between races.
These findings not only contradict contact theory but explain how contemporary race relations are seemingly following apartheid patterns insidiously. Durrheim et al (2011) appear to be illustrating that in-group bias is still prevalent and that respondents are more likely to express difficulty with racial socialisation vs. expressing out-group biases. Further to this Durrheim et al found that ‘black Africans’ were significantly less reconciled than the other race groups and that their attitude towards ‘whites’ had become more negative, while white attitudes towards ‘black Africans’ had improved. Finally Durrheim et al leave us with food for thought when they essentially warn us not to read too much into these findings. Their point being, that although ‘whites’ display declining prejudice towards other groups, this is not matched by “evidence of a similar decline in social distance scores.” They point to a gap between behavioural intentions and attitudes (Durrheim et al, 2011, p. 269). The occupational therapy lecture room is a microcosm of the same society that this research speaks to and this study specifically attempted to assess the contemporary racial interactions in everyday situations.

What does this mean to contact theory suppositions that present theory that supports an increase in belonging and decrease of in-group/out-group thinking by decreasing space between individuals and increasing contact time between members? A local dissenting voice is Buhle Zuma who takes concepts of desegregation based on contact theory to pieces, claiming a superficial understanding of segregation and its socio-political and architectural influences, starting from the desegregation policies of the 1950’s in America to present day concepts (Zuma, 2010). Her article makes interesting reading as she finds contact theory poorly conceptualised in its attempts to redress the race issue by creating spaces for cross racial contact to occur which is purported by many to be the panacea for all divided societies. This is integral to understanding student integration in contemporary South African universities, which by the act of desegregation created contact between the different races which will be reviewed below.

2.8 Student Integration

Much has been written about student racial integration globally, with contemporary findings from research indicating that students across America and South Africa display tendencies to choose to cluster in racially divided groups and spaces despite experiencing legislative integration years before and in the face of policies that endorse integration (Buttny, 1999; Durrheim & Dixon, 2010; Jansen, 2004). The University of KwaZulu-Natal’s student landscape supports this contention remaining racially polarized across faculties. The researcher for one finds that
students within and outside of occupational therapy congregate in lecture venues and social spaces in homogenous racial groups.

Pattman (2010) refers to this landscape at UKZN, when he says: “certain spaces on campus came to be seen as ‘white’, ‘black’ or ‘Indian’, so frequently were they habituated by students in mono-racial groups” (p. 957). Further to this Pattman found that students divided themselves into racially homogenous groups in so called “mixed spaces” as well as in lecture theatres. Jonathan Jansen (2004) used eye witness accounts of the day to day interactions of ‘white’ and ‘black’ South Africans in educational contexts (universities and schools) to make the point that while significant advances have been made with respect to desegregation of institutions very little progress has been recorded with respect to social integration among learners and teachers from different backgrounds. Jansen also found that students at universities are separated by a deep divide that speaks not only of outward diversity and dissimilarity such as language and symbols.

In research done locally to investigate patterns of racial contact in a myriad of settings including informal settings, lecture dining halls and lecture theatres Durrheim and Dixon (2010) found homogenous racial clustering in so called ‘integrated places’. Although there are many more opportunities available in a democratic South Africa than ever before for students of different races to interact and for “fostering of cross racial identifications” to occur, the chances remain slim as a result of “the cultural dominance of particular racial stereotypes, the elitism of racially mixed public schools, and the continued racialisation of spaces and inequalities in post-apartheid South Africa” (Bhana & Pattman 2010, p. 385). Soudien (2004) tackles this cultural dominance and suggests that assimilation amongst students is “overwhelmingly hegemonic” which Erasmus takes further and finds that educational systems promote “Whiteness” through their discourse resulting in ‘blacks’ having to work hard to manage and promote cross racial interaction (in Erasmus, 2010, p. 392).

Finchilescu et al (2007) surveyed university students over the lack of inter-racial mixing at the University of Cape Town, University of the Witwatersrand, University of South Africa and the University of Johannesburg. They found racialisation or as they put it “preoccupation with race” as well as, blacks finding “whites” avoidant of the past history while ‘whites’ felt that ‘blacks’ dwell on it (p. 732). Further to this, the study found socio-economic status and different spoken languages were factors that attempted to explain segregation. Keeping with the study of contemporary students, in a longitudinal study of racial seating patterns in a residence dining
hall students reported sitting where they were comfortable. This was linked to perceived racial and cultural commonalities although students had reported inter-racial contact that was positive (Schrieff & Tredoux et al, 2010).

This racial dis-integration -- the deepness of it, is the very focus of this researcher’s lens, as an academic I have witnessed the (perceived) lack of understanding and keenness to work with each other affect the aforementioned lecture room dynamics. I have concern that student and practitioner intervention in a diverse practice setting will be nuanced by these issues across practitioner/student relationships with both client and colleagues. This research was driven by a need to understand the reasons and barriers behind the reported racial patterning with a view to increasing understanding amongst academics of drivers of such behaviours.

2.9 Student Reflections

Professor C. Soudien (2008) records Zimitri Erasmus, a sociologist, who researched the historically ‘white’ University of Cape Town’s Health Science faculty as finding that ‘black’ students have to do all the racial work in the institution (p. 669). This being that it is the ‘black’ students that are required to find themselves a space in the universities landscape, while ‘white’ students seemingly are unaware of the racial divide and found themselves easily at home in the university’s landscape (Soudien, 2008). These reflections appear to speak of different perceptions of each other as well as belonging within student groups and the university landscape. It speaks of ‘black’ students being ill at ease and working hard to belong in an unfamiliar and perhaps culturally hostile environment while ‘white’ students transition well from school to the academy with strong senses of belonging and the familiar. ‘Black’ students appear to assimilate their identities with so called ‘white’ characteristics in order to fit in and perhaps not stand out, such as speaking and pronouncing the language used by ‘whites’ as ‘whites’ would (Vandeyar, 2007).

Perhaps this needs to be juxtaposed (these feelings of belonging) with more macro-cognitive thoughts reported by students about feeling of belonging in South Africa and the rainbow nation. Govender researching high school students in KwaZulu-Natal found participants decrying apartheid notions of describing themselves through racial labels and yet on the other hand she received overt clues to suggest that prejudicial thinking still exists among some learners. She explains that this contradiction can be explained by the fact that participants do not want to admit to having discriminatory ideas, as this is not in keeping with the whole spirit of a nation striving for togetherness (Govender, 2005). Similarly Keizan and Duncan (2010) found the same
inconsistencies in their study which they felt point to the ‘active battle’ that their participants were engaged in to make sense of the critical understanding and rationalisations of their behaviour (p. 481). High school students were also found not to refer to themselves or others in terms of race they displayed awareness of the “social stigma attached to openly talking about race” alluding to the “active battle’ to do right in a non-racial South Africa” (Vandeyar, 2007, p. 292). In post- apartheid South Africa with very strong branding and social pressure to buy into the “rainbow nation concept” it would behove participants to be politically correct as well as portray oneself positively in issues, contexts and discussions that reflect race and race relations. This is a possible reason for ‘white’ students to report that they do not notice the race of other students, so called colour-blindness (Vandeyar, 2007).

In their study of ‘white’ South African school girls Bhana and Pattman (2010) report this feeling of belonging in the rainbow nation, which allows them “opportunities to engage with people from other ‘cultures’ and learn about these” however in reality displayed friendships based on racial clustering and in-group/out-group thinking (p. 374). In self-reports of this phenomenon, culture was alluded to as the great divider which Bhana and Pattman argue is synonymous with race as it belies thoughts about the Other, who is of a different culture and race, this from a perspective that ‘whites’ are cultureless (Bhana & Pattman, 2010). It appears that although colour blindness is valued as a result of political correctness, other tags and labelling has taken the place of race which continues to divide the different races groups in racially homogenous ingroups.

2.10 Transformation of Higher Education Institutions

Much has been written (predominantly by academics) around transformation of higher education institutions since the democratic election of 1994 and a new dispensation. It has also been the focus of the 1994 National Commission on Higher Education whose purpose was to develop a strategy to ensure a “well planned and integrated high quality national system of higher education whose students and staff are increasingly representative of South African society” (Toni, 2011, p. 187) However there is a new tide of so called detractors that state that transformation is superficial and frontage to ‘old business as normal’ practices.

One of these detractors Jonathan Jansen (2004) extols the virtues of the new dispensation and the constitution and then gets to the crux: “But policy is not practice, and while an impressive architecture exists for democratic education, South Africa has a long way to go to make ideals concrete and achievable within educational institutions.” (p. 126). This long way is evident as following the merger between the then Universities of Natal and Durban Westville, a former
colonial university and a university built for people of colour, the new university focused on transformation specifically to merge and bind the disparate groups, students and academic staff alike. In an article, in a newspaper Professor Malegapuru Makoba Vice Chancellor of UKZN, alluded to challenges such as cultural differences on each of the campuses which tend to be compounded by race as well as continued segregation and different interpretations of equity and transformation (Makgoba, 2009). Four years down the line the limited transformation amongst students at UKZN remains visible to all observers and the need for research to find solutions and new strategies become imperative.

Toni (2011) in her article about ‘Dismantling Racial and Hegemonic Boundaries in an Inclusive Higher Education’ tries to answer the question of the way forward by drawing on ‘the relational model’. She says: “that it depends on how we relate to one another in everyday encounters. When we change such habituated and ritualized action sequences we also change meanings and the very notion of race.” (p. 195). Transformation necessitates changes at all levels. ‘Black’ students have been found to have difficulty identifying with ‘white’ teachers who represent a different culture and often a different language. The student thus attempts to fit in by working with the teacher and denying his own culture in the process (Vandeyar, 2007). This is an important finding to bear in mind, as the students at UKZN are faced with lecturers of different races as well as for ‘black’ students possibly the speaking of a different language and needing to relate to fellow black students who may be of a different cultural group and speak a different language.

Much has been written about university students’ integration along racial lines particularly internationally but also from within South Africa. Researchers have approached the topic from different angles, view-points and methodologies. Contemporary studies particularly emanating out of South Africa has tried to examine racial integration in everyday lived experience versus a social psychologist’s investigation of cognitive frameworks that rationalise the behaviours. South African research suggests examination of contextual drivers within a remaining unequal society.
Chapter 3
Methodology

3.1 Introduction

The aim of the study was to explore students’ lived reality of racial integration across the domain of university life and as a student of occupational therapy. This chapter will seek to explain the way in which the study was implemented, the theoretical underpinnings of the research in terms of the ontology and epistemology, the rationale behind the research design, sampling, data analysis and the ethical considerations guiding it.

3.2 Theoretical Paradigm

The researcher finds herself located within a particular epoch of history eighteen years post ‘liberation’ in South Africa researching a question that is sensitive, diverse and potentially conflictual. As the research leads one to a racialised discourse the researcher chose to embed the research within the theoretical paradigm of critical race theory. The discourse of race is framed not only by race per se, but political and historical context as well as racial socialization and forces of contemporary globalization. Critical Race Theory (CRT) according to McLaren and Roediger, looks at the way race is presented in everyday life including “the cultural logics and performative acts that inscribe and create whiteness and nonwhiteness” (quoted in Denzin & Lincoln, 2008, p. 459). CRT thus speaks most credibly to both the ontology and epistemology of this research project as it looks at the multiple realities of the participants through their telling. Specifically this framework’s ontology is linked to human beings’ struggle for power through amongst other variables race, as well as its epistemology that the produced knowledge, generated from the research can be used to create social transformation. (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011, p. 102)

3.3 Research Design

This research project is a descriptive, qualitative research design. Denzin and Lincoln (2000) say “qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or to interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them” (p. 3). This research project aimed to explore the lived reality of social integration as reported by Occupational Therapy students at the University of KwaZulu-Natal.
Race and its discourse, as literature indicates, is a phenomenon that is highly subjective, that appears in acts of consciousness. (Carter, 1995; Erasmus, 2008) A phenomenological lens as a research strategy aimed to uncover the ways in which individuals experience from the first-person point of view, racial integration on campus along with relevant conditions of experience.

The discourse engendered by the participants’ participation not only reflected their reality, but was actively constructed as they engaged, interacted and debated with others in the focus group. Content analysis as a tool was utilised to discover this lived reality, while matrices pictorially represented the findings with relationships evident across themes.

This research project utilised focus groups as the data collection instrument, which promotes group discussion to develop the insights that would ordinarily be difficult to obtain. During focus groups the participants shared views and discussed issues and thoughts around the topic. This allowed them to dialogue with the concepts under discussion as well as internal ones. The interaction, climate and probes within the focus group were intended to be a natural catalyst or spark that would allow the group to grapple with the topic and achieve depth of discourse. (Bless, 2000)

The moderator/s, not the researcher, introduced and facilitated the discussion using probes as required. A vignette was initially introduced to orientate the group to the topic at hand as well as, initiate discussion around the topic in a non-threatening and informal way. This was in the form of a prose anecdote illustrating, homogenous racial social grouping on the campus. The particular vignette was chosen to quickly focus the focus group participants on the topic at hand as it speaks objectively about the core issue. (See Appendix 5)

Homogenous focus groups of six to eight members each were held for duration of sixty to ninety minutes for each group or until data saturation was reached. All groups utilised close to the maximal time with moderators controlling the time and closing of the groups by asking group members to draw their thoughts together in a summary of their perceptions. One so called e-focus group was held with 4 participants who were unable to make the focus groups per the schedule but had volunteered. This was done through creating a forum on the internet that allowed all participants to see and respond to each other’s comments concurrently. Following transcription and data analysis through thematic analysis participants that formed part of the focus groups were invited to peruse the themes that were linked to examples and confirm, or additionally clarify the findings via email and hard copies forming part of the triangulation process to ensure rigour.
3.4 Sampling Procedure

The population sample was constituted from occupational therapy students in year 2 to 4 at UKZN. The research sample was made up of volunteer respondents (occupational therapy UKZN Students) who responded to an invitation to participate (email) sent to all students in level two, three and four to participate in the study. This was facilitated through emailing the class representative the invite who then distributed it to the class via the class email list which is the method of information transfer utilised within the department. Thirty students volunteered to participate in the focus groups and twenty six were available to attend on a specific date and time. Four students who were unavailable participated in an e-focus group. Convenience sampling was used and students were assigned to racially homogenous groups according to available focus group dates. This created focus groups that were based on year groupings as the dates were between examinations or after them and allowed respondents to join as a result of their availability and at their convenience. Participants’ race was ascribed to them by matching them against their student profile classification that they had self-declared on entry to UKZN. This information was accessed from the students’ statistics page by the administrator of the discipline following permission to access such by the Academic Leader. This procedure ensured anonymity and prevented the researcher from having to subjectively classify participants and hence participate in the classification of humans along this variable. Five focus groups were created with the following demographics per group:

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus group</th>
<th>No. of participants</th>
<th>Race group “self-declared”</th>
<th>Other info.</th>
<th>1st language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus group 1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>‘African’</td>
<td>Mix of students across years</td>
<td>6 isiZulu 1 isiXhosa 1 siSwati 1 English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus group 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>‘white’</td>
<td>All fourth year students</td>
<td>5 English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus group 3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>‘white’</td>
<td>All third year students</td>
<td>7 English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus group 4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>‘white’</td>
<td>All second year students</td>
<td>1 German 4 English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus group 5 “e-focus group”</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>‘Indian’</td>
<td>All third year students</td>
<td>4 English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Focus group two to five were homogenous in terms of race and year of study as students chose a time slot that suited them between examinations or after, as the data collection occurred at the end of the semester. Noteworthy is that ‘Indian’ students who are Hindu students did not volunteer and the ‘Indian’ focus group comprised of four female students of the Muslim faith, while the ‘African’ focus group were all students that stayed on the campus residence and insisted on forming one focus group. The one ‘coloured participant’ was offered a place in the ‘African’ focus group and took up the place without reservation. All focus groups were held in English although the ‘black’ focus group had a moderator who is isiZulu speaking. The demographics indicate that within this group, eight participants out of nine spoke English as a second language. Sampling issues are discussed in the limitations section in chapter seven.

Inclusion criteria

Registered occupational therapy students at UKZN over the age of 18 years old (legal age of consent)

Students in the second, third and fourth year of study.

First year students were excluded on account of minimal experience of university life and the discipline as well as the process of lifestyle adjustments from the domain of high school to tertiary education with possible change of province or changes in residence.

Able to set aside time for a focus group

3.5 Pilot Study

Prior to the focus groups being run, a pilot study was held with 5 staff members of the discipline to ascertain whether the focus group vignette, questions and probes were adequate to elicit the lived experience of the sample group. This occurred through inviting staff members to participate in the pilot study, at a departmental venue, in a given week over a sixty to ninety minute session. The researcher ran the focus group as it allowed her to be cogniscent of their responses and what relevant changes were necessitated. The pilot elicited robust comment and opinions and hence verified the use of the vignette and probes. Although probes remained unchanged, the need for following up of discussion with secondary probes was confirmed and emphasised to moderators.
3.6 Data Collection Procedure

3.6.1 Live Focus Group Procedure

- An ethics proposal was submitted to the UKZN Research Ethics Higher Degrees Committee (REHDC) for review and ethical clearance. An ethical clearance certificate was issued, granting the researcher permission to proceed with the study. (Ethical clearance number HSS/1136/012M. (See Appendix 1)
- Gatekeeper permission to access the students was requested from the Head of REHDC, Prof van Heerden and granted. (See Appendix 6)
- Verbal permission was obtained from Prof Robin Joubert to access self-declared racial classification from the Students Management System and granted.
- Invitation to participate in focus groups was emailed out to all second, third and fourth year students through the relevant student class representatives with attached letter explaining the nature of the study. (See Appendix 2) students were requested to email or respond in writing to invitation by dropping a reply with their name and contact details into a reply box in the reception area of the discipline.
- Students’ names and contact details were noted on a list by the researcher as they volunteered to participate and their self-declared race accessed through the system by the Discipline administrator. Students were then assigned to focus groups were they were assigned a number code that matched with a seat number.
- The Wellness Centre for student counselling on campus was approached regarding the referral of participants to them, who might experience distress during or following the focus group for counselling. Permission was obtained verbally.
- Three external moderators and two fieldworkers were employed to run the four onsite focus groups. The fieldworker recorded the focus groups as per the supplied note-taking forms. Thus there was a need for four moderators and four fieldworkers across the four focus groups. The moderators were sourced on the basis of their knowledge and expertise in facilitating discussion and understanding of the profession. The table below indicates their demographics and roles. (The section on Power Dialectic, page 29, explains the rationale for the use of external moderators)
Table 2

Moderator/fieldworker information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>No. of focus groups involved with</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moderator 1</td>
<td>‘African’</td>
<td>Social Worker</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator 2/fieldworker</td>
<td>‘white’</td>
<td>Occupational Therapist</td>
<td>2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator 3</td>
<td>‘white’</td>
<td>Occupational Therapist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldworker</td>
<td>‘Indian’</td>
<td>Admin Clerk</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Moderators were provided with a pack of relevant information containing focus group handling techniques as well as tips such as how to paraphrase, draw in a quiet participant and ask open ended questions among other issues. The information pack also included a copy of the vignette and letter of information and consent form as well as a literature review with aims and objectives of the study. Over and above this the researcher met with all three moderators individually to discuss the information, answer questions and discuss protocol. Moderators were matched to focus groups per their self-declared race, as per ethical requirements and informed of the day of the focus group and what time to arrive, and how to fill out the moderators forms. One moderator also performed field work duties following training, in groups separate to the one’s she ran. The moderators, all registered professionals and fieldworker provided verbal confirmation that they were aware of the ethical principles governing the process and contact with participants and would uphold these. The ethical considerations were discussed with each person in detail. The process of referral to the Wellness Centre for counselling on experiencing distress during the focus group was explained to the moderator and fieldworker who would offer to walk with the participant to the centre and ensure intervention. The fieldworker discussed her role with the researcher and understood the setting up and notation required of her. The moderators/fieldworker were remunerated at an hourly rate commensurate with the university’s rate.

- Participants were informed about the date and venue of the study via email.
• The venue was pre-set up and pizza and drinks laid out for the participants prior to the start of the focus group. Seats were pre-numbered to assist the fieldworker differentiate between the individuals. Participants were required to fill in the consent form on arrival and leave it in a box provided on the table within the venue. Participants then each selected a chair and a copy of the vignette was provided to all participants.

• The moderator and fieldworker welcomed and introduced themselves to the participants, explaining their role, the need for confidentiality and anonymity as well as the focus group time frame, access to the toilet and how the audio-recorder worked, and the level of the tone of voice that needed to occur. Students were requested to use their chair numbers to identify themselves when speaking.

• The focus group was then audio-recorded with the vignette being read silently by each participant and then discussed.

3.6.2 E-focus Group Procedure

• Four participants, two of which resided out of Durban requested participation and asked if they could be involved in an e-focus group.

• The e-focus group was set up on an online server linked to the University’s server which allows the creation of a chat room where all participants were able to see each other’s comments and respond in a consecutive manner. In this way a conversation was facilitated between the participants. There was no moderator involved, however one participant took a leadership role and posed the probes which were responded to by the participants. Each participant responded as a number and hence anonymity was preserved.

• The e-focus group concluded with a summary of the participants’ perceptions and a copy of the discussion was made and emailed to the researcher who stored the data on a password protected computer.

• The chat room was then closed and no trace of the discussion thread was saved.

3.7 Data Analysis

Miles and Huberman, (1994) define data analysis as: “consisting of three concurrent flows of activity: data reduction, data display and conclusion drawing/verification” (p.10-11). The researcher followed this description when approaching the data analysis of this research project. This allowed for a deepening of the consecutive focus groups that were informed by the
described cycle. The audio-recording from a focus group was listened to twice over prior to the next focus group to gain understanding of issues or aspects that the moderator needed to be made aware of such as clarification of misunderstood probes, not allowing participants to go the entire focus group without saying anything or of not following up with secondary probes as necessary. This also allowed the researcher to give specific suggestions to the moderators on relevant issues such as handling of multiple simultaneous voices and soft speaking participants.

Data was digitally recorded using a recorder and then transcribed verbatim by the researcher. The transcription included the annotation of non-verbal actions such as pauses, sounds or group noise where relevant. Detailed field notes were made by the moderator immediately after the focus groups, on the moderators’ own reflexivity as well as the more overt group dynamics and process as well as themes of discourse. (See Appendix 7)

Data reduction according to Miles and Huberman “refers to the process of selecting, focusing, simplifying, abstracting and transforming the data that appear in written up field notes and transcription. Data reduction continues until a final report is completed” (1994, p. 10-11.) The audio recording was initially listened to by the researcher approximately two times each, as part of familiarising herself with the content. The audio recording was then transcribed, followed by the fieldworker who is skilled in word processing checking the audio recording simultaneously with the transcription to verify its content for accuracy. Further to this the process was advanced by reading through the transcription to allow the researcher to further familiarise herself with the data as emerging sets of themes and patterns of perceptions. The transcription was then coded and thematically analysed utilising matrices as expounded by Miles and Huberman (1994). These matrices were drawn directly from the data per focus group and then coalesced into one large mind map.

Data display is an organised, compressed assembly of information that permits conclusion drawing and action. The researcher utilised the initial mind-maps, to form matrices showing interconnectedness as well as networks belonging to the same macro theme. This allowed for collapsing of sections of the original mind maps and the focusing around the key data that was highlighted in the focus groups. In this way the data was made more accessible and compact as well as to allowed her to draw justified conclusions and begin to conceptualise the resultant chapters.
Trustworthiness

Conclusion drawing and verification occurred through the researcher drawing conclusions from noting regularities, patterns, explanations, possible configurations, and causal flows (Miles & Huberman, 1994.) Triangulation of data occurred at multiple levels. The first level was through the use of the researcher’s reflexivity both as an observer of the student integration but also as an actor in the contextual field with good understanding of the issues reported within the data. The second level was through intersubjective consensus seeking, where the researcher released a copy of the themes that had arisen within specific focus groups to that group only for authentication, verification and further clarification. This was done through emailing the focus group members the copy as well as for the ‘black’ focus group hard copies were also requested and released to them via a focus group representative. A deadline for response was provided and only three students from one focus group replied. On perusal of these submissions no objections or feelings of misrepresentation were noted; the data did however not deepen or clarify the data. In this way the data was verified as an accurate reflection of the discussion. The researcher was then able to proceed with the write up.

3.8 Ethical Considerations

‘Race’ is a sensitive and sometimes volatile issue in South Africa and the world. The ethics of research that focuses on ‘race’ then becomes of heightened importance. The researcher is acutely aware of this and was committed to making sure that the research and the discourse that it engendered did not fulfil and give legitimacy to ‘race’ classification, stereotypes and negative connotations associated with the construct. The ethical considerations discussed below attempted to ameliorate this.

3.8.1 Responsibility

This entailed creating a ‘safe space’ for the voice of the respondent to narrate their lived experiences and internal reality without fear or favour. This asked of the researcher that she not only creates but protects the discourse arena and the players within. This was achieved by establishing the various levels of confidentiality within the group, the moderator ensuring all voices are heard and promoted and the reinforcement of ethical principles laid out here.

The safety of the participants was promoted by reinforcing that participants were able to leave at any time during the focus group as well as allowing participants with a distressing emotional
response to discuss their feelings with a counsellor that was available on site at a different location. This allowed the participants to access a counsellor anonymously, immediately and without the researcher’s involvement. Further to this safety was promoted by the confidential nature of the focus group.

It was also incumbent on the researcher to take responsibility that the research looked towards social justice and transformation by the creation of opportunities that address some of the issues that humans face which affects their lives. This research around ‘race should thus have social significance at some level. The feedback loop to both academic staff and students needed to be closed and the findings and recommendations of the research be clearly disseminated.

3.8.2 Power Dialectic

The researcher is an academic in the same Department as the participants and this created a power dialectic. This was accounted for in the informed consent form that confirmed that the research was in no way related to their course of study and did not prejudice them in any way.

To ensure that the power dialectic did not affect the focus group dynamic and the respondent’s participation external moderators for the focus group were used. This ensured that the participants were free to disclose their reality and thoughts and that the process was removed from relationships or structures aligned to the Department of Occupational Therapy and the examining of the participants. Different external moderators were utilised as a result of a need to keep the external moderators race consistent with that of the group as well as per their availability.

Further to this the researcher ensured that she portrayed herself as a researcher first and foremost in any and all correspondence or contact during the research process so that the participants were able to distinguish between the lecturer and researcher roles. This contact was in the form of lecturing contact, casual academic contact, and contact such as the necessary focus group emails. The researcher did not allude to the research during contact time, either formally or informally with the potential respondents/possible participants.

3.8.3 Respect for Autonomy

The respondents/participants were free to make their own independent decisions about participation and withdrawal with no coercion either overt or covert, the researcher was
particularly aware of this possibility being a lecturer within the Department of Occupational Therapy. Autonomy was ensured in the following ways:

Voluntary participation: A general invitation containing the information letter was sent out to all registered occupational therapy students within second, third and fourth year, by email using occupational therapy department database inviting them to participate on a volunteer basis. This process allowed the respondents to act autonomously when they volunteered, it was clearly stated from the onset that neither participation nor non-participation would in any way reflect on the students, especially as participant details were coded for purposes of anonymity during data analysis. (See Appendix 2: Information Letter)

Informed consent: participants were required to sign a letter of consent on the day of the focus group which comprised the title of the study, procedure and length of time of focus group. This was facilitated by the moderator on the day. It created an understanding of the nature of the research and outlined the nature of participation and importantly the rights and privileges of participants such as having the right to withdraw from the research process at any time on their own cognition. This document also requested informed consent for use of a Dictaphone also that no coercion between lecturer and student was at play. The informed consent letter was separate to the information letter. (See Appendix 3)

Anonymity: The participant was coded by the fieldworker according to a seating number at the focus group as developed by the researcher. This ensured that they would not be recognised and attached to certain opinions expressed. This was of great importance to the researcher, a staff member as it ensured that the anecdotes and quotes emanating from the research could not be attributed to any particular student participant by herself or other members of staff/or other students that the information will be disseminated to. This is of particular significance as participants needed to be assured that no future bias for or against any participant would occur. It is for this reason that the researcher did not personally conduct the focus groups but appointed an external moderator to do so. The seating number code was then changed into a consistent pseudonym during the data presentation stage. The e- group gave themselves numbers and this did not necessitate researcher intervention.

Right to withdraw: Participants were informed in writing as well as orally that they had the right to withdraw at any time during the research process including during the focus group without prejudice. It was explicitly stated on their consent form as well as told to them on the day of the focus group meeting by the moderator.
Confidentiality: The respondent's information letter and letter of informed consent stated that all information would be handled confidentially however this did not preclude dissemination of the information pertinent to the findings which has all markers of respondent identities removed. Participants were told before the focus group began that the research focused on the content of the discussion and not the participant's identities, and in this way reinforced confidentiality of person. Participants were furthermore requested to uphold the confidentiality of the content and identity of the focus group by not talking about it to others which was assented to verbally at the start of each focus group. Transcripts and dictaphone recordings are secured in a password protected computer for a period of five years with restricted access to the researcher and supervisor as per UKZN policy the Data Protection Act of 1998.

3.8.4 Justice

This entails treating all participant/prospective participant equally and equitably. This process occurred throughout the running of the focus groups and will further occur, following submission of the research study when findings and recommendations have been finalised, on the university premises at a time convenient to the researcher and the discipline. All registered occupational therapy students will be invited to give feedback following the dissemination of the research findings. The feedback will be invited through electronic forms as well as anonymous notes that can be dropped into the Departments suggestion box. These suggestions will be taken to the relevant structures including the discipline for vetting and consideration. In this way the researcher will enable all voices a chance to be heard.

The focus groups were loosely moderated to ensure openness and even handling taking particular care not to show any bias or responses which may indicate or expose ideological predisposition of the perspective of the researcher or the moderator. This type of moderation was essential in keeping within the phenomenological approach, creating opportunities to meaning making around the investigated issue by the participants, seeking a broad understanding from the participants’ perspective versus a narrow prescribed view, led by pointed probes. The focus remained consistent but the probes were not uniform for all focus groups as a result of data reduction and on-going verification as well as the particular character and content of the focus group on any given day. Consistency was maintained through a thorough briefing of the moderator prior to each focus group, through the open ended nature of questions and allowing the discourse to be generated from the participants.
3.8.5 Beneficence and non-maleficence

Beneficence entails always acting in the best interests, here of the participant and society and protecting the person from harm and is thus intertwined with ethical responsibility. It is anticipated that the findings of the study will contribute to transformational changes that will be wrought within curricula and educational facilitation of students within the Department of Occupational Therapy, and in this way directly benefit the students themselves, including the participants, their colleagues and clients.

This will occur through various levels of dissemination of the study including feedback of findings to all students registered for the occupational therapy degree in the form of an informative email and seminar as deemed appropriate at the time and in consultation with members of staff. Participants who have exited the course or graduated will be contacted through email and provided with the above email and invited to the seminar.

Non-maleficence was upheld by ensuring that participants and moderators were not exposed to any deliberate harm or risk of more than a minimal level. The possibility that the topic under discussion could illicit strong emotional responses such as distress or catharsis was at all times a consideration. The management of the focus group by a skilled moderator and the prior arrangement to provide immediate access to any student in need, contained risk for harm at a minimal level. This was ensured throughout all procedures, the management of data and the running of the focus groups.

This section in its ethical consideration and methodology formed the foundation upon which this study was built. Chapter four begins the discussion first generally and then specifically according to macro-themes of the findings.
Chapter 4

A. Introduction to Findings

4.1 Introduction

The aim of this research project was to explore students’ views of racial integration across the domain of university life and as a student of occupational therapy with particular reference to the barriers and promotive factors to racial integration within the Discipline of Occupational Therapy. This chapter will report on the findings garnered from 5 racially homogenous focus groups under macro-themes, sub-themes, foci and divergent points.

The findings are reported using three macro-themes that speak to the objectives of the research which will be discussed within the three consecutive chapters. The macro-themes are: (1) Othering, as the core macro theme, (2) Social cohesion, (3) Promoters and barriers to integration as an occupational therapy student. These inter-related macro-themes will then contain the related meso, micro-themes and sub-themes, giving structure to, and organising the complex data into related chapters however, need to be seen as a greater whole.

![Inter-related macro-themes](https://via.placeholder.com/150)

Figure 4.1 Inter-related macro-themes

The themes capture the data produced from all focus groups however they display dialectical discourse between sub-themes reported by different racial groups. This is of particular interest to the researcher as it showed divergent thinking/reasoning and experience of life and the perceptions thereof between the groups. Critical race theory debunks the notion that there should be ‘colour blindness’ to the identity of participants as the very nature of the study looks at race therefore the participants self-reported racial group is placed behind their pseudonym to
indicate relevant racial belonging. In order to visually describe and organise the complex data, visual graphic depictions displaying relationships are placed at the beginning of each new result section.

Generally the participants spoke freely and easily warming to the topic following the vignette opener (Appendix 5) and spoke strongly, resonating with the discussion as the group progressed. The participants had a lot to say, and appeared to enjoy the opportunity to speak about their experiences. Fieldwork notes by a fieldworker commented on the second year group (focus group four), who “took a while to get to the deeper issues” and she felt that this was perhaps on account of their inexperience in deep reflection or had decreased insight. This group appeared to not have formulated their own opinion and reflected back to family teachings/experience. During focus group two (‘white’ group) the moderator noted palpable tension in the room when they discussed racial conflict that had occurred within that year group. She noted: “...an atmosphere of frustration, irritation and despondency, linked to racial issues on campus....” Focus group one, (‘black’) was a vocally passionate group, who spoke about their experience of racism, as well the historical nuances of life on South Africa. The moderator was required to intervene many times as the group became very animated with many voices at once and a lot being said.

4.2 Demographic details: Understanding the Participants

In order to understand the research participants and their unique voices it is important to present the demographic details of the focus groups. This serves to bring significance and meaning to the findings that can be seen in the context of the participants as outlined in Chapter 3: Methodology.

Thirty occupational therapy students participated in the five racially homogenous focus groups. Participants were between the ages of 18-26 years. Nineteen participants were from year three of study (63%), with five from year four (17%) and six from year two of study (20%). There were 28 female participants made up of the following self-declared racial groups, six ‘African’, one ‘coloured’, 17 ‘white’, four ‘Indian’. The two male participants were both ‘African’.
B. Othering

4.3 Othering: Drivers of Ingroup/Racial Homogeneity

This section looks at reported variables that maintained or promoted ingrouping of racial homogeneity. Findings support the concept of Othering, a concept utilised by social science which recognises that by seeing and portraying another as Other, groups and individuals are able to intellectualise and rationalise divisions between themselves and the Other (Seidman, 2013). This allows one to interpret and re-interpret sameness within one’s group and oneself. Edward Said (1995) a critical scholar on post colonialism wrote about this when he said:

“The development and maintenance of every culture requires the existence of another different and competing alter ego. The construction of identity… whether Orient or Occident, France or Britain… involves establishing opposites and otherness whose actuality is always subject to the continuous interpretation and reinterpretation of their differences from us”. (p. 332).

Although similarities between the focus groups are evident, there are also differences between the so called ‘black’ and ‘white’ racial groups. These will then be reported as such by juxtaposing these perceptions within the discussion of the data. Othering is the core theme as a result of the nature and content of the data. The data presentation is artificial in its boundaries between the chapters and themes which should be seen as porous and intertwined, rather than limited and encapsulated. Viewed in totality and in context the macro-themes create a balanced perspective which displays Othering as a lived reality, nestled amongst themes of social and integrational change.
Figure 4.2 Overview of Othering (as 1 of 3 macro-themes)
The first meso-theme to be discussed is the theme of Apartheid’s aftermath which holds sub-themes related to conditions or by-products from Apartheid as discussed in the literature above. Three micro themes emerged from the findings, Affirmative Action, Segregated Social Spaces and Diminished Interpersonal Relationships.

4.3.1 Apartheid’s Aftermath

Figure 4.3 Meso-theme 1: Apartheid’s aftermath and micro-themes

The first micro-theme reported is diminished interpersonal relationships\(^4\), and focuses on the apparent poor relationships between the different races perceived to be as a result of the apartheid system legislated by the South African Government prior to 1994. This theme is then further broken down into sub-themes and foci which report the lived experiences and perceptions of the participants. The following graphic depiction visually organises the presentation of information in this theme.

---

\(^4\) Diminished interpersonal relationships- the word diminished points to general impairment of relationships as these are contextual and relative to individuals and hence the degree cannot be ascertained.
4.3.1.1 Diminished Interpersonal Relationships

Sub-themes of Racism, Stereotypes and Family Values emerged and are reported separately with foci and evidence led from relevant quotes from the transcripts. These sub-themes display the clustering of perceptions, and lived experiences that allude to diminished interpersonal relationships and should be seen as part of the whole.

Racism is defined by Oxford dictionaries as: “the belief that all members of each race possess characteristics, abilities, or qualities specific to that race, especially so as to distinguish it as inferior or superior to another race or races” (“Racism”, 2013). Racism as a sub-theme links to beliefs that through racialisation opportunities for Othering are created. The foci are specific to these beliefs and are labelled as reverse racism, the experience of discrimination and the stigma of integration with the Other.
Racism

Participants reported examples of reverse racism which within a South African context is the apparent discrimination towards a ‘black’ person by a ‘black’ person. In western literature this remains a contentious issue as it is felt that discrimination on the basis of race is just plain racism. (Norton & Sommers, 2011) In South Africa, as a result of Apartheid, racism is generally perceived to be discrimination by ‘white’ people against ‘people of colour’, hence the term reverse racism to highlight the difference. This appeared covertly as well as overtly within the focus groups of both ‘white’ and ‘black’ students. For example, opinions that a ‘coloured’ student did not belong in an ‘African’ focus group suggests overt reverse racism while feelings that one would not learn from fellow black students during group work assignments suggests covert displays of prejudice through stereotyping.

The first quote is an example of reverse racism and describes discrimination by ‘blacks’ towards a ‘black’ who integrates with ‘whites’ as experienced by a ‘white student’.

Ann (W): When I had my little stint at Varsity College I had my friends, me, Precious and Bronwyn. And Precious hung out with us white people and the black girls of Varsity College were disgustingly mean to her, because she wouldn’t hang out with them, and it became, I don’t know is that racism? Because it’s of your own kind.

Ann emotively gives us this example, using a rhetorical question to make her point, but closer scrutiny sees Ann not only introducing this concept that ‘black’ girls do not like ‘black’ girls joining the Other but shows in her example acknowledgement of the “Us/Them” dichotomy. This is supported by the following example from a focus group, of a ‘black’ student who is schooled at a private school finding that “black people did not understand that she didn’t talk like them, she didn’t act like them …and it was really a big pain for her.”

The next quotes displays ‘black’ on black discrimination again but in terms of an older generational mother’s preference for an Other as her daughter’s partner, as well as covert stereotyping that a ‘black’ group with be disadvantageous to join academically.

Nonhle (A): I am an African person but there’s so much more to it, there is so much more because I can bring a black male home and my mom, honestly speaking, will be like “ok are you sure” you know? It’s just a preference, you know, she would prefer me to bring someone of a different colour.
Thuli (A): …for example we are in a class and we get divided into groups and then the lecturer chooses, okay for that group you’re all white people, they’re all Indians (pause) and it happens you know and then sometimes I would say ay you can’t just because I’m black I’m put at a disadvantage ‘cause I’ve been put with the black group

Both of these examples as well as the examples alluded to earlier point out ‘black’ on ‘black’ racism across generations, many within student cohorts, as well as between an ‘black’ mother who had grown up during Apartheid and her desire for a ‘non-black’ partner for her daughter. Both, the content of the quotes as well as the language used within point to Othering with phrases such as “us white girls” and “I am an African person…” Nonhle appears to try and deepen the dialogue by verbalising this example, at the risk of stigmatisation, and first is seen to align herself with the “us black people” by claiming her Africanness and then by repeating “there is so much more” before the word “honestly” suggests the truth is incontrovertible. These examples point to the Other as displaying increased attraction rather than one’s own racial group which is then viewed negatively (“disgustingly mean”) and will diminish interpersonal relationships. (See Chapter 6: Mentality of the oppressed)

According to Oxford Dictionaries discrimination is the: “unjust or prejudicial treatment of different categories of people, especially on the grounds of race, age, or sex.” (“Discrimination”, 2013) In the context of this dissertation the researcher uses discrimination to describe a condition where one person is treated better than another on the basis of racial difference which could be perceived or enacted. Data from the ‘black’ focus group revealed multiple examples of perceived racism from the general example below, to the more specific.

Jabulani (A): The black child will feel inferior on an average basis, that is something you cannot run away from. A black child always knows that they were oppressed and they still are oppressed.

Several participants within the ‘black’ focus group described experiences of discrimination from school to university examples, to contemporary occurrences across domains of life. Practicing of occupational therapy as a student creates opportunities for discrimination to occur in the workplace, where clients may be found to refuse treatment by a ‘black’ student.
Thuli (A): ...coming to hear a white woman telling me: “don’t touch me, don’t touch me.” Blah blah blah. It is going to affect you. I don’t care if your heart is a brick, it will affect you.

The participant’s use of “Blah Blah Blah” perhaps indicates much more than is said, and also the mundaneness of this incident in terms of the ‘black’ student perspective. Finally the emotion that this experience causes is presented strongly.

The quote below displays discrimination in terms of service provision, a recurring focus in the ‘black’ focus group.

Andiswa (A): Where I was working at a supermarket… the owner would tell me to have better service to a white person and take their bags to the car. And when a black person (pause) she doesn’t say anything or she say like “go do something else.”

Andiswa reported being asked to discriminate against another ‘black’ person which is imposed reverse racism. Here she was required to disregard the Other from the owner’s perspective, while assisting the ‘white’ Other. This is not only a humiliating experience, denial of one’s own, and apparent siding with the Other, (the ‘white’ owner) but could have deleterious effects on one’s self-esteem with perhaps resultant hostility towards the humiliator, the Other. This is linked with Tajfel and Turner’s Social Identity Theory which is driven by self-esteem.

Another form of discrimination reflected was the stigma of integration: the connotation of disgrace associated with racial integration. This was seen within two of the ‘white’ focus groups with talk of being called a coconut, as well as ‘black’ students not recognising the attempt at integration or being perceived by ‘black’ students as doing them a “favour”. Daphne and Zai, below speak directly to the stigma.

Daphne (W): I also think it is how other people socially respond to you, ‘cause I know (don’t judge) a few years ago I did date a guy of another race and you go out to watch movies and then everybody stares at you to the point where you feel uncomfortable because like “oh they’re holding hands”. Or even just walking around, if you walk around with a person of another race, people look at you.

---

5 Coconut- usually alludes to a ‘person of colour’ spending time with ‘white’ people who are then said to be brown on the outside and white on the inside, however used within the focus groups differently
Zai (C): I know if I am going to bring a black boy home, whatever and say ok I want to get married, it’s going to be an issue. Because I know there is that thing in the community where it’s not spoken about, they are not going to openly voice it.

Daphne not only reports the experience of dating across the so called ‘colour bar’ but also displays anticipation that the stigma will still be at play amongst the participants when she says: “don’t judge”. Daphne experienced the people looking at her as stigmatisation, as the people acknowledged that she was with an Other as well as reminded her of the fact that her partner was not of the same race group. She emphasises this by noting that this occurs “even when walking around” in seemingly innocuous activity. Both display knowledge that there are issues with integration which are covert as Zai says: “…it’s not spoken about…”. “Openly voice it” perhaps means that it is voiced within ingroups but is not politically correct to speak it out.

**Stereotypes**

The definition of stereotypes, the second sub-theme, is “a widely held but fixed and oversimplified image or idea of a particular type of person or thing” (“Stereotypes”, 2013). Within this work it refers to the representation of whole blocks of people that are assumed to conform to fixed patterns or behaviours especially related to race group. The data related to this is further reported under the foci of cultural and behavioural stereotypes although they are not mutually exclusive. The quotes below illustrate similarities except they are from and about different race groups and reflect cultural and behavioural perspectives.

The following quotes are an example of cultural stereotypes, where generalisations are made on the basis of culture. Othering is displayed by the use of ‘they’ and ‘we’, as words that separate the race groups.

Mary (W): I know we like to say that everybody is the same but there are obvious differences in some ways and it’s like the way we’ve been brought up, the way as you say culture and I think that there is differences like if I think of the Muslim girls I think of make-up and prettiness. [coughing] They have got like certain characteristics about them and I think we’re quite laid back with the way we dress sometimes to varsity and the way we act.

Mary links culture (Muslim) to fashion, which supports research that points to youth in a globalised world making meaning of racial identity through “fashion, style and ultimately ‘taste’”
as well as other historical ways such as inherited, socialised and geographical factors. (Dolby in Vandayar, 2008, p.287) Further this allusion to cultural difference is called symbolic racism where segregational thought is framed by socially acceptable terms and is less overt. (Durrheim & Dixon, 2005, p.455)

Thuli, (below) admits cultural stereotypes without elucidating the specific ‘tendencies’ she generalises about.

Thuli (A): The first thing you gonna think, uh there’s the umlungu\(^6\). You know, you think, uh white person, they must have white tendencies.

These examples of cultural stereotypes based on religion “the Muslim girls” as well as race; “white tendencies” display the intertwining of stereotypes related to race, culture and religion in the conceptualisation of the ‘Other’. Durrheim et al (2005) found that in discursive research “that people construct racial differences as cultural rather than biological, allowing them to deny racism…” (p. 455)

The behaviour of the Other is reported in stereotyped attributes of certain race groups and appear to have endured and continue to foster current Us/Them internal dialogue, as Thuli states below.

Thuli (A): ...one of the biggest factors is behaviour, how certain cultures or race groups whatever behave themselves, bringing that into what we are discussing now about the divisions.

This internalisation can be seeing in the experience of certain race behaviour in school and its reactive repercussions at University. Chloe labels behaviour of ‘black’ girls in school and reports that 7 years later she is still holding these stereotypes and has to make an effort to break them.

Chloe (W): When I was in grade 8 I had a very racially segregated class… we had lots of racial fights because the girls who were of black colour were extremely disobedient, disrespectful, and they got the entire class in trouble, because the whole class went to detention because of the one group. So growing up, even when I was picking groups for biology class, it’s always, you keep going back to “ah but they were so disruptive” and, they create a reputation for

\(^6\) Umlungu- isiZulu for one who comes from across the sea, however colloquially meaning ‘white’ person
Chloe carries stereotypes from experience of the Other without reflecting on the reasons behind her own actions/feelings or those of the “extremely disobedient” black girls. These perceptions are the default experience that references her contemporary interpersonal relationships with the Other, (“you keep going back to”) and thinking any differently takes cognitive effort. Several social psychologists have written about cognitive shortcuts that allow one to expend less cognitive effort which according to Devine (in Baron & Byrne, 1994, p. 220) results in using stereotypes to place people in pre-established categories, even if these have been found to be wrong, without attempting to change these categories.

In opposition to this, is the quote of Thuli below, who is seen to stereotype ‘whites’, (“they”) as people that are not happy and that this trait defines the Other, hence integration is not sought after. This describes outgroup homogeneity, where an individual perceives the outgroup or Other to be homogenous. (Linville et al in Byron & Byrne, 1994, p. 237) “they are …” indicates the illusion of outgroup homogeneity. Stereotypes such as these, of the Other litter the transcriptions across focus groups. These language nuances link to the work of Charles Perdue (in Brehm et al, 2004, p. 153) who stated that pronoun usage such as they, them and theirs describing outgroups elicited negative emotions and the opposite for ingroup pronouns. Hence language provides an insightful effect of the concept of Othering.

Thuli (A): I laugh mina7 and I laugh and I laugh loud. Yah bon?8 So I can’t be chilling, when half of the time this person is moaning, they are hardly ever a happy person.

Family Values

The third sub-theme describes family values as a force that segregates through the foci of familial socialisation and learnt segregation in many guises. The quote below draws our attention to the context that families, post democracy, continue to live in their same segregated contexts (as during Apartheid) and hence are able to keep from integrating. This also links to segregated social space on university campus and in outside domains that impact on integration described later.

---

7 Mina- isiZulu word meaning I
8 Ya Bon?- isiZulu meaning “you know?”
Children are socialised under the influence of the family as they grow up; which is familial racisation and hence are believed to adopt the values and norms of the family. This is evident in the next quote however the participant also reports growth in terms of ability to integrate as a result of increased opportunities while the family seemingly has not.

Helen (W): …my parents hadn’t black and Indian friends that came over a lot, so their kids were never friends, so I grew up with a lot of white kids my age who then became my friends in that town anyway. And then when I moved schools to more of an integrated school it was later in life. But I think it also impacted on it because that’s how I spent the majority of my life being friends with people of my culture and religion so I think it took a long time for me to adapt to different cultures and religions and how you interact appropriately with them and I have learnt to do that, but I don’t think my family really has, because they still live in that kind of environment which is probably a thing for a lot of kids on our campus.

The paradox of being socialised within a family that does not have opportunities to integrate while youth do, demonstrates the inconsistencies within socialisation that young people are exposed to everyday. They are many personas negotiating new racial ground.

Another method of family racisation occurs through learnt segregation. Participants shared examples of families teaching specific segregational practices as values both overtly and covertly, for example one cannot date a ‘person of colour’. This is supported by the social learning view (Pettigrew, 1969) that children learn Othering thoughts from listening to family members and important formative figures and are then rewarded for following these norms (in Byron & Byrne, 1994, p. 230).

Susan (W): I think we were born after that whole era but our parents and our parent’s parents still got that mindset. (pause) Like my mom she’s got out of it but she still would be horrified if I would bring a person of colour home as my boyfriend and my gran is even worse, she wouldn’t come to my wedding if I married someone of colour. Now being fed that, my mindset isn’t like my mom’s and my gran’s but like you still being brought up with a little bit of that and it’s not something you can help, ’cause that’s what your parents are saying.

Susan can be seen to distance herself from her family views, (“born after that whole era”, “my mindset isn’t like my mom’s…”) but also rationalises her own practice through alluding to a small
degree of transference, (“a little bit of that and it’s not something you can help”) and a seeming lack of free choice. Susan and Helen (above) both allude to change in themselves without reciprocal change within the family which functionally creates divergence from family values. This is oppositional to Zai’s contention that family values trump different experience of diversity.

Zai (C): You’re going to go to a multiracial school, you’re going to grow up with different people of colours but at home you are growing up with parents who have instilled these beliefs in you, it doesn’t matter what you’re going to see out there. You’ve already come with this mindset…

Another example of learnt segregation is the stratification of ‘blacks’ into different types, some apparently more acceptable than others, for example western vs. rural, educated vs. uneducated, however with the realisation that they, the Others are still ‘black’.

Mary (W): I once spoke about it with my dad and he said, (pause)…there is an educated black guy for example who comes to university or something, he probably is more welcoming than like a rural black person (pause) like he doesn’t speak much English and doesn’t, hasn’t had that westernized upbringing, (pause) does make a bit of a difference, (pause) and they are still black but (silence)

Mary’s father attempted to explain to his daughter stratification of the Other in that the closer the Other gets to matching their sameness the more acceptable (“more welcoming”) the Other would be (possibly meant as welcomed). This matching would occur in terms of sharing the same language as well as holding westernised upbringing, although as Mary reminds us at the end “they are still black”, still the Other. This speaks to acceptance of the Other only when they appear more like one’s own social group.

Petra compares bringing a ‘black’ person home (to parents) to so called ‘white trash’, a pejorative for ‘white’ people who are lower class, uneducated and poor. This serves to display the extreme nature of the Othering.

Petra (W): It’s like you bringing someone like white trash home, your parents are not gonna be happy if you come home with this, I don’t know, tattooed and teeth missing, I don’t know, just like white trash (pause) I know that’s derogatory but (pause)
While the above quotes look at learning of segregation through the family unit, through role modelling, teaching (verbally and behaviourally) and through rewards for complying (instrumental conditioning) for example “... your parents are not gonna be happy...” Liesel below notes that interaction with family is formative and refers to the inherent lengthy periods of time spent together which creates the conditions for transfer of values. This describes classical conditioning a psychological phenomenon that is learnt by repeated exposure to a stimulus and a learnt reaction.

Liesel (W): I think it’s becoming our way of thought because of them. Just because of how much you obviously interact with your parents and their thoughts and their views so it does eventually become your thoughts and all there is.

Learning from family can be through observation and vicarious learning, without being taught a concept verbally, and this is what Thuli alludes to in the example below, which also displays the concept of Othering by way of being subaltern in terms of class and oppression of the mind contiguous with Apartheid.

Thuli (A): For a person who is not really that educated and doesn’t have as much resources as we have, who is taught by a black person who also thinks they inferior to a white person, their parents at home also working for white people. The parents doesn’t have to tell them that a white person is superior to you, they think okay my mom works for white people, the white people drive the nice cars, everything that they wanna so the child themselves start having that perception that okay I’m black and I’ll always be inferior to a white person.

This is a complex learnt segregation as it occurs at multiple levels. Firstly it describes subliminal conditioning of ideas, that the Other is superior and powerful, and resource rich. The parent/family passes this message on by being subaltern in terms of power relations and the nature of the engagement with the Other which is exacerbated by the subaltern being resource poor. Subliminal conditioning according to Byron and Byrne (1994) is difficult to counteract rationally as it is based in the subconscious (p. 134).

Finally not only is segregation learnt it is also ascribed through perception of why Othering occurs, mixing with assumptions of learnt “superiority” and cross generational patterns of integration.
Gugu (A): …a white child has been taught that you don’t mix with those people they are black. So as much as they are being told that this is who you are, you will always be, like Jabulani said, superior from a black child. So these children come with those minds, okay this is how it is, black goes to black, white goes to white, I don’t mix with the black community. That’s where I stay. That’s how their parents were taught and how they grew up.

4.3.1.2 Affirmative Action

As reflected in fig 4.5 below, the second micro-theme is Affirmative Action which is the process by which previously disadvantaged people are provided with opportunities through racial quotas and policies to compensate for earlier disadvantage. As a result of the system of Apartheid ‘whites’ were previously provided with more opportunities and resources and thus the so called designated disadvantaged group that is offered redress opportunities are ‘black’ people. This theme was seen across all focus groups and talked about passionately as it elicited strong feelings and many examples.

Figure 4.5 Apartheid’s aftermath: 2nd micro-theme, Affirmative Action, sub-themes and foci
Race Work Discrepancy

This first sub-theme which emerged looks at a perceived difference in the amount of work ‘white’ and ‘black’ students at university are expected to comply with, and resultant outcomes. This occurred in all three ‘white’ focus groups.

‘Whites’ work harder is the point made below, as a result of their colour, however professionally work is equitable in terms of skills required to be a therapist.

Sandra (W): Why should someone be required less of, because you know the colour of their skin? And why should certain people be required more of because of the colour of their skin. At the end of the day we all have to perform the same tasks. We all have the same requirements of us.

Sandra is asking a rhetorical question, to bring home the point that in her perception there is a lack of equity in terms of work expected from ‘white’ students while the professional requirements of the degree are the same. There is a strong sense of indignation and frustration in the tone of voice.

Linking with this, is the perception that ‘blacks’ are playing the system, taking it easy and are being passed, while ‘white’ students are working hard. Two distinct factors need to be highlighted within Katherine’s quote, first the Othering through the use of the word ‘them’, and secondly the perception that affirmative action quotas maintain low work standards amongst ‘black’ students.

Katherine (W): Lots of them have even said: “Ah but I’m black I’ll get through, it’s chilled, like they need me for the colour”. Whoa, like I’m here I am working my bum off like trying to get through here and it’s like kinda easy ticket through

The next example of Othering is through the citing or apparent use of ‘university policies’ to rationalise the amount of work done by ‘black’ students.

Ingrid (W): I think the perception of what people have about each other is very screwed that people can say that I am previously disadvantaged, it says in the book9 I am previously disadvantaged so I am allowed to do less, I don’t have to

---

9 Book—refers to the prospectus guide for the University
Racial Quotas

This sub-theme looks at the use of numerical requirements (quotas) for hiring, promoting, admitting and/or graduating members of a particular racial group. These racial quotas are evidently utilised within South Africa to create equity post democracy amongst previously disadvantaged groups. The issues represented as foci which were reported by participants range from the provision of scholarships/bursaries to university admission requirements and jobs.

The data displayed educational quotas in two ways, scholarships/bursaries that are awarded to ‘blacks’ and through University racial admission criteria.

A feeling of injustice is present amongst participants regarding awarding of scholarships on the basis of race. The words unfair and frustrating illustrate these feelings (below) while the participant alludes to the fact that she believes they are not based on need. This is a strong reason for Othering. The Other is receiving resources seemingly non-equitably as a result of race.

Mary (W): I also found it very unfair with the scholarships because, I'm not trying to say anything, but I got much better marks than the black people in our class at school. Like just in discussion and they are all on scholarships but I couldn't get one and I just find that a little bit frustrating because my parents are probably the same as quite a few of the black people's parents and that is not fair.

Linked with this feeling of being discriminated against, by the Other fulfilling the quota requirements is the realisation that university admission criteria and quotas exist that do not benefit the ‘white’ race group, and this leaves one feeling marginalised as a minority but not of the designated group referring to the group designated as favoured by affirmative action.

Ann (W): When I applied five years ago to do OT, no it's really 7 years ago to do OT, the lady told me I would not get it because I was white. A person from OT told me I would not get in because I was white.

Ann feels discriminated against by her being told she would not find a place in the discipline of Occupational Therapy as she was ‘white’ by two different people at the University. The fact that
she was told this more than once serves to increase her feelings of being marginalised, and serves to strengthen the case she is trying to make.

Contrary to the above examples of feeling marginalised from ‘white’ participants, a ‘black’ participant reports dialectical thought that affirmative action supports feelings of inferiority.

Thabo (A): *Then if you are saying universities are for everyone. Then I can say 100% for everyone who apply for this bursary. Why I’m saying black people must be 80%? Ja, because like there’s this thought that we must cover up (sic catch up) white people, because they are far in front of us. So we must try everything.*

This example refers to the other side of the coin of affirmative action, the realisation by some ‘people of colour’ that affirmative action is as a result of the ‘white’ race being far ahead in terms of progress, in this case education, than everyone else. Thabo is struggling to understand the quota system even though he is ‘black’ because he sees the accommodation of his race as proving the point that ‘black’ people need a helping hand.

These examples both above and below indicate the “re-racialising” of each other and the self as a result of affirmative action policies and implementation. (Moodley & Adam, 2000). Although this is a clear example of Othering on the basis of race, the ruling party according to Moodley and Adam (2000) claim that re-racialising cannot occur as de-racialising post-apartheid did not occur (p. 56).

These foci follow on from feelings of marginalisation as a result of affirmative action policies at university, but now leads on to feelings of being put aside in terms of human resource policies that look at affirmative action job selection. It displays the basis of a “we won’t get the jobs, because they will” perception which the participant below reports. This perception is reinforced by “informed people” such as qualified occupational therapists.

Ruby (W): *It’s almost as if it keeps getting instilled in us because we were on electives…the one OT was giving us advice on what to expect from job interviews… and she finished by saying but if you are up against a young black man for example, or a young Indian woman they would get the job before you, unless you scored higher in your interview, so automatically we are being told before you qualify even holding an OT degree is not the same if you apply with someone from the same university, studied the same degree, we don’t hold the same level. Which is a little bit disheartening.*
Another very strong focus occurred in the ‘black’ focus group where racial quotas for OT academic staff were discussed. The conversation below displays oppositional thought and heightened tension and feelings were displayed.

Zai (C): *But then we are coming back the point that we are just employing them just because they are black or just because they are fill up the statistics.*

Andiswa (A): *Why? Why? Why? (becoming loud interrupting) No but they are qualified! They are qualified!*

These perceptions of students support contemporary research and writings that point to the current implementation of affirmative action as being divisive and not meeting the aims of social redress post 1994. Neville Alexander, (2007) a political analyst and commentator put it succinctly when he references affirmative action as: “the unavoidable perpetuation of racial identities which is implicit in its very conceptualisation and evident in the day-to-day expression of the policy in practice” (p. 101). Further to this Alexander reminds the reader that the state has the “prerogative” to create social identities, which in this case affirmative action policies are doing, which is working against the South African Constitution’s intention of a non-racial society (Bill of Rights, Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, Act 108 of 1996). This can be seen clearly occurring through the process of Othering that the affirmative action sub-theme reports.

Engendered Feelings

These feelings are experienced by participants as a result of the practice of affirmative action. It has been emerged as mainly two reported emotions, anger and feelings of an unjust inherited culpability.

**Anger** was clearly articulated by Ruby below.

Ruby (W): *That animosity from apartheid is still rife. And you think it wouldn’t because our schools all the way from junior to high schools and varsities have become so integrated you would think that that integration would encourage that bonding and that integration we would want to see. However there is still some instances that, it’s almost like a feeling of anger towards what happened in the past and that is still being brought up in the future*
The **inherited burden** of ‘white’ South Africans which refers to the perceived load of redress and reconciliation that young ‘white’ participants, felt that they were carrying as a result of previous ‘white’ generations profiting from Apartheid.

Ruby (W): *We are being held accountable for the action of what others did way before us even. Even though we are willing to make those connections we are still being seen as what we were way back when, instead of what we are now.*

Both anger and the inherited burden of ‘white’ South Africans, point to feelings that have come to the fore post-apartheid and are reported by several participants across the groups in different guises. Ruby verbalises the feeling of subliminal anger and the wish to be distanced from the system of apartheid that ‘white’ people implemented and benefitted from. Finally she expresses a need for recognition as a new non-racial citizen without the legacy of the past which is supported by many ‘white’ participants who questioned the need to look at race contemporarily. Erasmus (2010) uses Critical White Studies to frame interrogation of these feelings of being subjugated by history, for example “being held accountable for...” through distancing of the ‘white self’ and hence perpetuating ‘white’ privilege (p. 396). These feelings display a need for reconciliation and a refocusing on the present away from historical Othering divides.

---

**Othering**

- Apartheid's aftermath
  - Segregated social spaces
    - Racial Space as Social Symptom
    - Racial Segregation as promoter of Segregation
  - Racialised Social Space
  - Labeling
  - Apartheid leftovers
  - R.S promotes seg. activities
  - R.S.* outside UNI
  - no go zone
  - Cornered R.S

R.S* - racialised space

DIPRS* - diminished interpersonal relationships
4.3.1.3 Segregated Social Spaces

This section looks at social spaces that are informally segregated in terms of race (both on campus and in the larger domain of life, see example below) as well as the reported sequelae as a result of such space. Durrheim et al (2005) suggest that racial categorisation is “anchored in and encouraged by the racialised organisation of space and bodies…” (p. 457). Such foci were a strong element within the focus groups, with in-depth discussion and important concepts emerging as a result of this the foci are seven in total.

Zai (C): You know that is how society is in that area, you are not going to put yourself in that area. You are going to stay away from it, but then the thing is also, is that yes ok, the reason why you are going to stay away is that is the attitude. That is how people are presenting themselves. That’s what they are putting out, you don’t want to be a part of it, so you are not going to be a part of that.

Racial Spaces as a Social Symptom

Participants reported racialised space as a symptom/construct of society. This supports work by Durrheim and Dixon (2010) who studied racial patterning on a KwaZulu-Natal beach and found highly racialised space, perceptions and societal mandating of said space. This sub-theme brings together foci that illustrate this.

The following quotes display racialised social spaces through the same observation of students, which is that campus is marked out with particular spots known for hosting one racial group. (certain spaces on campus are seen as white) and are so named, for example the White Quad. These areas and their names are known to students across the races, which appear across themes. The first quote attempts to identify the reason for the ‘white quad’ existing, pointing to minority comfort while the second alludes to self-segregation.

Emerald (W): …that’s quite shocking like there’s an area where the whites go and sit. I think that white people at this varsity are quite a minority and so literally it’s everyone who is white, just happens to be in that area.
Farieda (I): At the reserve (lower level of the library). The Indians have occupied one end and the blacks the other end

Stereotyped labelling creates racialised space through concepts such as the self-fulfilling prophecy. Ruby speaks about labelling when she claims that UKZN has a reputation of being a ‘black’ campus with resultant limited social opportunities and hence the need to know the appropriate space for one’s race group to “hangout” in. Importantly the quote also illustrates that these perceptions are passed on even before a student enters the campus, creating anticipated racialised space and expectations of being the Other. This phenomenon links to the above legacy of apartheid particularly laws such as the Extension of University Education Act, Act 45 of 1959, Reservation of Separate Amenities Act, 1953, although they have been repealed.

Ruby (W): I was a bit stunned when I told everyone I was applying at UKZN. They said: “ooh your social life is going to end. It’s predominantly a black and Indian campus.” So automatically there’s that society’s prejudice against UKZN, for being a black and Indian Campus. So there’s automatically that social prejudice against UKZN which then I think puts that segregation in place when you arrive here. Because automatically we got told: “Oh no you must know where the white quad is, because that’s where all the white kids hang out”, and that’s the first thing we learnt in first year, so (laughter) there’s automatically that segregation.

Apartheid’s leftovers offers an explanation for the racialised space as being a holdover of that time, however the quote below also utilises the strong word ‘outsiders” to denote feelings of being separate from the Other.

Tracey (W): Ja, it was before, it was the Indian campus during apartheid. And that’s why there is still a lot of segregation and that, it hasn’t left. The idea of apartheid and the separation thing, it’s still very strong, on this campus particularly. Ja, we are the outsiders, the one, you know, in the minority and it definitely shows.

---

10 The Westville campus of UKZN was previously the University of Durban Westville built for usage primarily by ‘Indians’, and presently houses the Health Sciences other than Medicine and Nursing campus
If ‘white’ students feel marginalised then so too, do ‘black’ students, with an example of these oppositional thoughts reflected in the quote below. Strong sentiments with sarcasm drive home Jabulani’s synthesis of the past echoing onto the present.

Jabulani (A): It’s prior to 1994 UDW was for Indians. They didn’t want Indians to go to your Stellenbosch\textsuperscript{11}, your Rhodes\textsuperscript{12}, the former white universities that is why they created UDW, the apartheid system. That is why they made these universities; they didn’t want you to be there so that you don’t invade their spaces at UCT\textsuperscript{13}. You must not be in your comfort zone and feeling as if you are accommodating us. The other one is accommodating us. (sic)

Jabulani’s last words are saying that a black person should not think that they are accommodating the ‘white’ person as historically it was a ‘black’ campus, but that the ‘white system’("the other one") is still making place for/accommodating ‘blacks’. In their research Durrheim and Dixon (2005) reported the same, and found that the entry of ‘blacks’ into previously restricted /segregated spaces post-Apartheid has resulted in ‘whites’ “running away from them” (p. 454). This divergent product of de-segregation is an important factor in the concept of Othering.

**Racial Segregation as a Promoter of Segregation**

This subtheme again produces several interrelated but differentiated foci, which encompass perceptions around racialised space which promote segregated activities. The foci centre around racialised space which cause segregational activities, occur across domains of life but influence university life, create no-go zones and corner people into them.

**Racialised space as promoting segregated activities** is clearly perceived. The following points report the sequelae that stem from racialised space, which is space that hosts particular race groups almost exclusively. The point is made that in racialised space different activities occur which fosters segregation and Othering.

Helen (W): The hostel environment. They are doing things that all of them have to do. You are not doing activities where like different cultural groups will do

\textsuperscript{11} Stellenbosch- reference to the University of Stellenbosch in the western Cape
\textsuperscript{12} Rhodes- reference to Rhodes University in the Eastern Cape
\textsuperscript{13} UCT- University of Cape Town a historically ‘white’ University
“The hostel environment”\textsuperscript{14} on UKZN is perceived as a highly racialised space with predominantly ‘black’ students living there which creates perceptions of: “They are doing things that all of them have to do”. Students that reside on campus are described as Other who do different activities from the participant’s ingroup. This is outgrouping on the basis of different residential conditions as well as different activities. In the last two sentences Helen expresses the opinion that if one does the same thing this increases racialised space by the space becoming connotatively linked with race and culture of the Other.

The University is seen as a microcosm of society; hence the racialised patterns of interaction that occurs outside campus which may be described as racialised space outside university domain, hold sway and influence life within as well. This is seen in the following quote which is one example of several (regarding these foci) that emerged in the focus groups.

\textit{Helen (W): Within the Durban context, there’s very specific places where, that a lot of Indian people go there, a lot of black people go there and a lot of white people go there. Like outside of varsity, it’s just how Durban seems to be. Ja. So that again, us and some of the Hindu and black girls will go out, but we all go to different places, because that’s where then your friends from outside the varsity go.}

Durban is reported as a racialised social space with different race groups choosing different spaces, however Helen also alludes to ingrouping when she says “that’s where your friends from outside varsity go” which implies that the group is homogenous racially and chooses the same racial space.

A ‘white’ student also reports that certain racialised areas are off limits to ‘white’ ’students using military language “\textit{no go zone}” which is normally territory that one is disallowed to go to or through, in attempts to establish and promote peace. Following this a ‘black’ student uses similar military type language in the word “\textit{invade}” to describe ‘white’ perceptions of ‘black’ students entering into older colonial Universities.

\textsuperscript{14} Hostel – refers to student residence on campus
Sandra (W): UKZN campus, like res campus, is like a no go zone, if you are not black or Indian. It is just the way that it is. So that in itself, like you don’t go there. That’s just what you do.

Jabulani (A): That is why they made these universities, they didn’t want you to be there so that you don’t invade their spaces at UCT

Both foci no-go zone and cornered space link to subliminal racialising of space, as the congregation of homogenous race groups is not legalised or created by formal admittance criteria, but is commonly accepted apparently without critical thought, but rather stated as a given fact by the participants.

While Sandra above talks about racialised space using military terms to denote segregation, Aalia an ‘Indian’ Muslim student explains that as a result of apartheid separating people onto different areas of residence, cultural attributes linked to communities are then transferred to the race tag.

Aalia (l): This is South Africa and most things are traced back to Apartheid. With different race groups segregated and similar races living together, one can understand why culture and values have become related to race.

This example allows us to deepen the understanding of racialised space, both as endemic in greater society but also as a legacy of apartheid.

Othering can be seen at two levels in the quote below, where the participant notes the segregation and so called “running away” from each other but also in his analysis of “white” students being cornered, with no escape giving rise to the foci of cornered racialised space.

Jabulani (A): You see after 1994, most kids went to white schools, former white schools, model C schools. But what you notice, the more the black kids, white kids run to private schools. You know why this is happening? It’s because they can’t in essence they can’t stand to be with us. But now they are at university, there is nowhere to run.

Jabulani talks about his perception that ‘whites’ are avoidant of ‘people of colour’ but does not interrogate this further than his understanding of a need to be in a homogenous ‘white’ group.

---

15 Model C- government schools that were prior ‘white’ schools during apartheid and are better resourced
as “they can’t stand to be with us”. Here again we see description of the Other using the pronoun ‘they’, discussed previously as a language divider. The image that is portrayed is a very powerful one of ‘white’ students being herded away by the arrival of ‘people of colour’ into their space as well as the words “nowhere to run” as if there was a hide and seek game and the opponent has been caught out or more powerfully yet pushed into a corner.

4.3.2 Us and Them

![Us and Them diagram]

Figure 4.7 Meso-theme 2: Us and Them and micro-themes

This meso-theme brings together micro-themes that link specific thought/interactional patterns that emerged, that point to created divides between the racial groups as reported by participants. These sub-themes are directly seen to divide the races into Us/Them dichotomies along “distinctive identification of who is ‘us’ and who is ‘them’” which combines inclusion and exclusion criteria simultaneously (Brewer, 1997, p. 205). The figure below puts the meso theme of ‘Us and Them’ into context of the Othering macro theme. The micro themes of Cultural formulation; Choices and Social dividers are addressed.
Figure 4.8  Us and Them: First micro-theme-Cultural Formulation, sub-themes and foci

4.3.2.1 Cultural Formulation

Cultural formulation as a micro-theme refers to inherent/perceived sociocultural issues that provide a matrix of sub-themes such as Language; Cultural Diversity and Class and Resources. Related foci reflect ingrouping and outgrouping with Us/Them dialogue.

Language

Language appeared many times across the focus groups in terms of being culture bound and reported as a barrier between the races which is perceived to be culturally specific. Ivy explains that this was the reason she chose racial clustering (choosing to join homogenous racial groups) in First year to avoid marginalisation in terms of language.

Ivy (W): I know for me on the 1st day, the reason I went to the white group because I know it's stupid but I can't speak Zulu, so I wouldn’t want to go and sit with the African students in case they spoke Zulu and then I wouldn’t understand anything and then would be excluded anyway.

The experience that language was a promoter of Othering is displayed through the comfort of speaking a first language and by the same variable creates an Us/Them dichotomy. Herein, language dynamics became evident as significant foci. The comfort and easiness of first
language speakers sitting together, is juxtaposed against the accommodation of a non-speaker which creates “awkwardness.”

Ingrid (W): *I think language as well, if there was one white girl sitting with a bunch of Zulu girls, they wouldn’t be able to speak their language and it would be awkward for them. Whereas it is easier for them to sit on their own and speak their language freely and openly and that’s what they are comfortable with…*

Coupled with the use of pronouns that create Us/Them divisions (“they and their”), one could see the use of accepting the role of “the benefactor” who sacrifices their company to enable “them” (the Other) to sit together and be comfortable. This very act is a social divider.

Speaking one’s first language provides one with social comfort and ease of communication even though it creates an Us/Them dichotomy, pointed out below. Language hegemony is evident where by speaking the second language (English) poorly, you receive poor service. This is as a result of not meeting the hegemonic colonial language standards (“fall below the bar”). The reported lived reality is that second language speakers are subaltern, they are the Other, and are discriminated against.

Andiswa (A): *But you have to fight, you have to strive for a better service. It’s not every restaurant, it’s not always the case but there are some cases, most of the time that happens. Especially, er I’ll just put in the language, if you can’t use the English language properly, maybe you are gonna come with your broken English, or something, automatically you are going to fall below the bar.*

Andiswa’s words of having to “fight” denotes a struggle for equal treatment (at a restaurant), while simultaneously reporting a metaphorical bar which you fall below if as ‘a person of colour’ you speak the English language poorly. The bar is then the subaltern great divide into Us and Them categorisation. Naming this divide is paradoxically acknowledging “the bar” and legitimising its use by creating a standard that needs to be met albeit a mental one.

**Religious/Cultural Diversity**

This sub-theme looks at how expressions of culture and religion divide people into being on different sides of the fence.

The following two quotes illustrate how differences can create separation or explain why because one is different one would connect with people that are judged to be the same
(Ingrouning). The focus groups held many such examples ranging from the difference in food, religion and how way of life would prevent one from visiting a friend as a result of lack of knowledge and comfort of their lifestyle, to not sharing the same taste in music.

Thuli (A): So the problem comes where now, it goes back to your own cultural and your own self where you come from again. Because white people hate people that shout. They can’t stand shouting. Now go to Eastern Cape, wherever, neighbours are 200m apart they shout and that’s for them that’s fine… While a white person will not understand that. They will not understand that. So wena\textsuperscript{16} coming from wherever you come from and you are used to communicating to someone nimisana\textsuperscript{17} and whatever and now you are amongst white people who do not understand how on earth can you do that?

Thuli attempts to explain that there are cultural differences and how they create divisiveness through this example. A simple example of cultural practice is shown to create Othering and Us that shout and Them that do not. This is emphasised by the participant by repeating “will not understand that”. This arose in the ‘black’ group as an answer to the problem of integration and was seen to be accepted by the group.

The next quote looks at differences between the groups, identified as a promoter of Us and Them particularly religion in this case is reported as being linked to specific interests.

Farieda (I): Owing to our strict values and religious beliefs we don’t attend clubs or parties as do other racial groups, and having friends from other racial groups who do so will make us feel out of place.

Farieda focuses on religion as a subset of culture that drives outgroup homogeneity through creating specific interests (clubs and parties) and suggests her ingroup shares “strict values” and discomfort with the Other. This describes in and out group homogeneity which is different from social psychology research where the ingroup is seeing as heterogeneous.

Differences between students can provide boundaries for ingrouping as seen above through a superordinate goal of strict values, however may also create Othering through the perception of the differences as “foreign”.

\textsuperscript{16} Wena- isiZulu word meaning you
\textsuperscript{17} Nimisana – isiZulu word
Petra (W): The Muslim girls they have arranged marriages and things like to me that’s so foreign. You know, it’s so difficult for me to level with them and like trying to understand because I’ve been brought up in a completely different way and for example like the black girls a lot of them believe in like this witchcraft and stuff which again is completely foreign to me.

Diversity is reported as being foreign (Other) and non-understandable while words such as ‘witchcraft’ which have negative connotations are used to describe some ‘black’ religious practice. If diversity is a divider then homogeneity allows one to belong. This bridge to belonging is advanced as one not having to explain one’s ways and customs. This ring fences ‘belongers’ or Us and creates more “foreignness” in the Us/Them dichotomy.

Perhaps this is an example of Allport’s contact theory working conversely. Where contact theory speaks of decreasing racial prejudice by “increasing the degree of contact between different groups”, we see the possibility of the opposite happening (Baron et al, 2009, p. 215). Increased contact between Them and Us can, under the wrong conditions perpetuate stereotypes and connotations of the ‘Other.’ This is seen where social categorisation is driven by the perceiver’s motivation or reason for particular categorisation and may fuel outgroup homogenous stereotyping (Brehm et al, 2004, p. 180).

**Belonging** as a driver of Us/Them divides is discussed, pointing to differing morals and values and giving an example of feeling different by being asked to explain their culture and religion. This apparent US/Them logic seems to imply that there are different values for all religions and cultures with minimal in common hence the need to stick to the same ingroup.

Farieda (I): I also feel society has a lot to do with it and each individual’s personal and cultural morals and values which will lead you to the tendency to sticking to a certain group, and yes, a lack of insight and understanding as said above is another problem. We find ourselves having to constantly explain our ways and customs as it is seen as out of the ordinary to other racial groups. As we can all see this isn’t simply about race, it also boils down to culture and religion.

**Class and Resources**

The final sub-theme relates to class and the amount and type of resources at one’s disposal that creates Us/Them scenarios. Class and lack of resources tend to create hierarchical or estranged relationships and patterns of interaction alluded to below.
Ivy (W): I think it’s also again the environment you have been brought up in. If you are brought up and you have a maid and a gardener (pause) and that’s the only influence of an African person you have, you wouldn’t really consider them as friends unless you grow up with their children and then when you come into a bigger environment and they’re there, you don’t really know how to engage with them or how to relate to them because the maid and the gardener is the only exposure you have had to them.

Helen (W): Like for our research group, ok we were also friends but the inclusion of any member was like you can get to a set point when you need to. You can be at the meetings; you have a car or something which then made for an easier group. With the res students because they were all on campus together and I don’t think we thought of it as excluding them, but we never met on campus personally (pause) So like all of us had cars, we could all get to a point whenever we needed to.

These quotes separately identify two issues, class in the first and access to resources in the second. The examples are intricately connected to each other and issues of race and marginalisation through exclusion. One is unable to “engage” with domestic workers not only as a result of class, but that in South Africa that class usually denotes a person of colour whose first language is probably not English. This is the racialising of some categories of work as a result of Apartheid and colonisation. The second example is the marginalisation of students who reside on campus, (all ‘people of colour’) who are excluded from a research group as a result of them not being resourced enough to afford a car which would allow them to travel to an outside venue for research meetings. This clearly shows that the ‘white’ ingroup did not consider the outgroups’ lack of resources in terms of travel, as no accommodation is evidently made for these individuals.

These examples of racialised contact display a power differential or as Pratt (1992) says: “Highly asymmetrical relations of domination and subordination”. Power differences between ‘white’ and ‘black’ remain in terms of type of contact between the races as well as in terms of resources.

Zuma (2010) labels this “class alienation” which names racial segregation in everyday situations based on class differences (p. 102). Put in clarifying terms it sounds as if “they don’t have cars, but all of us do” which is the rationale behind this example of Othering on the basis of access to
resources and an inability to compromise. Another possible explanation was that the outgroups’ lack of access to transport was known and used as a socially acceptable explanation of not working with them, and part of overt and covert power differentials at play within this example. This is what Campbell (1982) calls “clique selfishness” selfishness by the ingroup to simultaneously promote ingrouping while “hostilely” excluding outgroups (quoted in Brewer, 1997, p. 204). This links to the next Micro-theme Choices as well as the foci Resources in Chapter six.

4.3.2.2 Choices

This micro-theme refers to the act of choosing particular ways of life that then create contexts of Othering, either intentionally or unintentionally driving Othering behaviour and perceptions. Sub-themes of lifestyle choices, goals and values as well as political representation on campus organise the data.

Rep*- representation

Figure 4.9 Us and Them: Second micro-theme- Choices, sub-themes and foci
Lifestyle choices

This sub-theme looks at lifestyle choices such as the clothes one wears and even cellphone wall papers. These may appear to be simplistic stereotypes, however illustrates the complexity of being human, and how such differences can be used to fuel Us/Them thoughts and divisions. This is done through “preserving distinctions between their ingroups and outgroups” as cited by Castano et al (in Brehm et al, 2002, p. 136).

Self-presentation is the manner in which one presents oneself as noted above is the basis of this foci with clear evidence of “preserving distinctions”

Mary (W): Like with the cell phone and the wallpaper¹⁸, for example, a lot of the black girls have a picture of their faces as their wallpaper and I always laugh at them and I say, “How can you put a picture of your face, like a big face on the wallpaper?” and none of the white girls do that, it’s just something small, but it’s a little difference that’s just the way we are, that’s like just the way our friends are and just the way who we surround ourselves with.

This discourse displays multiple examples and layers of Us/Them division as a result of choices. The first choice is an aesthetic/decorum sense that appears to prevent Mary and her ‘white’ colleagues from having the same behaviour. The next layer is the ingroup bias, “that’s just the way we are…” and that the ingroup is homogenous. Finally the fact that Mary found the picture on the cell phone divergent from her own concept of what is right and wrong displays a sense that the ingroup has the prerogative on “normalcy.” This is further explained by Dolby’s research that found South African ‘white’ youth attaching themselves to Eurocentric values and negating blackness were able to construct a “global white identity” (in Vandeyar, 2008, p. 287).

How a person spends their free time/leisure seems to further create Us/Them dichotomies if it excludes or marginalises the outgroup and rewards ingrouping. The following examples indicate that some leisure activities are reported as exclusionary in terms of cultural dominance of the activity as well as racialised social spaces for example night clubs and cultural games such as thunee¹⁹.

---

¹⁸ Wallpaper- the screen of the mobile/cell phone
¹⁹ A complex card game played by Indian South Africans
Katherine (W):  *Most of the people that hang out in the caff (sic cafeteria) are the Indians, and they play thunee and they have their little social groups and it’s not very welcoming to anyone else. I mean I don’t choose to hang out at the caff.*

Feelings of exclusion demonstrate how the choice of leisure pursuits could have cultural nuances or overtones which create feelings of exclusion.

Petra (W):  *Ja, we could go out together but if you think about going to a club, it’s majority white people and then you have like a black club or an Indian club, it’s still segregated, I mean even like Beauty who lives with us, when she turned 18 my brother and I offered to take her out and she said no she didn’t want to go, because that club had mainly white people there. So even if we all did live at res together, would we still go to the same place, would we do the same things?*

Petra reports an incident (above) when her adopted ‘black’ sister was invited to go out clubbing with her ‘white’ siblings she declined as she would be in the minority. Although Petra fails to analyse this incident it draws into sharp relief the drivers that remain unidentified in our society around comfort, feelings of belonging and social ease. Has the ‘black’ sister failed to identify with her new family ingroup; has she recognised that she would feel alienated in terms of music, race and lack of inter-racial contact and dating; or needed to belong within a familiar setting?

Goals and Values

Goals and values, as the second sub-theme speak to philosophical and sometimes inherited guidelines along which people live their lives. The examples below rationalise racial clustering utilising goals and values to explain that goals are culturally (ethnicity/racially) driven while values are often family driven. These choices then allow the participants to see difference and Otherness instead of commonalities and universal humanness.

Emerald (W):  *Just a strange bit of insight, maybe as you were saying about common goals that in our cultural groups which are essentially our racial goals we are all working towards different goals at the end of the day. There maybe sort of broad goals but sort of life goals that are sort of culturally oriented and that is kind of what draws us together, maybe?*
Common goals held by cultural groups are essentially racial goals is the logic applied above. This implies that culture and race are the crux of goal formation within ingroups that have culture as their common denominator.

Aneesa (I): ...as our spirituality has increased and things such as praying together have brought us closer together, whereas if we were not in a homogenous group we may tend to neglect our spirituality or other morals and values as it may not be the shared with the heterogeneous group we are in.

Tracey (W): I think it’s got a lot to do with like your values and the way you have been brought up as well, that’s going to guide who you want to spend time with, and be around. So I don’t think it’s necessarily all to do with race and that kind of thing…

Tracey, Aneesa and Emerald explain ingrouping around consistent values and goals however this becomes a rationalisation to explain racial homogenous clustering. It alludes to the perception that values and goals are racially similar within an ingroup and dissimilar across the outgroup. Although this maybe correct specifically it cannot be correct for the universality of being human, being a South African, or a university student. Hence social identity and grouping around race exclusively and no other criteria creates Us/Them dichotomies. This is perhaps reflective of the specific lifespan stage these youth are currently in coupled with familial socialisation alongside nuances from living in a highly racialised country/world. This is linked to research by Castano et al (2002, p.315) that describes self-conception as a driver of intergroup difference, which in turn supports social identity theory whereby cultural differences result in ingroup bias. This sense of exclusivity of values (in the above examples) are part and parcel of the self-concept and thus creates the Us/Them and biases one to see the ingroup favourably.

**Political Representation**

The micro-theme of Choices also includes political representation on campus as a sub-theme.

Sandra (W): I also find it interesting there is no white student party or anything on campus only black. I don’t even think there is an Indian one. Like it is only them fighting for their rights as blacks on campus, on a majority black campus.

‘White’ political representation in student political parties is a choice however leaves ‘white’ students marginalised from political activity as a result of perceived under-representation of
‘white’ and outgroup/‘black’ domination. This comes out clearly in the use of “it’s only them fighting for their rights” pointing to the Us/Them divides that such choices predict, as it is assumed that only ‘white representation’ or minority representation would allow for one’s rights to be upheld or protected. The South African political landscape is narrow in the amount of political parties that represent the people and then further divided along racial lines, which forms superordinate ingroups, hence creating alienation if one is not felt politically represented by “Them” (Moodley & Adam, 2000, p. 54).

4.3.2.3 Social Dividers

Social dividers as the third micro-theme analyses sub-themes which illustrate issues/occurrences in society that divide people overtly into Us/Them categories. This includes contextual factors created during the era of Apartheid as well as contemporary practices that divide on the grounds of legal or policy requirements, however, are perceived to create societal divisions. Sub-themes that organise the data here are area of residence and societal labelling.

Figure 4.10 Us and Them: Third micro-theme- Social Dividers, sub-themes and foci
Area of Residence

This sub-theme is reported in two interwoven foci of segregated residential areas promoting segregation by limiting opportunities to socialise and integrate. This is then related to the theme of racialised space as a result of apartheid.

Segregation as a concept and reality has appeared in different sections of this study, under different guises, within the section Apartheid’s aftermath as well as keeping families segregated in the foci of “Familial racialisation” and in “Segregates social spaces”. It is a strong focal point as a result of the legalised separation of people through Apartheid’s laws, most notably the Group Areas Act 41 of 1950 which made it mandatory for different races to live separately from each other with limited socialising sanctioned. This is evident in contemporary society still with residential areas slowly integrating along class lines however with some areas still being predominantly racially homogenous. Susan attempts to explain that there is segregation even amongst the white students according to residential areas, which is perhaps avoidant as it does not look at racial segregation which was the topic at the time of the discussion.

Susan (W): There is segregation but it does have a lot to do with where you live like the white girls are actually segregated a bit because there is like the girls from Hillcrest and the girls from Durban North and you know then it’s the girls from res and the Muslim girls and it is like a location thing and a culture it’s not an intentional segregational thing.

Juxtaposed with this is Susan’s own thought later which attempts to confront this rationalisation of other participants, by pointing out that living in different areas does not prevent them from travelling long distances to see each other within the same race group, (ingroup) while keeping segregational divisions in place for outgroups.

Susan (W): We’re saying we would make the effort, make the effort, make the effort, but with our white friends it’s so easy. Why are we having to say make an effort? I would do that. I would have to make an effort to go and visit Farieda, or come to Tilly, but with us Tilly lives in Toti (sic Amanzimtoti20) but we still make the effort to go there. Like it’s, you know what I mean (trails off)

20 Amanzimtoti- a small town 25 Km away from Durban
Susan’s question goes unanswered by the participants in her focus group as it is a controversial statement as it reminds the participant’s that although they claim to want to make the effort to join other races, they don’t while they make big efforts to commute long distances to each other without this being considered an effort. Effort is only required for the outgroup which implies that even in the task of integration there is a power dynamic and boundary at play.

The identification of limited opportunities as a divider between Us/Them occurred in all focus groups. The participants felt there were limited opportunities to interact as the ‘white’ students left campus immediately after lectures ended as well as the nature of a very full course (Occupational Therapy) disallowed free time to socialise.

Ruby (W): *When you are on campus, where there is a res\textsuperscript{21} life and where you spend the majority of your time on campus, the campus almost becomes your social life. Whereas with us none of us stay at res, so our social lives are majority off campus. Because we all live so far apart, our social lives are very segregated so we don’t often interact outside of varsity*

Ruby discloses two important facts, that the students that don’t live at the residence leave and socialise off campus, and secondly a contradiction which many of the other participants disclose, that they do join each other off campus.

This needs to be read with the acknowledgement that Susan above made, that the “white’ students commute across the city (long distances) to socialise with each other thus creating opportunities amongst the ingroup. Contextually it should be noted that transport to and from campus is often dependent on lift clubs, taxi and bus timetables.

**Societal Labelling**

The current reality within South Africa, of having to try and redress pass inequities relies on governmental policy driven labelling of citizens to keep score of transformation as well as ascertain whether the individual is from a previously disadvantaged group. This results in so called racial labelling although the South African Constitution (The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, Act 108 of 1996) propagates a non-racial society, seemingly working at cross purposes to the non–racial ideal. This is what Sandra suggests in the quote below; with an air of exasperation she appears to have racial labelling fatigue, which could be for a variety of

---

\textsuperscript{21} Res- reference to campus residence for students
reasons which she does not interrogate. The upshot of this labelling is the re-creation of Us/Them scenario pre-1994 democratic dispensation.

Sandra (W):  *I think from a university level, I find so many instances where they ask you to identify yourself as like a race, if you know what I mean. You always have to state what race are you, like on all application forms, exams, all of those kinds of things. Kind of puts you into those things.*

Sandra points out that the very act of self-declaring one’s race is a social divider into Us/Them categories. This is also seemingly exacerbated by the frequency one is required to self-label and related to the micro-theme of Affirmative Action.

Professor Crain Soudien was recently quoted in a local newspaper as saying: “Racial formulae reproduce the problems of the past” (in Jansen, 2013) when he commented on racial formulae utilised to monitor transformation at South African Universities. This succinctly reminds one of the current debate in the public domain that pits transformation and the need for continued labelling by race, against transformation in terms of social cohesion and diversity building.

### 4.3.3 Relationship Inhibitors

The third and last meso-theme for this section of Othering is Relationship Inhibitors. This looks at specific micro-themes of motivational and interpersonal factors that explain the sub-themes and foci that directly inhibit or retard relationships between the students from forming. The four sub-themes of Fear and Distrust, Misunderstanding, Reward/non-rewards and Decreased Effort will be explained with their foci below.
4.3.3.1 Interpersonal Factors

The first micro-theme of Interpersonal Factors relates to factors within relationships between students that are obstructive in nature with the sub-themes of distrust and fear and misunderstanding emerging.

Distrust and Fear

This sub-theme reports on feelings of fear that were reported in ‘white’ focus groups around times of boycott, strikes and unrest on the University campus. Fear is an emotion that, when felt towards another person, usually precludes them from ingroups and hence the Us/Them dichotomy is exaggerated and social distance between the race groups increased.

Students’ strikes were reported as a major contributor to the break down in trust and the eliciting of global fear towards the Other. The researcher is using global fear as a descriptor as it is all encompassing and general in nature, not driven specifically at a person, but as a result of that person being associated by default with fear inducing activities. Ivy below reports the experience of non-modulated fear towards ‘black’ students following the witnessing of violent acts during a strike.
Ivy (W): I know one of the things that really got me was the striking at UKZN, and after the striking if you see a group of three or more black students coming towards you, you absolutely are terrified and it's got nothing to do with the students themselves it's just because of how terrifying it is, to be chased by students, and seeing all of that, coming from a school where you have never ever seen striking or been exposed to that. And then you come here and you get chased of campus and rocks thrown at you. I think that would be quite a negative stigma and it takes a while to then feel comfortable even in lectures. If someone walks in because there are some of the lectures the students actually sneak in and let stuff of, and you are “Oh my God, goodness is there someone in here that is going to” (pause) so it ruins the trust relationship that you then have to try and look at the individual instead of (trails off)

All ‘black’ students are initially stereotyped as possible perpetrators of violence however Ivy, then reports that one needs to intentionally find the individual (not the Other striker) instead of having the reaction that all Others are strikers. This displays intellectual insight into the phenomenon, but an inability in the situation to react outside of Us/Them dichotomies. Related to this, was an incident a year ago which is alluded to next, where following a student strike action hate speech against various racial groups appeared on the social media site Facebook. This incident is reported as an experience of not feeling wanted or alienated and the resultant reaction of closing oneself off.

Ingrid (W): During the last strike on campus there were comments passed on the Facebook group by an African student who said that the purpose of the strike was to get rid of the Indian and white students on campus. Now that immediately puts our backs up like you are making it a racial thing now. The strike was actually because the students in res wanted extra funding and whatever else, but it took one person to send that message that they don’t, (trails off) to kill the white and Indian students. It is so unnecessary but that one comment is enough to make us not want to socialise with any.

These examples provide evidence in support of widespread local and international stereotypes that ‘black’ people are violent and have criminal intent (Welch, 2007). The participants also experienced these incidents first hand and therefore have personal evidence as well as the emotions and fear that form part and parcel of being threatened, which confirm media, family
and past prejudices of “swart gevaar”\textsuperscript{22} prevalent amongst ‘white’ South Africans during the apartheid era.

The “race card” is colloquially used in South Africa during instances of conflict or dissonance where a ‘person of colour’ is said to suggest that racism is at play as an explanation for the incident.

Political correctness and the fear that one will be labelled a racist are the reported consequences for a ‘black’ student pulling the race card. This inevitably results in self-sequestering into racially homogenous groups to avoid this from happening. This theme of being tired of the race card appeared a few times in all ‘white’ focus groups.

\begin{quote}
Sandra (W): \textit{I am always so scared to shout at a black person in case they say, oh it’s because we are black, you know, you always have to tread so carefully in case someone pulls the race card on you.}
\end{quote}

“Treading carefully” reveals a way of dealing with the Other that will be unauthentic and shallow as well as increase the social distance between the different race groups. This prevents the ‘white’ student from having contact that could cast them in a bad light and associate them with being racist in contemporary time. Issues such as these and others, conglomerate to form possible explanations for the lack of meaningful and real (non-structured) integration happening amongst the students.

\textbf{Misunderstanding}

The second sub-theme that explained relationship inhibition emerged from foci that centred on perceived errors in communication. These misunderstandings as reported by ‘white’ students are perceived non-racial issues that are construed as such which like the discussion of the race card above, foster avoidant behaviour. Literature reveals that contact between ‘black’ and ‘white’ in post-apartheid South Africa could continue to be controlled through invitation of the ‘black’ subaltern into the contact space of the ‘white’ (Erasmus, 2010). This displays a power dynamic within the interaction, coupled with often a difference in first language which would further influence the reading of a comment by another. Kochman (1981) also found that groups with little cross cultural socialisation are more likely to misread each other’s’ communication (in Buttny, 1999, p 249). Further race sensitivity could create misunderstandings between races as

\textsuperscript{22} Swart gevaar means black danger in Afrikaans, a term utilised during Apartheid to sow fear of ‘black’ people.
a result of Apartheid history and previously established relationship dynamics. Any or all of these, would explain the quotes (below). These examples might also indicate naiveté or lack of cultural/racial sensitivity amongst the students and warrants further exploration.

Mary (W): Conflict always comes up from misunderstanding. There’s no boundaries with her (talking about an old “black’ domestic worker for the participants family) but then you say something and she takes offence to it. And you’re going “but I was just joking”, there’s just this misinterpretation, and that’s where it comes to, these little differences.

Ann (W): I asked the African lady something, took it the absolute wrong way, she took it she went and reported me and called me a white racist and I was like what are you on about?

Between students

Halima (I): I can be myself around my friends. They accept me for who I am, I can let my guard down. We understand each other well. Sometimes our classmates totally misinterpret our (Muslim) behaviour and how we are.

4.3.3.2 Motivational Factors

Motivational Factors as a micro-theme, comprises sub-themes that explain factors that drive inhibited relationships (meso-theme) and these are decreased effort as well as reward systems.

Rewards/Non-rewards

Rewards references the examples provided; that there are rewards for relationship inhibition. All examples thus display a reward as a consequence of action through academic clustering and the stigma of integration. The apparent stigma of integration which refers to negative consequences perceived or otherwise, is evident in the quote below.

Emerald (W): I think it’s also that within our cultures, the white culture, the black culture, we are going to think, “Oh all the white girls are going to say I am a coconut, all the black girls are going to say I am a coconut”. You are scared what the people are going to think at the end of the day, so you follow the societal norms of hanging with your own cultural group or whatever in order to avoid condemnation.
Feelings of intimidation appear as a determinant of behaviour as articulated by stigma.

Aalia (I): But I admit that it was a little awkward thereafter with everyone having predetermined notions about one another based on race. We are not exempt from this either. We all tend to judge a little bit, sometimes become a little intimidated and thus we tend to stick to “our own”.

Strong connotative words such as “condemnation”, “intimidation”, and “judge” show the strength of these examples from the participants’ points of view. The reaction to ‘stick with one’s own’ or “to avoid condemnation” is a strong driver of relationship inhibition. Sociocultural factors are seen to have a strong motivational drive to inhibit contact with the racial outgroup to prevent negative emotions in the context of South Africa.

**Academic clustering** is the clustering of students to achieve academic rewards, through being at a homogenous academic level, or with people that have similar work ethics or academic styles. This was reported in the focus groups as an explanation as to observed racial homogeneity of these groups which then excludes people who are of different race group meeting these standards for example at academic level. This exclusion displays covert racial bias and stereotyping as it remains attached to racial categorisation by clustering on the basis of racial homogeneity. Although not overtly evident within the quotes, these same are offered as explanations of the clustering. This can be seen through subtle phrasing such as, “people on the same academic level”; “their work skills” and “I can rely on my friends” that points to ingroup favouritism over outgroup bias. The quotes below describe respectively:

**Academic level**

Ivy (W): I think that’s a lot of what happens in class. You sort of also group with people on the same academic level.

**Work ethic**

Tracey (W): It has also got a lot to do with your work ethic as well. I think that also causes a lot of problems in OT as you do lots of group work together. Some people like to leave things to the last minute and other people don’t and they want to start early on, and they end up doing everything because the other person just doesn’t offer to do anything. So I think that their work skills that also can cause a lot of problems as well.
Academic styles

Halima (I): Being with my friends has helped me (pause) be a better academic. I can study well with them. I can work well with them for group assignments etc. Over the years we have grown used to each other’s ‘styles’ and when doing work together I know I can rely on my friends to submit group work that I will be happy with.

This outgroup bias, of not making the academic bar is related to academic self-fulfilling prophecy in outgroups, as well as Claude Steele’s (1997) work on stereotype threat where both conditions create an unhealthy context that places pressure on the outgroup to perform or confirm stereotypes. Researchers such as Steel noted the possibility of disidentifying with the academic task in preference for a self-esteem building activity which might be one of belonging to the subaltern outgroups (in Brehm et al, 2004).

Decreased Effort

This second sub-theme describes the foci associated with the drivers of decreased effort in integrating viz. comfort zone and habituation. The quote below highlights effort not reciprocated and through classical conditioning will not persist but rather become less. Recognition of this non-reciprocality creates Othering on the basis of perceived effort.

Nonhle (A): …us black people will try so hard to change ourselves, to become like the white person or want to relate to the white person, or whatever, but the white person is not willing to do the same…

Both quotes below describe apparent lack of effort to get to know the Other as a result of being within a comfort zone and possible anticipated discomfort, which is overt as Emerald suggests or subconscious as Thuli subsequently clarifies to explain “those boundaries that we cannot pinpoint” (not quoted here).

Emerald (W): I have sort of found an insight today that sometimes we don’t integrate with other races, because we are stuck in our comfort zones and it is too much effort.

Thuli (A): There are boundaries where you are white and I am black. (laughter) You can be my friend, we share the same bed, we share everything but there are those boundaries that we cannot pinpoint.
Both participants make their points powerfully to show the gravity of the problem; Emerald by the use of the word “stuck” that connotes immovability and Thuli by building her case with ‘feel good’ emotive language (friend, share the same bed, share everything) and then hammering home the point that there are subconscious boundaries which she names further along in that dialogue.

The next example looks at the discomfort of an anticipated future inability to socialise with another race vs. the comfort of sitting with racially homogenous people from initial meetings. Mary reports looking for her homogenous race group as she anticipates that she will be able to meet up and have common interests which are also part of establishing a comfort zone, both in the present as well as in the future. This is also perhaps an example of a self-fulfilling cycle that keeps decreased effort going.

Mary (W): When I was in first year I did a BSc. And there was probably 3 white people out of, I had a class of 900 in my chemistry class, and there were... 5 white people so we sat together and I promise you it was really awkward because you look up into this thing and you just see this sea of black faces and Indian faces and you see this tiny little group of white people. But I didn't know who they were, what their interests were, but when I saw a white person we automatically greeted each other and became friends, and I know that sounds terrible, but that is what happened...You assume you can have a future and a friendship because to be honest, seeing the res people I wouldn't assume that we could go out on the weekend together.

Habituation: this refers to clustering with a homogenous race group by force of habit, which was reported in multiple ways.

Petra (W): It’s almost just habitual. I don’t know what it is we just (trails off) and it’s the same thing in class, we all sit in the same place every single day.

Halima (I): Something I noticed about our class is that many of us knew each other before campus. As a result we stayed with our old friends or acquaintances.

Both habits are clearly visible, returning to a habitual place within a venue as well as by habit staying with old acquaintances. This prevents students from getting to know others as they are in habitual ingroups and to change a habit requires motivation and effort. Further to this Linville,
Fischer and Salovey (1989) report that limited contact and contact with a non-representative sample of the outgroup results in perceived outgroup homogeneity.

4.4 Discussion

The concept of Othering where one creates social categorisation that fosters outgroups, who are normally seen as homogenous and ingroups that are initially homogenous and then increasingly seen as different, is evident in the findings of this chapter. In depth interrogation of the data gave credence to the aim of exploring the participants lived reality and ensured the data was treated with gravitas as Othering data revealed complexity and richness. In particular the overlapping nature of the discourse centres around the structural vs. personal drivers of Othering.

Structural drivers are the environmental and historical facilitators of Othering which may be tangible (a homogenous racial suburb) or intangible (results of poor schools for children of colour). On the other hand, personal drivers are drivers that are traits/behaviours/attitudes that have been presented in the data as the narrative of their experience by the participants. These personal drivers are specific and highly individualised however also display the shadow of apartheid such as attitudes being formed by social learning from parents who have been socialised with segregationist thoughts.

Structural Drivers

The findings indicate that structural drivers such as previously segregated residential areas, leisure areas and resultant legalised social alienation between the races continues to segregate races, albeit to a lesser degree. This suggests that Apartheid and the systematic application of it, continues to cast a shadow on South African life and integration following its dismantling nineteen years ago. This is clearly evident in the section called Apartheid’s Aftermath (p. 35) as well as in nuanced forms within participants’ choices, social divisions and emotions such as fear and trust in relationships between the protagonists. This is the finding amongst students who form the so called “born frees” who were very young at the time of the changes and have grown up predominantly in post-apartheid South Africa.

---

23 These personal drivers are reflective of students at a certain age and stage of life
24 Cognisance must be taken of these structural barriers being universal in nature and found globally however perhaps entrenched and more pervasive in South Africa because of the legacy of Apartheid.
Exacerbating these social fractures is the attempted redress such as bursaries and affirmative action which create tension between the races with little interrogation of the reason for its application, history and intention as evident amongst all participant races. A further twist to this is that social and race categorisation continues unabated, as a result of this redress which creates the requirement of ongoing race categorisation which appears to drive stereotyped Othering and the consolidation of Us/Them projections. Brewer (1997) analyses the outgrouping tendency as a result of redress measures into 5 factors that have negative social psychology implications (p. 207). They are:

1. The resultant decrease in opportunities to create common group identification.
2. People are categorised by race from birth.
3. It lends itself to so called “natural categorisation” which makes differences appear unbridgeable.
4. Problem of who is the categoriser?
5. Social differences in terms of access to resources and power make co-operation unrealistic to expect.

The findings support Brewer’s factors, and concern in terms of building social cohesion with highly differentiated in/out groups. Particularly evident is the confirmation of ingrouping through racial categorisations, the designation of racial categories as per the old apartheid system, the naturalness of this essentialism, the government/university as the authority of the day being the categoriser, and the power dialectic that has emerged.

A sub-theme which requires mentioning here is racialised space as a result of these inherited structural and contact limiting historical factors. Contemporarily, the university campus is seen to be splintered by racialised space which is inherited historically, passed on by newer generations of students (new inheritance, such as the ‘white quad’) as well as actively forming through novel creations (“At the reserve the Indians have occupied one end and the blacks the other end”) and by perpetuating fresh racialised space divisions (“no-go zones”).

**Personal Drivers**

Personal drivers that have been formed as a result of the above or been internalised through social learning from parents, authoritative figures and peers can be seen threaded through the focus group transcripts. The first such driver is that of stereotypes and the usage of such to create divisions between the protagonists such as: “‘whites’ don’t smile” or “‘black’ students
have self-portraits as wall papers”. Stereotypes involve generalisations about the typical characteristics about a specific social group to a greater or lesser degree which may or may not be evidenced based (Judd, Ryan & Park, 1991, in Baron & Byrne, p. 231). Literature explains that stereotypes are easily confirmed by the perceiver as information that supports the stereotype is readily noticed while information discrediting the stereotype is ignored. This process then confirms the stereotype (Brewer, 1997). The participants, who have interacted with each other over a period of two to four years, (within the discipline of Occupational Therapy) as well as worked together on group assignments and on fieldwork placement blocks, appear to continue to see each other in stereotypes or according to social categorisations different from themselves which creates the separate group dichotomy.

Finally attributions are made about the causes of behaviour that maintain stereotypes through all the focus groups, through compartmentalising these behaviours into attributions of social class, religious, and traditions in lieu of race which is interpreted to be largely as a result of social correctness in a post-apartheid South Africa, for example:

Petra (W): “...for example like the black girls a lot of them believe in like this witchcraft and stuff which again is completely foreign to me…”

Castano, Yzerbyt, Bourguignon and Seron, write about the exaggeration of such attributions in order to preserve ingroup/outgroup differences (2002, p.320).

Social identity theory links self-esteem to the fate of one’s ingroup with resultant negating of outgroups in attempts to increase one’s self esteem. This is not overt within the transcripts however one sees the rationalisation of the ingroup’s behaviour, if that behaviour is deemed to be questioned by inconsequential and illogical arguments often with self-cause bias, for example:

Felicity (W): A lot of times they follow through with their traditional practices (pause) just going to extremes like slaughter a cow for Christmas or something and they invite you for Christmas, and you know being friends, like your social group they celebrate different celebrations the way you do.

The focus group transcripts also displayed a few incidences of Othering on the basis of discrimination. This is defined as the unjust or prejudicial treatment of different categories of people, especially on the grounds of race, age, or sex ("Discrimination", 2013).
Tajfel (1982) and Turner (1987) concept of social identity theory is supported as an extreme form of Othering and can be seen in a few of the examples presented in this chapter. The example, where a ‘white’ participant reported that they could not work with students who lived on campus, as they did not have cars to commute to outside venues is one such example.

The need for self-esteem can also be seen in social learning phenomena where the students are taught segregation, overtly and covertly, and through intricate social rewards. This appeases the need for self-esteem both personally and in an ingroup collective. This is seen in the direct example that Thuli explains below, regarding personal achievement that is recognised by her dad, but subtly alluding to her athleticism on the track.

```
Thuli (A): “…if you go to a multiracial school and I go on an athletics field with white people, my dad can tell me that “you’re gonna win that race.”
```

Much has been written about intergroup conflict stemming from competition for resources or opportunities that creates the conditions for prejudice (Baron & Byrne, 2004, p. 225). This so-called realistic conflict theory relates to prejudice developing from competition with resultant derogation of the Other (Bobo, 1983, p. 1201). Participants displayed conflictual feelings when they described affirmative action as a policy and in its implementation with simultaneous feelings of being subjected to racism. Examples display strong conflictual positions that are framed cognitively with Us/Them language and feelings. This perpetuates Otherness and consolidates the cognitive schema in place already.

The findings of this chapter confirm the perception of the researcher of a virtual lack of integration across ‘racial lines’ both in class and on Campus in general. It highlights severely limited understanding and misunderstanding between the different race groups as well as a pervasive ethos of seeming passivity and adherence to and of this phenomenon. This remains a concern as the students have interacted with one another in structured and unstructured time/events and are involved in a discipline that stresses acknowledgement of individuals and collectives away from stereotyped versions that society and the media perpetuate. It appears that in an egg or chicken type debate we see that limited understanding creates foreignness/Otherness which fosters limited contact which perpetuates Otherness and confirms understanding or misunderstanding when coupled with stereotypes and direct experience of the Other.
Van Dijk (in Buttny, 1999, p. 249) found that ‘whites’ often tell a narrative that is critical of, or regarding an issue with people of colour without necessary having denouement which suggests continuity into the present. This view impedes social cohesion as it is perhaps a reason for the preponderance of ‘white’ voices within this macro-theme as they resonate with integrational issues. Further three ‘white focus groups’ formed 63% of the research participants and all three focus groups spoke strongly about Othering for extended periods of time. The reasons for this finding cannot be conjectured and not within the ambit of this dissertation.

Moving forward into Chapter Five the research looks at a smaller macro-theme that emerged in terms of integration and that was factors that supported social cohesion as experienced by the participants. These findings were unsolicited directly, but emerged in the general discussions that spontaneously arose. This is seen as important to the researcher as it shows that there are positive experiences present, however less recalled and less talked about.
Chapter 5

Social Cohesion

5.1 Introduction

This chapter is linked to the main research objective of exploring student’s perceptions of racial integration. It looks at it from another perspective which is the converse of Othering, focusing on opportunities and instances of social cohesion, as reported by the participants.

5.2 Social Cohesion

Social cohesion is the formation of understanding between disparate members that crosses over conformity of thoughts, race, religion and language, but builds meaning by banding together for a variety of reasons. This is explained by Zai (C), a participant in the research who said:

“It’s all fine and good to be with the people you’re comfortable with, but you need to realise, you need to understand you need to be able to fit in with different groups at different times because being with people that you’re comfortable with is not necessarily your ideal.”

In Chapter four, participants discussed Othering themes and experiences in depth, however also discussed experiences of social cohesion albeit, to a lesser extent. Importantly participants did not only discuss the negative but also gave examples of socially cohesive experiences and opportunities across all focus groups. Themes and foci, within this chapter are directly related to themes in both Chapter four and six.

The macro-theme binding this chapter together is thus social cohesion with three related meso themes being, Universal Values, Discovering the Other and Increasing Contact Time. The data displayed within this chapter was not as complex as that for Othering in the preceding chapter and hence the depth of analysis and finer nuancing of findings is less detailed. Thematic analysis revealed the emergence of strong stand-alone micro-themes with relevant foci allowing the chapter to look and feel as different as the data suggests.
Figure 5.1 Overview of Social Cohesion (as 2 of 3 macro-themes)
5.2.1 Universal Values

Universal values are common principles and sometimes ideals that guide peoples’ lives. Participants reported integration around humanistic relationship factors that are universal in nature and that cross the spectrum of humanity. These universal values were then recognised as a shared commonality that created ties and understanding between students. Integration for example occurred when there were incidents of reciprocal love and altruism. This is seen subtly in the following example where values of common good are evident.

Halima (I): *Despite hearing some negative comments aimed at us “Muslim girls” we chose to ignore this and work positively with them*. 
*The outcome was that they really appreciated us at the end and we formed a pleasant relationship. All relationships take work haha.*

Other factors that promoted integration occurred when the Other was seen to have a good character or had traits of kindness and humour. These again align with universal values of common goodness.

---

25 Them- refers to two girls from a different unspecified race group on fieldwork placements with participant
5.2.1.1 Reciprocal Acts

When participants received or enacted reciprocal acts of humanism they reported these as examples of social cohesion. Yalom (2005) an author on group dynamics writes about altruism as an experience where one can receive or give, which improves self-esteem and mutual validation. This needs to be seen in terms of Tajfel and Turner's social identity model in terms of increased self-esteem through group and collective achievements.

This reciprocity according to Brewer (1997) is usually between individuals rather than groups and requires multiple occasions of co-operation to be translated into feelings. This phenomenon by Brewer is not seen in these findings, that indicate reciprocity at a group level over and above common group goals and norms which bode well for actions towards social cohesion. The acknowledgement that there is a need for this type of reciprocity is clear in the following quotes, one from a negative point of view and the other positive.

Zai (C): You do need to meet someone half way, if you are going to expect things to run in a certain manner, sort of thing.

Nonhle (A) ...certain people are not willing not only to accommodate other people, but like what you said, meeting each other half way, like on the same level...

Altruism is the selfless concern for the well-being of others (“Altruism”, 2014) and is written about by Yalom a group therapist as “profiting from something intrinsic to the act of giving” (2005).

This example describes a participant's perception that reciprocal acts of goodwill had been experienced across the race groups. This is deepened by her assertion that all participants had experienced this which was not refuted by the participants in the following discussion.

Ann (W): I think every single one of us in this room has been there for a person of a different colour and a person of a different colour has been there for us.

This supports Brewer’s (1997) contention that trust is created between ingroups and outgroups by reciprocity of actions such that both opportunities to trust and be vulnerable co-occur. Trust is then gained in the co-operation and counter sharing while vulnerability is based on the possibility that altruism is misplaced. If in as in the example above, both sides gain, then ingroup/outgroup margins diminish.
Love as described within the data and by the Oxford Dictionary is a strong feeling of affection ("Love", 2014). The following two examples focus on two different applications of love, one centring around friendship and the other stating that one does not have to share common interests with another to experience love and reciprocate it.

Katherine (W): A guy in our class was in hospital and I visited him and I was getting hold of him every single day, asking how he was. Like I love that boy to bits. Like me and him are really close, we sit together in class and everything and to know that he nearly died, absolutely killed me. Like I don’t see race at all. It’s my brother, like my best friend.

There is a close relationship evident between the participant and to a male classmate, however it is not evident whether this act of love deepened the relationship or if it was the result of an already deep friendship. Of interest is her use of the word “boy”26, which colloquially may intimate a playful friendship akin to childhood or a parochial viewing of this peer as a boy, a diminutive, or an Other.

Petra (W): We don’t have common interests. To be totally honest we don’t really, but at the end of the day, what does bring us together is our love for each other. For example we’re there for each other, we are a support system for each other, for example, her one group of friends died recently and like I will be there for her and I will support her, and that and like she’ll sms me today and she’s like: “thank you just for being there”, you know, this is what it’s about.

The quote displays surprise with the realisation that the participant’s adopted ‘black’ sister and herself share bonds of love even though they do not have the same interests. Does this indicate a predisposition to think of ingroups as homogenous, that family members have to be the same to belong? Erasmus (2010) points out that while researchers assume that contact with the Other facilitates breaking down stereotypes findings indicate that often it allows for the dominant ingroup to relearn and sometimes unlearn these stereotype. This is evident in Petra’s relearning of uncommon interests with her ‘black’ sister, which is the stereotype versus learning that bonds of love trump these stereotypes as a superordinate factor creating a new ingroup.

---

26 “Boy” was a commonly used term during apartheid to refer to a ‘black’ male, and was considered derogatory.
5.2.1.2 Good Character

This universal value relates to choosing to be around/join people that are seen as good within this micro-theme. This is a common value in society, passed on through families as well as moral authorities such as religions and schools. Humour as a value is coupled with kindness in the quote below and appeared in three focus groups as an attribute that facilitated friendship. This needs to be tempered with Thuli’s statement (p. 42) where she reported that ‘whites’ “are hardly ever a happy person”

Petra (W): Sense of humour and kindness and certain traits that are very similar that bring us all together (pause) like I was saying, one of the Muslim girls I am very close with, we have a very similar sense of humour so we are very close and she is a lovely person.

5.2.2 Discovering the Other

This meso-theme focuses on opportunities that allowed the participants to experience their peers across the racial divide and subsequently the humanity within with a resultant change in perceptions of outgroups or individuals. The two main sub-themes demonstrate the method by which this perceptual change was achieved, namely through discussion and the sociological phenomenon of acculturation.
5.2.2.1 Acculturation

Acculturation is a process in which assimilation of the practices of a different cultural group occurs which is normally by the minority group assimilating into the majority group. According to Crossman (2013) acculturation may be reciprocal between parties in terms of influence over each other and may be seen in factors such as language preference, common values, and political and ethnic identities.

Learning culture/language, represent perceptions within the focus groups that speak about assimilation on the basis of culture and language. In a predominantly Afrikaans speaking environment (at another University) integration is seen between ‘black’ and ‘white’ students who speak English, which is a minority assimilating with a minority. This is an example of superordinate goal of the English language forming a new ingroup.

Helen (W): At TUKS\textsuperscript{27} there is a lot of racial integration because the English people hang out together and that’s black and white, like Indian but that’s a minority at a place like TUKS, so it’s my English friends who have a lot of black friends and I do have black friends who speak Afrikaans and they went to the

\textsuperscript{27} TUKS- reference to the University of Pretoria
Learning/acquisition of an outgroup, different language facilitates assimilation. Within this example, this is the acquisition of isiZulu as a language to assist Occupational Therapy practice as well as living in a rural isiZulu speaking area. This is acculturation by the minority language speaking group into the majority, which is different from Helen’s example above. The need to learn isiZulu appeared in two out of three ‘white’ focus groups.

Ann (W): Think most of us can’t wait to like learn the language of African, of the Zulu, whatever, learn Zulu. (laughter) I don’t think any of us are scared of what we are facing, because it’s (pause) we all know we are going to go rural, we are going to learn so much about a new culture.

The next example lends itself to many themes as it highlights integration through exposure to the Other (Viz. the discussion micro-theme above and the meso-theme increased contact time below). The researcher chose to place it there, as it is general in nature and alludes to integration through exposure to different cultures which the participant perceives to be of benefit when integrating in a racially mixed arena such as University.

Aneesa (I): I have also attended a mixed race school and agree that people from here tend to be more open minded and open to heterogeneous friendships than those at schools with concentrated racial majorities. The students that came to campus from the mixed race school were able to break out of always being in ‘cliques’ whereas the others weren’t.

Similar life experiences allow one to experience universality as well as in this case demonstrate altruism ("love and caring") and potentially experience and discuss existential issues. Both examples below utilise the words “similar situations/challenges" to emphasise the same experience which builds understanding. Authors in psychology have named this differently over the years from Irving Yalom’s (2005) corrective emotional experience to cognitive dissonance (Baron et al, 2009). This will be discussed further at the end of this chapter.

Susan (W): The Muslim girl we keep talking about. Her and I were going through a very similar situation last year in 2nd year. And we were there for each other. It was different situations, but like at the end of the day, it is about loving each
other, and caring and being that support system, no matter what colour or culture you are from.

Farieda (I): This is also owing to the fact that through the years we have grown and faced similar challenges that have allowed us to grow together and learn from one another.

The researcher found that changes and the embracing of cross-cultural attributes was brought to the fore in foci linked to learning of the Other’s language and culture as well as sharing of similar life experiences across cultures. This would occur through exploring views, cultures and differences as well as through actively learning about the Others’ culture and language.

Talking (discussion) with Others and getting to know them (through the foci below) was reported in the focus groups as a positive interactional mode.

5.2.2.2 Discussion

According to the focus group discussions, social cohesion can be built through discussion with the Other around their views, culture and differences. This discussion was explored in different contexts such as informally spending time in class, in the car and during socially engineered time (formally). This will seemingly build deeper understanding and appreciation of the Other as illustrated by the statement of Susan (W).

I think once you start spending time with that person you find out the similarities. Like I can completely not understand where her family’s coming from when it comes to marriages. It frustrates me but you have to accept it. Like I can’t ask her to come to my 21st birthday, because I know she won’t be allowed to come but we are still friends and you accept that part of each other.

Friendships across cultural/religious groups allow one to see different views of life such as a Muslim family arranging a marriage for their daughter as well as restricting her socialising. Although these customs and practices are initially unfamiliar, and non-understandable from the ingroup perspective, acceptance of a friend’s lifestyle is promoted by shared similarities. This links to universality as a common bond as well as decategorisation of the Other as a result of highly personal interactions (Brewer, 1999).
The next two examples illustrate participants’ views about the value of exploring culture as foci with their fellow students. Katherine reports the benefit of structured/facilitated discussion within a lecture, while Halima a Muslim student suggests that it is a duty to discuss culture to prevent misunderstanding which was a common thread in the focus group that was of Muslim origin.

Katherine (W): *We had a values clarification lecture this year, talking about abortion, it is very interesting, they are bringing culture into it too, not just your own opinion but always bringing culture into your different lectures. Makes it very interesting and makes us understand where the other is coming from and find your differences and your similarities.*

Halima (I): *I think it is our duty to inform others about our culture so that they will be more understanding of us.*

Learning about the differences about Others allows for misunderstandings to be cleared up, and while agreement need not be sought, respect for the Other is achieved. This is what Farieda (I) speaks about here:

*I believe it’s wonderful having different races within our class as it opens our minds and teaches us how to respect each other.*

### 5.2.3 Increased Contact Time

![Diagram of Social Cohesion]

**Figure 5.4 Macro-theme 2 Social Cohesion, third meso-theme, micro-themes and foci**
Simply put, this theme relates to the fact that spending more time together with the Others was found to foster integration. Specific activities mentioned were: travelling to varsity together, living together hypothetically and fun times. Of particular relevance to chapter six and chapter seven was the specific mention of growth games within three focus groups, facilitated by lecturers, as an enabler of increased socialisation and fun together. The micro-themes will be discussed below under the headings of Socialise and Fun times.

5.2.3.1 Socialise

This micro-theme refers to opportunities to mix cross racially amongst themselves according to participant perceptions.

Field work placement sites, where students are required to work together in mixed racial groups, both treating clients individually and together as well as running a communal project was seen as an opportunity to integrate and learn about the Other.

Farieda (I): Being placed at prac venues with a variety of races has definitely been a blessing! It’s where our relationships with the other racial groups have grown.

Mary talks frankly about this experience, that was created artificially ("forced to") while the next quote points to the goal directed behaviour that is shared amongst the disparate students on fieldwork practical as well as the conditions that warrant mutual support as being the “therapeutic” integrational principles.

Mary (W): You may start out in those racial groups, but I do think like especially through prac I have become so much better friends with people from other races, because I didn’t get that opportunity to go and chat to them, now suddenly my last two prac groups, we were like majority weren’t white so I was like forced to get to know them (pause) And it’s actually really important even though we complain that our groups aren’t our friendship groups, but it’s actually really good that they do that because you are forced into these relationships and you just have to kind of make way. And it does teach you quite a lot.
Ruby (W): I don’t think university has that same camaraderie unless you are on prac where there’s a group work setting where you have the same focus, the same goal. Then it’s great it is very easy to find that camaraderie and support for one another.

Ruby’s astute observation that there are particular conditions in which “camaraderie” is seen to be fostered will be discussed within this chapter’s discussion.

**Travel/live together** as foci appeared in numerous focus groups both as a perception as well as lived experiences informing these perceptions. Participants felt that increased contact time, while travelling to university together or living together in the residences would improve integration.

Susan (W): Daphne, Fazila and I drive in the car every morning together, so we are obviously gonna be close. We form more of a bond or we relate to each other more, like Fazila is of a different race and culture but I can call her one of my best friends and (trails of)

Liesel (W): If I look at friends who are at UCT, well both, thinking of two friends one’s a Muslim girl and one is a white girl. Although the Muslim girl has been brought up in sort of a western culture while her best friend is a white girl, I think it is purely cos they are both in res and they get to spend majority of their time together. So time is a huge factor.

Both anecdotes describe increased contact time as the factor that has encouraged integration across racial groups. Further analysis also displays that these examples entail the sharing of resources, being reliant upon each other as well as being in a closed secure personal space. This supports Allport’s (1954) contact theory supposition (in Brehm et al, 2005).

While the above looks at time together travelling and at residences, this section looks at integration and opportunities for **time together on campus** which offers integration during the day. Two different but related examples follow, with the first talking about experiencing a friendship as a result of staying late on campus, and the second which is related is the acknowledgement that ‘white’ students leave campus immediately after lectures are over. Aneesa explains this as ‘white’ students “see no point being there longer” and once this pattern was established in first year, the students that remained on campus tended to choose friends
that would be around as well, friendships following function. This phenomenon can be utilised to improve social cohesion and is therefore discussed further in Chapter 7.

Susan (W): *With the different cultures and the similarities and the same Muslim girl we are talking about, we are good friends with her and she is from a completely different culture and it’s because we spend so much time with her. In first year I would be at varsity till like half past four and so would she, so we would spend that time together so I also think that makes a big difference like Petra would spend a lot of time during exam time with her and that’s when they got to know they have the same sense of humour so I think once you start spending time with that person you find out the similarities.*

Time spent after hours is reported as a humanising force (above) with Petra finding a reciprocal sense of humour in an outgroup member.

Aneesa (I): *The minority race\(^{28}\) on campus tends to leave campus as soon as they can as they see no point being there longer than they need to for academic purposes, whereas the races\(^{29}\) which are more densely populated on campus tend to stay on for extended periods in their free time to socialise. First year everyone got that impression and just formed bonds and selected friends that would be able to relate to their lives and situations.*

The above quote is important as it emphasises differences in choosing to spend time on campus vs. leaving which is a pattern established by students in first year. This creates a vacuum in terms of cross racial representivity on campus.

### 5.2.3.2 Fun Times

In this micro-theme, participants across the focus groups reported that the experience of fun created opportunities for social cohesion. It appeared across all the focus groups and was discussed by several participants. In the following quotes three participants report different examples of these fun experiences, one being formal *growth games/experiences* that were facilitated by a lecturer as part of the curriculum, the next a social event such as a formal party, and lastly the sharing of a religious festival in terms of explaining its’ meaning and significance and traditions while sharing relevant food together.

---

\(^{28}\) ‘white race’

\(^{29}\) ‘people of colour’
Mary (W): I actually think, for all the years is to do socialising, enjoyable activities where you actually just laugh in class. This year has been the best year because we have had so much fun. That has brought us so much closer together because you have those games, where you have to do, I don’t know all these things and also a lot of reflection about what you think and it’s something that has brought us so much closer together.

By comparing the year with previous years, in terms of fun experienced Mary emphasises the impact that the growth games had on the class as well as the fact that it required reflection, which “brought us so much closer”. This links with the theme of ‘Discovering the Other’ as it allows through reflection for one to see oneself and the Other in a different light.

Petra (W): I think a really nice positive example is our Ball this year, erm some of the Muslim girls came and they wouldn’t usually come and we have so much fun with them and that was a really positive integration amongst, because we had something in common, we were all third years together, we were all having the same food and dancing together. So that was nice integration.

Petra reports on the experience of fun and shared commonality which prefaces “the same food and dancing together” as Muslim students are seen to be Other as a result of strict taboos around food consumption (halaal) as well as cultural taboos that disallow them from frequenting “clubs” and mixing with the opposite gender. A shared fun event is therefore a strong social cohesive.

Aneesa (I): The Eid\textsuperscript{30} party is a lovely example of integration in our class. We invited them to join us and helped them understand our culture and religion which they thoroughly enjoyed and visibly respected us for and I felt an immediate closeness after that. Their respect and understanding for my beliefs, even though it wasn’t shared, brought comfort and joy.

These growth experiences, allowed the participants to experience each other across race boundaries. Working together towards common goals and experiencing universality and socialisation in an environment that is positive and fun appears to be the drivers of this foci on social cohesion (Yalom, 2005).

\textsuperscript{30} A Muslim religious day which is celebratory, occurring twice yearly
5.3 Discussion

This chapter brings together the lived experiences and perceptions of participants who shared their views about drivers and opportunities for social cohesion. It can be seen that the themes are framed by two factors, activities that promote changing the mind-set as in the theme ‘Universal Values’ and through active engagement with the other such as in the theme ‘Discovering the Other’. In the theme ‘Increase Contact Time’ we see these two factors mix to influence each other and create the opportunity for social cohesion.

Increased contact time between the races is a functional factor that creates the space for team building, which suggests that authentic time spent with the Other promotes understanding. This need is influenced by conditions discussed in Chapter 5 which unmasked contemporary societal contexts such as racialised spaces, family sanctioning of integration through familial socialisation and the ever present influences from Apartheid. Current societal conditions appear not to be creating these spaces, space to interact, either frequently or adequately enough if at all.

All the above themes directly and indirectly meet and support Allport’s (1954) Contact Hypothesis, which proposes that under particular conditions contact between differing groups that are against one another will reduce prejudice and discrimination.

The theme of universal values as a facilitator of social cohesion can be further explained by Yalom (2005) who refers to it as the feeling that “we are all in the same boat” (p. 6) which create the sense of belonging and that one is not alone. Further Yalom’s social learning speaks of the opportunities to learn or unlearn within a group through feedback, (direct or indirect) as well as imitation and role modelling (2005). This can be applied to the findings that have been presented over and above the contact hypothesis. Participant examples of social cohesion demonstrates universality of experience through discussion and lived experiences as well as the experience of common events and shared novel experiences which promotes interpersonal learning.

This could be explained through the correction of attitudes/stereotypes as a result of reality testing in real life interactions that change one’s mind (Yalom, 2005). Cognitive dissonance that arises from these interactions could also produce a change in attitude to match one’s behaviour. (Brehm et al, 2005).
Finally discovering the Other posits transactional interaction that deepens understanding and breaks stereotypes. Brewer et al (cited in Brehm et al, 2004) describe factors that allow one to break stereotypes and see the person (p. 146). Two of these stereotype breaking factors are useful, when applied to the findings, which are personal information and motivation. Knowing personal information of the Other has been shown to disallow stereotyping and increases the motivation to break stereotypes. This motivation can be seen in the cooperative nature of field work placement blocks, joint assignments and the growth games that were team orientated. Motivation and interpersonal information will be discussed in chapter seven.

The following chapter brings the research into the domain of occupational therapy and reports findings that focus on the objective that explores barriers and promotive factors to racial integration within the Discipline of Occupational Therapy. The chapter is interlinked with chapter four and five as it correlates with the macro-themes, however reports specific barriers and promoters that the participants discussed; which has significance from a training perspective.
Chapter 6

Promoters and Barriers within the Occupational Therapy Discipline

6.1 Introduction

The final objective of this research was to explore specific barriers and promotive factors to racial integration within the discipline, as this would increase understanding of the occupational therapy specific, lived reality. The occupational therapy department is situated within the School of Health Sciences and was established in 1981, within what is now labelled as a previously 'black' university. Students are admitted in accordance with an affirmative action policy, with the average cohort of students for any one of the four years of study being 28. Twelve academic staff, the majority hired according to affirmative action policy and the transformational charter teaches across the four years of study including fieldwork placement. This chapter reports themes that are divided into barriers and promoters of integration specific to the discipline and where probed for during the focus groups. (See probes 6-9, Appendix 4)

6.2 Promoters and Barriers

These findings, obtained from further thematic analysis are inextricably linked to Othering and Social Cohesion and should be seen as the final chapter of an unfolding story however with a particular focus on barriers and promoters in practice, the workplace, with occupational therapy staff and within the University's structure. As this was probed for participants presented negative data as the converse was then seen as the solution. The presentation of this chapter merges promoters and barriers together as division would be a false separation and needs not to be read as such.
6.2.1 Staff

This micro-theme reports on perceptions of promoters or barriers that participants hold around staff. A discussion on staff arose in three out of five focus groups in different ways. The foci Staff attributes, Facilitation and Consistency divide this theme’s data into attributes that the participants see in the staff, facilitation of the students in terms of engagement with diversity and consistency in terms of academic task fulfilment.

Staff Attributes

Zai believes that the occupational therapy staff is divided along racial lines and that there is racial clustering in the staff room which is seen as poor role modelling while Andiswa feels that the occupational therapy department is racially unrepresentative. Both are seen as barriers. There were many comments and discussion around staff that was similar in content.

Zai (C): *We gonna see yes your Indians lecturers all together your white, all together…The parents are showing the children, how do you expect your child to...*
grow up? You can’t grow up living and see that black is black and white is white, then you expect them to go out and (trails off)

Andiswa (A): There is no equalisation within the staff department, in terms of race, there is quite a few Indians erm and a few whites. There is only one black person and the rest are their admin staff.

On analysis the participant’s view the staff as role models however continue to think in racial terms and classify their lecturers according to the racial categorisations that were upheld during the Apartheid era. This illustrates that “born frees” continue to socially categorise in terms of race, seeing the lectures as outgroupers. This could be as a result of hierarchical educational structures, staff being of a different ‘race’, or values that describe educators as authoritative people who have great knowledge.

Facilitation in Conflict Resolution

This refers to enablement of the participants in terms of teaching and learning tasks within the curriculum and outside of it in terms of increasing tolerance and facilitation of conflict resolution around cultural diversity. It needs to be seen then as a subset of chapter five’s social cohesion which serves as promoters of integration through facilitation of fieldwork practicals and growth experiences. Both examples below describe facilitation by staff around diversity training/interventions aimed at integration as a result of racial conflict/tension within the class. Several participants felt that so called intervention made situations worse if they were not handled correctly.

Tracey (W): …we had to break into pairs with someone we didn’t really know and I went with a white girl whom I didn’t really know that much about honestly, I got told I couldn’t be with her we were the same colour and therefore we knew each other and I got put with a black person and I just found it ridiculous because I didn’t know the person and the whole aim of the activity was get to know each other and not based on your race or anything. So it just made me even more irritated. like forcing the issue upon us and hyping everyone’s attention and I think our class from that day actually made things worse.

---

31 Youth born in South Africa around or after the democratic elections that created a democratic country
Ruby (W): *I think they broached the solution in an inadequate manner. They try and force a solution rather than us work through it ourselves and I think sometimes that adds additional tension that shouldn’t have been there in the first place so sometimes when they get involved without fully knowing what caused the issue it just adds to the tension instead of helping the issue.*

Tracey has difficulty accepting the stereotype that if another student is ‘white’ like herself she is assumed to be known. She uses the technicality that the task was to find someone she did not know, and the facilitator had not made the race of the individual paramount in the pairing. Ruby emphasises the feeling of being forced to do something, and reports that this increases tension between (in this case) the races. This demonstrates how a “promoter” can be a “barrier” if not applied correctly. The perceived application of “force” is working against the participants’ motivation and they could become defensive and reactive, forming stronger ties in the group around the “aggressor” and united against a common cause. This supports conflict theory (Baron & Byrne, 1994, p. 225).

Facilitation of race issues and diversity training requires skills, correct attitude and knowledge. According to Brown (2001), participants should not be forced to participate, but see the benefits of and support the intervention. Facilitators should ensure that participants feel part of the solution; by being part of the planning, goal setting, timing and norming, up front. Facilitation needs to be effective enough that it create opportunities to acknowledge other’s values without necessarily being forced to change one’s own especially if as Brown reminds us it is “value driven” for that “creates resistance” (2001). This is borne out in and evidenced in anecdotes and discussion in chapter five where efforts to promote integration are perhaps more interactive/participatory and indirect.

**Consistency**

The examples below demonstrate frustration by the participants towards what is perceived to be changing standard and unreliability of staff members when it comes to race related issues. Helen points out that in a peer group marking format, a ‘black’ student was given the same mark as herself which she subtly is saying was as a result of the race.

Helen (W): *There was an issue where I was in a group with a black student who didn’t do any work for an assignment and I refused to put her name on the assignment and let her present and the whole class, white and Indian and black*
were like, you are not going to put her name on? She ended up getting the same mark I did for doing maybe a 10th of the work.

The following example focuses on the perception that the lecturers do not mark consistently between themselves.

Ruby (W): There has to be an objective way of doing it, there has to be that hint of subjectivity in the fact that there are going to be different circumstances, but every supervisor should mark it in the same manner and for the same students.

This theme for the need of marking consistently is emphasised by the quote below, which seems to imply that both students and lecturers are playing the race card. Sandra insinuates that in her perception ‘black’ students fare poorly and cite ‘race’ as a reason demonstrating both stereotyping and a mistrust that they are held to the same standards as a ‘white’ student. She emphatically exhorts the lecturers to explain marking guidelines which all races are measured equally against suggesting that this is not the expectation. This example displayed mistrust which reduces the possibility that ingroup/outgroup divides will be bridged through cooperation, as it is based here on apparent inconsistency (Brewer, 1997, p. 205).

Ingrid finds inconsistency in the focusing in on issues such as race while there are additional issues that are neglected. All ‘white’ focus groups felt strongly about the racialising of various factors (see Affirmative Action, p. 46). This is another example of racial sensitivity, the perception that race is over emphasised and that they are not benefitting from it.

Sandra (W): It might also benefit right at the start to put your race cards away. You are going to be judged according to your performance, if you don’t hand it in you are going to get zero, you don’t do your presentation you are going to get zero. This is your clinical performance that you measured against, whether you are black, white, red, or Indian.

Ingrid (W): Don’t point it out and not point out other issues

Consistency is then suggested as a promoter. As Ingrid succinctly suggests that the discipline should handle social and academic standards consistently which would result in “race sensitivity” fading. This perception needs to be seen in the academic context of the discipline
having keen awareness of this need. The discipline has assessment and other standards with procedures and documents in place to ensure consistency.

6.2.2 In the Work Place

Figure 6.2 Macro-theme 3: Promoters and Barriers, second micro-theme, and foci

Occupational therapy students work in fieldwork practice venues where they hone their clinical skills. Jabulani discloses that he is uncomfortable treating a client of a different race which is mirrored in cross racial professional relationships.

Discomfort

Jabulani (A): Even now I don’t feel comfortable. Like when I’m treating a patient of another race there is that sort of not being comfortable. Like the first thing is the language, and the stereotypes from black to white, from black to Indian and what not and when it goes to that relationship between the staff, the MDT. Somehow, somewhere there is going to be those impacts.

The words “even now” above, denote two possible things, firstly even after studying and practicing for several years as a student, or “even now” after the abolition of apartheid and
growing up in a democratic country the participant is still uncomfortable with treating clients cross racially. It is unclear whether he uses the ‘black to white’, ‘black to Indian’ in that order intentionally. This would imply the stereotypes are emanating from himself. He also alludes to language discomfort which has been discussed earlier. Thuli (below) is more direct in terms of discomfort of distancing herself from racial prejudice from a client.

Thuli (A): When you come in you are there to treat the patient, right, but I am still having problems with detaching myself with who I am, leaving that person at the door and coming to hear a white woman telling me: “Don’t touch me, don’t touch me.” It is going to affect you. I don’t care if your heart is a brick, it will affect you.

Zanele (below) starts by giving an example of racial discrimination by clients in a hospital in her home province (not shown). She then discusses the occupational therapy team in the hospital who are all ‘white’ and Afrikaans speaking. This and the fact that she felt excluded from them has left her deeply worried about returning to work there post completion of her degree (not shown).

Zanele (A): Now there is only one black therapist in that dept. and another 6 therapists who come from Stellenbosch, UCT, UP\(^{32}\), most of them from UP. So you can see from the very first start that inside the dept. there is no colleague relationship thing, because of that. There is only like one black person, like I say, an OTA is black and the OTT is also black. But the rest of them from Head to Chief to the 6 other therapists they are all white. And they speak in Afrikaans and to make sure you don’t get what they saying or whatever, they don’t keep that relationship. They don’t mix together, they don’t even attach you, wherever you are is wherever you are…

These examples display negative affect that ensues from experience in the field as a result of racial discrimination as well as feelings of being marginalised by race, language and attitude. This links with the theme Mentality of the Oppressed as well as seeing oneself as part of the outgroup created by the Other.

The foci below describe particular role model deficits in terms of students and clinical staff. Thabo resonates with a male occupational therapist at a local Hospital who has a separate

\(^{32}\) UP- reference to University of Pretoria
office to the other occupational therapists and does not mingle with them. Thabo foresees that this is himself in the future, while Jabulani reports that students that are weaker in the course are ‘black’. This led to the following exclamation: “It’s not nice not having a black person with a 90 there on the top. It is not nice, it is not.” A lengthy discussion on the reasons for ‘black’ students doing poorly in the course followed and indicated this was a profound issue for the group.

Thabo (A): *There is a black guy, in Hospital X. He is a qualified OT. He doesn’t mix with the others, the other two Indians and the white, so I think, that’s what I will end. I will be like him.*

This example supports avoidance of peers of different race groups through “self-segregation and selective contact” (Erasmus, 2010, p. 388).

Jabulani (A): *you find a situation whereby you accepted all those students according to their percentages and their marks were academic excellence, but you’ll find it is always a problem that you find that all the struggling students are black.*

Research on the academic outcomes of ‘black’ students has two perspectives that are reported, one in which ‘black’ racial identity “impedes” success and a second where the converse occurs (Harper & Tuckman, 2006, p. 387). The former explains Jabulani’s comment who has noticed a pattern that ‘black’ students are not top of the class, which is an accurate reflection of the student cohort researched. This phenomenon, research informs us, might create disengagement from occupations that are unsuccessful, to prevent self-esteem loss especially amongst African American males (Osbourne in Harper et al, 2006, p.387). It appears that ‘black’ participants resonated with this as it prompted consensus comments and means that these participants are cogniscent of systemic barriers that exist within the academy.

Erasmus (2010) reported on research with students from the University of Cape Town, related incidences where ‘black’ students did the “race work” meaning they had to work towards social cohesion and challenge negative perceptions at the same time holding “the feelings related to this burden of race”(p. 392). Jabulani is holding his ‘blackness’ up to the light that is indicating low competence in terms of academic results while at the same time internalising the ‘black’ ingroup achievements and challenging the stereotype. This acknowledgement is viewed as a promoter as it can lead to breaking through “stereotype threat” and becoming a student that in spite of boundaries continues to strive.
Professional limitations are evidenced in the subtle restrictions which remain within student’s perceptions of the practice of occupational therapy. Zai reminds the reader here, that a “person of colour” would not open a private practice in a predominantly ‘white’ area as it would not be supported. This indicates that the “born frees” continue to reflect on racial inequities and discrimination which affects their practice. The racialising of space is seen to extend into the practice area of occupational therapy as a result of segregated space in society as well as prejudice and outgrouping of therapists from a different race group public that chooses to continue to categorise albeit on race or practitioner experience.

Zai (C): *I know I am not going to go and open up a private practice in the middle of Hillcrest, which I know is a predominant white area, not just predominant white area, but predominant white area from apartheid type whites.*

6.2.3 Structure

Structural issues such as lack of facilities and events that draw people together were reported by participants across the focus groups. This was both at occupational therapy level as well as at a broad university wide level. There was some discussion that Howard College\(^{33}\) has a different profile from the Westville Campus of the University. (not shown)

Sandra (W): *Our campus has no real socialising event opportunity like other campuses do. If you go to UCT or Bloem\(^{34}\) or anything like that… they have rugby teams and soccer teams and netball teams that people could join and get behind and they have big parties and bands and draw you to campus life and there is nothing on our campus to make me wanna stay a minute later than what I have to. Absolutely nothing and if I don’t have to come in, absolutely required to pass my course, I won’t, there is nothing for us…*

This structural issue is a vital promoter to facilitation of integration and will be discussed in chapter seven.

\(^{33}\) The University’s main historic campus in Upper Glenwood
\(^{34}\) Bloem- reference to the University of the Free State
6.2.4 Praxis

Praxis refers to the practice of Occupational Therapy, as distinguished from theory. (“Praxis”, 2013). It therefore addresses issues that build practice, knowledge and skills within the discipline. This micro-theme there are four foci, Managing Diversity, Content, Resources and Timetabling which speak specifically to the praxis of occupational therapy in terms of promoters and barriers from the participants perceptions.

Foci that follow bring together varied thoughts and responses to instance that relate to diversity management in the occupational therapy discipline or specific interventions aimed at improving integration. Farieda reminds the researcher that many students have limited cross-racial experience prior to University attendance. This then requires new social learning and experience.

Farieda (I): An Indian/Muslim friend of mine who is a second year OT student and attended a Muslim school all her life was very taken aback by her new class that she was placed in, in first year, saying “Oh My, I’m not use to this, the white girls are so different!”
This example reports the melting pot environment of the University which for many having come from homogenous schools both racially and culturally is different. The cultural milieu and structure of universities affect one’s sense of self and belonging and needs to be considered (Chávez & Guido-DiBrito, 1999) and this finding above needs to be considered more closely within the discipline.

A focus group discussed their strong negative experience of a workshop that was aimed at promoting greater racial integration and tolerance displays some of these emotions in the foci below. Sandra sums up the feeling below.

Sandra (W): *Our class had to then endure like teamwork and socialising techniques. And get to know each other games and stuff like that.*

Sandra (W): *You can’t force integration, you can’t. When you do it, it just makes it ugly.*

Emotive words such as endure, force and ugly point to these strong negative emotions. There is resistance to being told what is right or forced to work with the Other in the above examples. It also serves to remind the researcher that such interventions need to be facilitated by a skilled practitioner, long term and not only at a time of crisis as in the sub-theme of facilitation of conflict above. (See recommendations chapter seven)

Finally Yvonne alludes to a promotional days that the occupational therapy discipline runs in the ‘quad’ as an opportunity to facilitate racial integration acknowledging that it is difficult.

Yvonne (W): *And like doing the promoting things in the quad and that but integrating race into it more, becoming like an awareness thing, it will be very difficult to do that.*

Specific facets of the course content that promote integration were discussed in the focus groups. The following refer to reoccurring foci across groups, namely common events that shared culture and experience, commonality in experiencing challenges and integration on clinical practice outings. These were mentioned with specific anecdotes as promoters.

---

35 Workshop class had experienced inter-racial conflict and an outside facilitator was employed for a series of workshops to facilitate increased tolerance

36 Main central open space between lecture venues and the cafeteria on the Westville campus
Aalia (I): … we as a group have tried to involve our classmates into our religion and culture by having a little Eid\textsuperscript{37} party in class with eats, drinks and applying mendhi\textsuperscript{38}… I think this went off well and represents where our class is at currently. We are much closer than in our first year.

Farieda (I): Our class has generally been very warm, respectful and kind towards other religions and races. This is also owing to the fact that through the years we have grown and faced similar challenges that have allowed us to grow together and learn from one another.

Aalia (I): With regard to the department promoting integration, I think that it has done a great deal by putting us into diverse groups for prac and by the use of group work.

The foci of resources, particularly unequal access to the same, appeared in the ‘black’ focus group only and prompted an outpouring of perceptions and negative emotions. ‘Black’ participants expressed the feeling that their lack of resources as a result of living away from home and at residence on campus, has resulted in them faring poorly compared to other races. Nonhle speaks of staff that fail to recognise this phenomenon and Thuli speaks of the difference between staying at home during school years and lack of financial and parental support at University. These issues will be conversely seen as opportune promoters and will be addressed in Chapter seven’s recommendations.

Nonhle (A): I think what all of us are shying away from is the fact that sometimes our lecturers, they don’t forget who is more accommodated, most of the black people live in res, most black people are far away from their families, most black people that are doing OT don’t have the resources that the white people have, that impacts a lot, it impacts on us academically, on like literally anything …

Thuli (A): It’s resources (pause) ‘cause when you were in school, living with your parents, you did not need to go buy beads and gonios\textsuperscript{39} and amaqanda\textsuperscript{40} for prac the following day, you don’t have money, you can’t be calling your parents every

\textsuperscript{37}Eid- religious holiday for Muslims occurring twice in a year
\textsuperscript{38}Mendhi- henna applied to the hands in intricate patterns through a cone filled with paste
\textsuperscript{39}Gonios- Goniometers are instruments that measure joint range
\textsuperscript{40}Amaqanda- IsiZulu word for eggs
Monday, “Ma I need money for noku nokudla”\(^{41}\) with my patients, you know. The white people have that, they can build a castle.

Resources are seen to be a divider into Us/Them categories that influence integration as it creates a victim and a resource rich unequal counterpart. This supports conflict theory where there is competition for resources between groups which increases intergroup resentment and further non-integration (Levine and Campbell in Brehm et al, 2005). Erasmus (2010, p.395) posits that intergroup relations needs to be viewed with an emphasised equality of race and class as social dividers. This is particularly evident in South Africa with lower socio-economic rungs of society being predominantly “people of colour” with subsequent less access to resources (Moodley & Adam, 2000).

Simply put the **occupational therapy timetable** is very full, apparently disallowing socialisation. This is a barrier to creating opportunities for integration. Katherine also acknowledges that year one and two of the course are foundational with lots of theory and recommends interactional opportunities be built in.

*Daphne (W):* I think one of the things specifically with our degree is we haven’t got a lot of social time at varsity. We come in, we have our lecture, we go home. So if it was a case of we have a lecture and then a three hour gap and then a lecture, I think in that three hour gap we may get to know each other more a bit because we don’t have these gaps, socialising only occurs in the car and outside of varsity and so when you come into the lecture room you don’t have anything to talk about with someone who hasn’t travelled with you, you don’t stay with.

*Katherine (W):* Really this year has been so more creativity. If you think about the first two years it’s not (pause) it’s all the foundations of OT… Oh, at least with our first week orientation we played growth games as first year, or let’s make sure that we are doing that at least once a semester, get everyone focused, enjoyable, knowing each other, Ja

Thuli explains the need from her perspective for integration as it promotes interpersonal learning. This identifies a need to interrogate the timetable to address these needs.

\(^{41}\) Noku Nokudla- isiZulu word for food
Thuli (A): *When we go out, we are not gonna be hopefully, only working with black or white or coloured or whatever type of people, so I need to know about her culture whether I like it or not. So whenever it’s group time I go to my black people, there is nothing new that they gonna tell me that I don’t know, so putting me, forcing me to go and listen to her culture and the white persons and the way they do their things at home is a big advantage for me, they are not doing for themselves, they are also doing it for me.*

Intergroup/cross racial learning is promoted succinctly by the quote above as it highlights the need for this specific type of interpersonal relationship building on the health sciences with close contact between disparate people who are required to understand each other’s contexts amongst professional staff as well as professional client.

### 6.2.5 Mentality of the Oppressed

This, the final micro-theme, reflects feelings of being less of a person which appear subtly in the ‘black’ focus group however the example below is overt. This was a product of Apartheid which suggested that all things associated with being “white” were good and all things black subaltern (Vandayar, 2008, p286). Jabulani, a so called “born free” exhibits these feelings of inferiority when he views peers (such as a physiotherapist) who are ‘white’.

Jabulani (A): *There’s a white physiotherapist. At one instance there is going to be that feeling that she’s superior because she’s white not because of the profession*

These feelings can be explained by increased anxiety and uncertainty following the perception that the Other is different and perhaps with different strengths, which results in avoidance and outgrouping or self- segregation (Gundykust in Buttny, 1999, p. 248). This may also be symptomatic of low self- esteem as the greater the amount of discrimination and devaluation one experiences the lesser the self- esteem. (Hansen and Sassenberg in Baron et al, 2009, p. 133) This is seen in a convoluted example below, where through the effort to be equal cognitively, the participant realises she is “inferior. This illustrates the profound devaluation of the self.
Zama (A): *It also goes back to erm, white person inferior*\(^{42}\) *and I’m going to do everything in my power to be above them. That’s you kind of reinforcing that they still think their perception is still they are above me, you know. So I’m doing everything to be above them. So basically it’s still having that thought that a white person is more superior. Ja*

This and the quotes below are examples of Biko’s “mentality of the oppressed”. Biko (1972) said: “At the heart of this kind of thinking is the realisation by the blacks that the most potent weapon in the hands of the oppressor is the mind of the oppressed. Once the latter has been so effectively manipulated and controlled by the oppressor as to make the oppressed believe that he is a liability” (p.74).

Thuli (A): *I am not talking about superior or inferior here. I’m talking about you as an individual. It doesn’t matter who what where. You have these subconscious boundaries…*

Jabulani (A): *The system that we are from, there’s always those boundaries that you don’t fit there ja you fit there because it’s still the social thing but when it’s academic you wouldn’t fit there, understand. So it is the system that is causing the boundaries.*

Internalisations of liability type self-thoughts are evident in the ‘black’ focus group from “subconscious boundaries” to “systemic boundaries”. Freire (1970) writes about this, supporting Biko and says “internalisation of the opinion of the oppressor” which is derogatory in nature causes resultant fulfilling of this opinion as a result of multiple sources feeding into these feelings. Unresolved or perpetuated feelings such as these will prevent occupational therapy students from reaching their capacity or believing in themselves.

**Discussion**

This chapter focuses on discipline specific promoters and barriers to integration however should not be seen as stand-alone, as related foci are found in chapter four and 5 five directly and indirectly. The foci are related to the practice of occupational therapy or the learning of occupational therapy and in most cases are very specific in their focus.

---

\(^{42}\) Inferior- participant is thinking aloud that ‘white’ people elicit feelings of being inferior
Generally the findings indicate that the University has transformed in terms of racial demographics amongst students without creating a transformative climate or experiences that foster social cohesion and transformation of embodying racial practices; while domains outside of university remain fractured and unequal. The profession of occupational therapy upholds human rights, and the “valuing of each person’s diverse contribution to the valued and meaningful occupations of the society and equal access....” (WFOT, 2006) which is the lens that is applied to the findings herein.

Important structural factors, both temporal and spatial, particular to the course and university life highlight the need to create the space and opportunities for interaction. This is mirrored in chapter four and five when participants referenced the Eid party, discussed no go zones, and where participants presented racialised space, which presented barriers to integration as well as opportunities to discover each other culturally. Specific issues such a timetabling, facilities and events speak directly to examples in the participant’s lived reality however also point to structural deficits within the discipline as well as the University as a whole. Buhle Zuma (2010) reminds us that having broad social and racial representation at university appears to create equality however this view is “naïve” and “false” as “structural issues influence and may shape everyday encounters” (p. 102).

These everyday encounters have been reported within these pages and demonstrate support for Buttney’s (1999) writing that ‘whites’ are seen to avoid ‘blacks’ in the following ways: being non-assertive, avoidant, assertive or aggressive for example, criticising integration. Examples of avoidance going out of your way to prevent interaction with the Other such as not visiting the ‘black residence’ assertive such as refusing to give a ‘black’ peer a good mark in peer evaluation as they had not worked and aggressive for example when one vociferously criticises diversity training.

Two focus groups queried staff consistency and facilitation of students, while staffing descriptors such as racial clustering and staff ratios were discussed in one. All examples within this sub-theme were reported as barriers, which is interpreted to indicate high levels of mistrust and limited role modelling of staff. Brewer (1997) suggests that misplaced trust results in decreased likelihood of integration and cooperation between ingroups and outgroups. Participant’s lived reality has created examples of misplaced trust without ensuing interactions that have ameliorated these initial experiences. Promotive interactions according to Brewer (1997) occur at both an individual as well as group level and can be viewed as a “reciprocity pact”. This
supports Chickering and Gameson’s (1987) good practice educational principles of encouraging contact between students and faculty, developing reciprocity and cooperation amongst faculty and students, and respecting diverse talents and ways of knowing. The findings support these authors and show clinical fieldwork in groups and growth games reported in chapter five were promoters within the discipline which is facilitated by staff. By the very nature of intensive supervision and liaison between staff and student on clinical fieldwork as well as the interactiveness of teambuilding and growth games, high levels of a reciprocity pact are seemingly embedded in these interactions through the meeting of the above principles.

Just as families were reported as influencing racial socialisation, in this chapter occupational therapy staff are perceived as being poor role models in terms of the perceived racial clustering and apparent lack of racial equity amongst the staff complement. This indicates a continued need for role modelling by authoritative figures perhaps as a result of the post-apartheid legacy or the continued divided social and formative opportunities. Role modelling could be seen as an intervention to breaking stereotypes, habitual and learnt behaviours as well as creating a milieu of non-racialism and co-operation amongst diverse groups of people. Transparency of appointment mechanisms and other practices and policies that guide the University’s transformation may be useful.

Throughout the transcripts and found within the sub-theme of Mentality of the Oppressed is an oft felt or alluded to feeling of self-segregation and self-depreciation by ‘black’ participants. This is seen in actions, where Thabo feels he will be like the self-segregating occupational therapy in a hospital; thoughts, (Jabulani above); as well as attitudes. As a reaction to feeling lesser or marginalised, perhaps ingroups are sometimes see as more “virtuous” than outgroups that prevents integration (Brewer, 1997, p. 206).

Understanding this mentality of the oppressed, is important as the ‘black participants’ all resonated with examples of experiencing racism that were discussed in the focus group. These experiences promote self-categorisation and may be the reason for social distancing between ‘black’ and ‘white’ participants in a sub-conscious effort to avoid such events through “racialised practices of entry and withdrawal, approach and avoidance…” (Durrheim & Dixon, 2005, p. 455). Self-categorisation, along attributions that are stable and fixed such as race and education, results in negative psychological feelings about oneself (Baron et al, 2009). This feeds into self-depreciation, self-fulfilling prophecy and confirmation bias (Brehm et al, 2005).
Jabulani’s example, speaks to all chapters where participants indicated that they see each other and themselves in racial boxes which Brewer (1997) states points to a curricular that has promoted “divisiveness” versus “those that have the goal of teaching children to become experts in more than one culture. The former promotes divisiveness, the latter multiculturalism as a shared value.” (p. 208). Vandayar (2008) criticises educational institutions for assuming that by “establishing the physical proximity of members of different groups” they would promote integration without “interrogating the quality of the contact” or the “institutional arrangements, policies and ethos” (p. 287). The view that students are arriving at university with formed racial identities premised on racial socialisation and apartheid’s legacy is emphasised within both this study’s data and other research which creates the need to focus on these facets of the “academy.”

Finally all five focus groups discussed group work and clinical field work experience as being promoters of integration. It needs to be pointed out, that in a full curriculum with diverse teaching, content and experiences these two examples alone were discussed, perhaps indicating a lack of an overt milieu of social cohesion through discussion and practice as well as content within the occupational therapy curricular which supports Vandayar and Brewer.

Chapter seven, the conclusion of this dissertation will report on the main study findings, establishing whether objectives and aims where met, presenting the limitations and making recommendations.
Chapter 7

Conclusion

7.1 Introduction

Complex data which emerged from the focus groups enabled the exploration of Occupational Therapy student perceptions of racial integration across the University and specifically within the discipline. This chapter will bring together the findings and discussion as well as afford the researcher a voice in an attempt to ‘bracket’ out her experience from the findings presentation. Limitations and recommendations will be presented to establish the significance of the study.

7.2 Discussion

Self-segregation/racial clustering was not disputed following the presentation of the vignette; however students either attempted to explain its existence from both negative and positive stances. Data further revealed that students continue to resonate with racial categorisation and experience integration and social cohesion along homogenous groups mainly. Strong evidence of Othering was perceived, particularly from the ‘white’ participants while at the same time they reported examples of social cohesion. ‘African’ participants were focused on three issues, their many experiences of contemporary racism, resource inequities that created division as well as the historical legacy of apartheid. These experiences of racism, along racist service delivery, including in restaurants, appear universal as they mirror Buttney’s findings in America amongst middle class African-Americans (1999).

Strong emotions/views and rich data were revealed through the focus groups which vindicated their use as the research tool as it facilitated spontaneous discussion through stimulation of discussion as well as interrogation and the resonation of/with issues. There appeared to be a feeling of being safe amongst racially homogenous groups, as participants spoke freely about the other which may not have emerged in mixed groups. Both volunteering of participants as well as having the groups led by external moderators allowed for openness, honesty and the raising of controversial issues.

A perception of ethnic victimisation was evident across both ‘white’ and ‘black’ ingroups. This is seen in ‘white’ focus group dialogue through the examples of redress of affirmative action, ‘blacks’ being let of the hook, playing the race card and having to do the race work. ‘Blacks’ feel that they are not being accommodated and on the back foot through examples such as
affirmative action/language. Having experienced racism they bring with them emotional baggage, second guessing the reasons for ‘blacks’ not being top of the class and blaming lack of resources as reported by Sidanius (2004). This displays both the need for the “prejudice reduction framework” and the “collective action framework” discussed by Dixon et al (2010) in the literature review and will be addressed in the recommendations, by not only focusing on reducing negative outgroup attitudes but by creating responsive conditions that promote social change.

This research supports many ideologies that seek to understand racialisation and integration, from contact theory to personal attitudes, to familial racialisation and interpersonal learning, and structural/systemic drivers (related and unrelated to apartheid) and the pedestrian nature of categorisation which is universal. However there are opportunities to promote social change in the “micro-spaces of everyday, bodily interactions” as Foster (2005) alludes to in terms of racialisation. Stereotyping and ingrouping is motivated by cognitive, sociocultural, and motivational factors (Brehm et al, 2005). Each of these factors is found within the data in terms of perceptions, thoughts, attitudes and knowledge with racialisation occurring in all life domains including interpersonal learning. The recommendations will thus seek to specifically address these motivational/cognitive and sociocultural factors by proposing the creation of new micro-spaces and new everyday bodily interactions through practical interventions.

The research supports Brewer’s (1997) advice to policy makers that discrimination is still the real issue for intergroup relations and hence it is not revelational. However just as Brewer (1997) suggested that institutions/policy makers should strive to reduce the correlation between social categories and social roles, wealth and power, it is important that the occupational therapy discipline review the research findings within this dissertation. This serves not to remove ingrouping based on race by draconian means but to remove obstacles such as cultural hegemony that may be subtly prevalent in educational discourse and practices.

My voice as an academic

The data suggests that the occupational therapy department is not aware of the lived reality of the students and the finer nuances of such which is reflective in its procedures and protocol. I believe that these findings will shock my colleagues who resonate with the topic at different levels, and carry themselves with ethical propriety at all times and attempt to be non-racial and consistent in their interaction with students. Their interrogation of these findings will be
important to not only plan the way forward, but to also conscientise the staff to these perceptions, that are the “elephant in the room” within the academy.

7.3 Study Limitations

Some limitations arose as a result of the sampling of the students. There was increased volunteering by ‘white’ students who made up three focus groups out of five and 53% of the ‘voice’ which entailed more dialogue and transcripts available for this race group. The Indian focus group was also not representative of this race group as the four participants were all Muslim and hence limited the voice of the Indian group to persons of a particular religious persuasion, this was not anticipated at the onset of the study. The ‘black’ focus group comprised of eight students that resided on campus and therefore ‘African’ students who reside off campus were not heard from which might have increased the depth of the data. The time of year during which the focus groups were held at, namely post examinations could have decreased volunteering to participate and increased tension amongst participants that was projected into focus groups.

As this qualitative study occurs within a small discipline with in depth interaction occurring amongst its students it also has specific attributes that make some of the data non-transferable to the wider university for example resources required for client interventions.

7.4 Recommendations

This section attempts to encapsulate strategies, opportunities and interventions that can be taken forward within the discipline of Occupational Therapy (UKZN) and perchance the University to improve integration amongst students. This is not and exhaustive list, however frames the findings within the data into pragmatic suggestions.

7.4.1 Multicultural Adult Learning

Chávez and Guido-DiBrito (1999), stress the importance of understanding that education is culturally constructed, and thus in multicultural settings, the learner and teachers might be coming from different world views and contexts. They continue to remind academics that this interface, where students might find themselves out of context and adrift within the hallowed walls of ‘The Academy’, which has been designed around different values needs to be examined and the basis for reconfiguration of curriculums. This is self-evident in the findings of this study with a number of recommendations linking with reconfiguration.
7.4.1.1 Resources Unlocking

Occupational Therapy is a course that requires students from time to time to have material resources such as cooking ingredients for use in therapeutic activities that are used on clinical placements. These resources need to fit the client’s profile and therapeutic activity requirements and are thus highly individualised and temporaneous. ‘African’ students who reside at residence have pointed out that they are under resourced in the ability to get access to the resources from a financial as well as logistical point. The Dept. of Occupational Therapy should endeavour to unlock resources for all students, allowing them access to a range of supplies. A credit system is proposed. The researcher suggests that each student be allowed to access a resource supply from the “media centre” created within the occupational therapy department, and “purchase” resources for a fixed sum, determined annually according to anticipated need for that particular level of study, and implemented on a non-monetary credit system (no money changes hands). Coupled with this a loan system of non-consumables such as table top games or sports equipment will run parallel, where students are allowed to borrow equipment for a limited number of days and then return it. This will allow the Discipline to monitor each student’s usage, provide opportunities to gain therapeutic supplies as well as teach students how to work economically, forward plan and budget for equipment, simultaneously creating equity through access.

7.4.1.2 Inculcating a Liberatory Praxis

Occupational Therapy within South Africa sits in an era where young health professionals are being trained in a free and democratic country, which still has vestiges of the old apartheid system still evident. This legacy has created both structural and interpersonal relationship divides in a diverse multicultural society. This needs to be addressed as Freire (1972) suggests, through not only creating spaces for integration, but impregnating the curriculum with liberatory discourse across the years of study. This will enable ‘black’ students to build self-esteem around black consciousness type attitudes to facilitate self-liberation vs. angst, attitudes of entitlement and passivity. ‘White’ students will be facilitated to improve understanding of the legacy of apartheid and forms of redress while working to break through perceived “inherited burdens” (Brehm, 2005, p. 138). Sidanius (2004) found that perceived ethnic victimisation increased with ethnically orientated organisations and this appears true too, for ingroups of racial homogeneity hence the need for recommendations such as these.
This liberatory praxis should create an ethos of non-racialism through building understanding of context, diversity, culture and race relations both formally through lectures/programmes and informally and non-directively through creating a milieu of humanism and contextualised social identities within the discipline. Gardner (1997) suggests that academics create learning environments with a multiplicity of both cultural norms and learning styles through collaborative and individual activities that build understanding through reflection and discussion (in Chávez & Guido-DiBrito, 1999). This can be done through a lecture/seminar on understanding South African history as the context for occupations which builds self-insight as well as insight into the practice field as well as across the curriculum. These actions then link to both prejudice reduction as well as collective action as mechanisms of creating social change from two angles. (Dixon et al, 2010).

Within this praxis it is imperative that excellent role modelling occur, from academic staff to peer role modelling. Chávez and Guido-DiBrito (1999) extol the need for academic staff to realise that they perpetuate racial divides sub-consciously and hence to “make the invisible visible” through careful examination. Role modelling therefore should display acceptance of diversity, non-racialism, acknowledgement of racism with resilience and activism as antidotes and healthy self-concepts. An annual staff seminar as well policy guidelines regarding mentoring and role modelling should be facilitated and form part of the promotional criteria that informs teaching and learning practice. This can be offered across the College of Health Sciences and need not be specific to occupational therapy.

There are multiple examples of the mentality of the oppressed within the data, coupled with resultant angst and seemingly passivity in the face of the experience of racism. These feelings of being subaltern and ‘inferior’, hindered by unseen boundaries need to be targeted through the above mechanisms. Subservience to the stronger more powerful Other was seen in terms of language proficiency, hence work with improving English should be included in a more focused fashion, as this is the medium of instruction as well as the language that the profession is most published in. The Occupational Therapy Department should further facilitate the explanation of key lectures within a majority mother tongue such as isiZulu (which is the University’s language policy). An example of this would be to allow the access lecture notes in isiZulu and/or English. Lecturers need to be made aware of ‘stereotype threat’ and work conscientiously with ‘black’ students to prevent them disidentifying with academic work (Stambor, 2006).
As experience of contemporary racism appears very strongly within the data the Discipline should consider creating a programme run by the Academic Development Officer (ADO) to build resilience for the experience of racism. This can be done through techniques such as cognitive re-structuring/framing and conscientisation/self-awareness building. This and building into the curriculum (first year) assignments that require interrogation of this type of emotional baggage, while getting to know the Other. These recommendations create opportunities for cognitive dissonance as well as increasing the amount of contact time and quality of the interaction that work towards decreasing the frequency of instances of discrimination/marginalisation (Saguy et al, 2009; Baron et al, 2009). Further the ADO should ensure that specific programmes/interventions required to build tolerance in diversity and integration be facilitated by a skilled practitioner in diversity training and not only at a time of crisis. Having fun together and teambuilding/growth experiences were reported many times as a panacea for social cohesion and these need to be incorporated in the above.

### 7.4.2 Facilitating Greater Cohesion

Social cohesion begins with understanding ourselves as humans and building understanding. This is not a boxed educational task but extrudes into the practice of occupational therapists who are required to understand the people they work with contextually and as an amalgamation of factors that shaped them (WFOT, 2010). This section looks at opportunities for this to be facilitated within the discipline.

#### 7.4.2.1 Facilitating Mutual Self-discovery

**Stereotypes**

Systematised breaking of stereotypes that the data reveals needs to be acknowledged and tackled as they are both internally as well as externally held. These recommendations need to be seen in conjunction with the other recommendations as they are not mutually exclusive and demonstrate overlap. Brehm et al (2005) suggest that the sharing of personal information as well as taking the perspective of the Other are evidenced based methods of breaking stereotypes. Lecturers in the setting of activities, seminars and group work tasks, including assignments, need to build opportunities for this to happen while ensuring biases are not confirmed and the self-fulfilling prophecy is not activated by this interaction.

---

43 Academic Development Officer- ADO employed within the discipline to assist students with academic and social issues have have implications on their study.
Contact theory

Allport’s contact theory (1954) with its factors that promote integration was voiced through examples of social cohesion and has found to have contemporary relevance within South Africa through recent research (Foster, 2005). The continued social engineering of students by the academic staff through racial mixing of student work groups, such as assignments and fieldwork placements, found favour with the participants who provided thick descriptions of this breaking down of attitudes and the fostering of new. This needs to continue, while semesterised growth games within classes as well as between years should be scheduled to allow for the establishment of superordinate goals and the creation of porous boundaries between ingroups (Baron & Byrne, 1994).

Durrheim and Dixon (2004) assert that racial evaluation is an “activity that people do together” where space as a phenomenon creates the conditions for continued racialisation, perpetuation of hegemonic cultural practices and social division (p. 632). This is supported by the data from racialised social space to minorities leaving the campus immediately as a result of perceived threat or lack of social opportunities and spaces of belonging. This needs to be addressed through timetabling within the discipline that allows time for general socialisation and for the “alienated” occupational therapy students to join the greater student body during the day. It also calls for a common room/area where students, specifically in occupational therapy and perhaps across health science disciplines share a venue that speaks to being comfortable and belonging and interacting across ingroups from race to discipline to culture.

7.4.3 Areas that Require Further Research

The researcher is of the opinion that participatory action research should be considered in integration building research within the discipline. This allows cycles of reflective and collaboration with participants to change/understand the area of focus. This research will not only inform the discipline of methods/techniques/changes that are relevant to building social cohesion amongst youth but also inform about the negative. It would be significant to the greater student body and the University as a whole.

7.5 Researcher: Owning my Thoughts; Bracketing them out

In the tradition of phenomenology it is important that I the researcher attempt to bracket out my own perceptions and lived reality from the work; this is what this section is about. I attempted to bracket out my perceptions and emotions by acknowledging my thoughts within the work and
those that the data created. I also tracked the same in regards to the analysis of the data, verification of the data through triangulation and my supervisors reading of multiple drafts to ensure trustworthiness. This piece of prose serves to allow a view into the emotions and perceptual journey that I underwent through the course of the research.

On downloading the first transcript I rushed home and listened to the copy twice. The ‘black’ focus group transcript left me feeling ill, miserable and astonished. Many questions plagued my mind. Was this how the students that I work with see the discipline, their peers, the world and me? Why did they seem to be more hung up about race now, than since I had experienced it in my heady student activist days railing against apartheid? Why had they continued to experience racism to the degree that they reported and why did they seem to use the group for protection and safety? Did they feel intimidated by the research and needed to approach it from a “strength in numbers” type scenario seen in their request to have only one focus group? This was only the beginning of the journey with the data as many more emotions would be experienced over the year as I worked with the data.

The data made me **emotionally exhausted**. I found myself not only working on the data from a researcher point of view, but processing it as a person of colour, as a contemporary activist, as a human, as one who is vested in this country doing well-inclusively, as an academic, and as a global traveller who recognised these issues are not ours alone. I caught myself debating issues in the staff room linked to these thoughts and questioning my lack of contemporary activism, trying to find meaning, make meaning and find some denouement for myself. I feel I am still working on it and perhaps it is a life’s work that this small project can add to.

The data from that initial inauspicious start **took me back in time** to being a politicised student and reflective of where I had come from, my dreams for the country, from being a citizen, to being abroad at the time of the elections of 1994 and finally my own humdrum life of pedestrian academic existence since five years ago. It made me **grateful** that I had dared to approach this topic even in a mini dissertation as it made me want to pursue those dreams from yesteryear afresh, with **new zeal and passion**, but this time in an academic’s shoes.

While the data had inspired me to continue, it **shocked me**, by some of the assertions and as I continued to work I was saddened. **Saddened** by the contemporary experience of racism by ‘black’ students and the wish to sweep it all under the rug by ‘white students’. Saddened that my young daughter would be faced with some of these issues residing in South Africa, as a “person of colour”. I put the research down, for many long months torn by how to represent it,
authentically and objectively. A very busy academic life served a foil for my procrastination, buying me time but adding to the emotional baggage. In retrospective I realise that I required the time to allow the data to rest in my mind and to find the distance that I required to see it for what it was, in all its glory and sordidness and to be able to objectively work with it or attempt to.

Small things appeared to irritate me such as *frustration* of not being the moderator of the focus groups. I felt that the moderators, with no fault on their side, had not been well versed with the literature around the topic as I was as they allowed opportunities to probe important points pass by. Another irritation was that by this being a mini dissertation it did not afford the topic the breadth that a full research Master’s would have. This perhaps explains the lengthy nature of the dissertation.

As the write up began to come together, I realised the need for these students to vent and talk and discuss, as often it was as if I had opened the floodgates, and they literally talked the hind leg of a donkey. Race is a divisive fact of life, and then it began to merge into my fears, *causing greater angst and distress*, what if my supervisor or examiner would not resonate with the uncomfortable content of this dissertation, what if race continued to divide …?

At one of these points, I felt alive and conscious that this small work could and would make a difference. I remember sending a text message to a friend saying “I have fallen in love with my data all over again”. I had begun to see that this was a serious piece of work that had come into being by my participants’ voices and thoughts and perceptions and that I could “play it forward” a colloquial saying that means I could make changes occur. I hope it does.

### 7.6 Conclusion

Racial Othering is present amongst occupational therapy students at UKZN which is not a new or localised phenomenon. It is found across the world and evident across cultures however this ingrouping is nuanced and perhaps made stronger by our history of apartheid and the consequential attempts at redress. Just as students see Us/Them distinctions they also see the positive in integration and have shared incidences of social cohesion/integration and many thoughts around the promotion of integration. Although complex and often deep the research remains positive as there are clear and practical recommendations that can be implemented to create a different future reality.
7.6.1 Significance of the Study

This study produced information that seeks to deepen understanding among academic staff of students perceptions that drive homogeneous group interaction and decrease intergroup contact. The aim was met as staff will be involved in a journal club seminar regarding the findings while the researcher will seek to implement curriculum recommendations during the discipline’s curriculum review this year and during the planning meeting January 2014. The research findings will also be disseminated as widely as possible, through the following means:

- The dissertation being filed within UKZN’s electronic and hardcopy archives for all to access, a pub
- Findings will be fed back to all students registered for the occupational therapy degree, as well as students that have graduated and were participants in the research in the form of an informative email and through a seminar
- A publishable article will be submitted to a SAPSE accredited journal within a year of the study being completed
- A conference presentation discussing the research findings will be presented to the occupational therapy profession at large at the Occupational Therapy Association of South Africa’s conference in Cape Town 2014.

The significance if the study does not lie in the understanding of the group dynamics and integration amongst the present set of students but in the systemic changes that the recommendations will seek to instil in academic teaching, small group social engineering, curriculum planning, timetabling, cross cultural/racial growth experiences and University wide practices. Finally the lecturer/researcher believes that already the Other has been incorporated into the Us, by her deepened understanding of students' perceptions and her continued endeavours to ensure that this is sown in staff minds as well. The University's Transformational Charter is being worked towards in this small way; however the researcher will seek to create opportunities for senior University management to interrogate these. This will be a multi-levelled approach from a discipline and college level to the University's transformation committee and the Student representative council.
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Appendix 2: Letter of Intent and Purpose of the Study

Masters research project title: Racial integration and dynamics amongst Occupational Therapy students at UKZN

Student name: Chantal Juanita Christopher

I am currently completing my Masters in Philosophy of Group Therapy and am looking at the social integration patterns of occupational therapy students. The topic is of interest to me as I witness how students congregate in groups that are made up of individuals of the same so called ‘race group’ for want of a better term. Following the end of apartheid and given that most of you have been socialised post the liberational changes in South Africa this apparent patterning is of sociological as well as professional interest.

In order to research these integration patterns I would like to invite you to volunteer to participate in focus groups where your feelings and understanding around this issue is called for. The groups will be held at a convenient time and place by a facilitator external to the OT Department to allow for your anonymity to be maintained. The groups will be between one to one and a half hours long and refreshments will be provided. Each selected participant will be invited to participate in one initial focus group and thereafter in a further focus group to verify findings. A focus group is a relaxed discussion between volunteers and a facilitator and allows for free sharing of ideas and your experiences. A volunteer can participate at a level that they feel comfortable with.

These groups will be confidential in nature as your responses will be coded and your identity protected. The researcher/supervisor or any other reader will not be able to be match responses to you as an individual.

You are free to leave the research process at any time as well as during the focus groups without being prejudiced in any way. The research process also falls outside of your typical student activities within the Department of Occupational Therapy and although the researcher works at the university, you will not be prejudiced in anyway by your participation in this project as the link between your identity and responses will be unidentifiable, even to the researcher.

The information collected in the study will be used for research purposes only. The audiotapes will be destroyed at the end of the research. The transcripts will remain in the property of the researchers and will be kept private and strictly confidential as per the University of Kwazulu-Natal’s policy.

Procedure:

Should you volunteer to participate in the focus groups you are required to inform the researcher in person, by email or putting initial show of interest form into sealed box provided in the OT Foyer by the specified date. Focus group members will then be selected on a first come first served basis and divided into homogeneous groups. If selected you will be notified of the time of the focus group as well as the venue on UKZN- Westville campus. An external facilitator
will run the groups while an external fieldworker will take notes and audiotape the discussion. This data will be then be analysed and you may be called to another focus group to verify the findings.

**Risks**

The risk of any harm to participants is considered minimal due to the current lived experience as an occupational therapy student on campus. The focus group facilitator is furthermore a health care professional, with a strong ethical practice and humanist ethos, well briefed in the area of investigation.

The content and the disclosure in the focus group may elicit a range of emotional reactions within you as a participant. A trained counsellor will be on hand to debrief you as desired or as required.

**Benefits**

There are no direct benefits for participants. However, this study should provide you with an opportunity to contribute information that will be used to facilitate greater social awareness and understanding between student and academics and directly contribute to the transformational changes being made to the occupational therapy curricula and pedagogical facilitation.

**Contact details of researcher**

If you have any questions about the study, please contact me at:

Researcher: Chantal Christopher 0845633799 or 031-2608218 or christopherc@ukzn.ac.za

Supervisor: Mrs. Dain van der Reyden 031 2607310 or dainic@telkomsa.net

HSS Ethical committee contact person: Ms Phumele Ximba 031-2603587 or ximgap@ukzn.ac.za
Appendix 3: Letter of Consent

UNIVERSITY OF KWAZULU-NATAL
College Of Health Sciences
School of Occupational Therapy

Dear Participant,

Invitation to participate in Focus Group/s
Master of Philosophy in Group Therapy Research Project
Researcher: Chantal Juanita Christopher (031-2607310)
Supervisor: Dain van der Reyden (031-2607310)
Research Office: Ms. P Ximba (031-2603587)

I, Chantal Christopher a Master of Philosophy in Group Therapy student, at the School of Health Sciences, of the University of KwaZulu-Natal wish to thank you most sincerely for indicating an interest in participating in my research project entitled: Racial integration and dynamics amongst Occupational Therapy students at UKZN.

The aim of this study is to: Explore racial integration across university life as experienced by Occupational Therapy students to produce insights that will deepen understanding among academic staff, inform training and eventually also practice.

Through your most valued participation I hope to understand how you experience racial integration on the campus.

Your participation in this project is voluntary. You may refuse to participate or withdraw from the project at any time with no negative consequence or impact on your student grading or any other aspect of your life as a student occupational therapist. There will be no monetary gain from participating in the focus group however transport costs will be reimbursed. Confidentiality will be ensured however this does not exclude use of the findings of the study for dissemination. As the researcher I will not be able to link any comments made, to any particular participant ensuring anonymity, anonymity will further be ensured at all times by the removal of identifying data from all forms/transcriptions and all recordings which will be safely/securely...
stored by the researcher within the Occupational Therapy Dept. with access limited to the researcher and the supervisor, as prescribed by UKZN policy.

If you have any questions or concerns about participating in this study, you may contact me or my supervisor at the numbers or email addresses listed above.

The focus group discussion should take you about 60 to 90 minutes to complete. I appreciate your interest and I hope you will be able to take the time to participate in this research project

Sincerely

Chantel Christopher

Researcher’s signature____________________________________

Date_________________

Supervisor’s signature____________________________________
Appendix 4: Focus Group Probes

The focus group will be loosely moderated creating an ambiance within which free flowing and open discussion may occur. The following questions are thus open ended stimulus type questions that will be used as required. Probes to seek depth and clarity will be utilised as the content emerges.

1. Would you please share your thoughts about the article?
   Prompts: How does the article speak about your experience and observations or not?
2. What elements may be identified from the article?
   Prompts: Are any of these elements part of your campus life?
3. How do you experience campus life/integration?
4. Share some ideas about why students socialise around racial lines?
   Prompts: Where do we get racial identity from, what intention does race have, why do we see each other in terms of race?
5. What implications could this have for you as occupational therapy students/practitioners?
6. What can be done to change this pattern?
   Prompts: What can/should be done? By who, when??
7. Thank you for the fruitful honest discussion. To end with I would like everyone to draw their feelings and thoughts together to form a summary. Who would like to start?
Appendix 5: Vignette

The significance of ‘race’ at UKZN

…These questions were addressed unintentionally by some third year undergraduate sociology students in an exercise I had asked them to do in small groups at the University’s Howard College campus. The students had started a course on ‘social identities’ which I was taking, and this exercise was intended to encourage them to think about group identifications and dynamics. I asked them to identify and map student groupings on campus, and taking individuals from these, to find out whether they expressed any sense of group affiliation.

Perhaps the most striking finding from this exercise was how racialised the groups the students identified were. Indeed it was reported in some accounts how certain spaces on campus came to be seen as white, black or Indian, so frequently were they habituated by students in mono-racial groups. Even in relatively mixed spaces it was reported as being unusual for black, Indian and white students (and especially undergraduates) to social and engage with each other. And in lecture theatres students, it was found, tended to sit with others with whom they identified as the same ‘race’.

Appendix 6: Gatekeeper Letter of Permission

17 October 2012

Ms CJ Christopher, 8727379

Re: Gatekeepers Permission

Title of Study:
Racial integration and dynamics among Occupational Therapy students at UKZN

This letter serves to confirm that you have been granted gatekeeper permission in order to utilize the data requested provided that the terms of the informed consent documentation are strictly adhered to.

Yours truly
Prof HJ Van Heerden

[Signature]

Academic Leader: Research
Chair: SREHDC
School of Health Sciences

Ms P Nene
Postgraduate Officer:
School of Health Sciences
UKZN: Westville Campus
Tel: (031) 2608280
Fax: (031) 2607872
NeneP1@ukzn.ac.za
## Appendix 7: Moderator and Fieldworker Notes

### Expanded Field work notes (moderator)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group #:</th>
<th>Site:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note taker:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General notes:**

What were the main themes that emerged?

What did the participants say that was unclear to you?
What did you observe that would not be evident by reading a transcript?

Where there any group dynamics or individual behaviours that were notable?

What problems did you encounter (e.g. logistical, behaviours of individuals, questions that were confusing, etc.)?
# Field work notes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group #:</th>
<th>Site:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Moderator:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time started:</td>
<td>Note taker:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time ended:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Seating Chart:**

Make a seating chart indicating the participants and their identifier. Use this chart to identify speakers as you take notes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
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<td></td>
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